

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-2340

REGINALD D. EVANS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

YORK COUNTY, INC.,

Defendant - Appellant,

BH MANAGEMENT; PACE RIVER APARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ROCK HILL INC.; PACES RIVER APARTMENT; CLIFFORD BERINSKY;
THOMAS I. HOWARD; BROWNLEE LAW FIRM PLLC; DINA D. BIGGS;
ALYSSA PRUITT; LAND STAR TRANSPORTATION LOGISTIC,
INCORPORATED,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Senior District Judge. (0:15-cv-04954-JFA)

Submitted: March 29, 2018

Decided: April 2, 2018

Before AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Reginald D. Evans, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Reginald Evans appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing his third amended civil complaint as barred by the *Rooker-Feldman** doctrine. To the extent that Evans sought to directly challenge the state court's judgment in federal court, the district court correctly determined that it lacked jurisdiction over his claims. See *Thana v. Bd. of License Comm'rs for Charles Cty.*, 827 F.3d 314, 319-20 (4th Cir. 2016) (discussing application of *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine). Although the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine would not bar Evans' due process claim, we affirm on the ground that Evans failed to state a viable claim as to the named defendants. See *Quesenberry v. Volvo Trucks N. Am. Retiree Healthcare Benefit Plan*, 651 F.3d 437, 442 n.* (4th Cir. 2011) (“[W]e can affirm on any basis fairly supported by the record.” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

* *Rooker v. Fid. Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983).