

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-1165

CHARLES GABRIEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FORSYTH COUNTY CLERK OF COURT MS. SUSAN FRYE, Office of the 21st
Judicial District Court; HOLLEY ROBINSON, Deputy Assistant; STATEBRIDGE
COMPANY, LLC; BROUGHAM REO OWNER, LP; JOHN A. MANDULAK,
Individually and as Trustee; HUTCHENS LAW FIRM; SUBSTITUTE TRUSTEE
SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 19-1673

CHARLES GABRIEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FORSYTH COUNTY CLERK OF COURT MS. SUSAN FRYE, Office of the 21st
Judicial District Court; HOLLY ROBINSON, Deputy Assistant,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

STATEBRIDGE COMPANY, LLC; BROUGHAM REO OWNER, LP; JOHN A. MANDULAK, Individually and as Trustee; HUTCHENS LAW FIRM; SUBSTITUTE TRUSTEE SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, Chief District Judge. (1:18-cv-00354-TDS-LPA)

Submitted: July 31, 2020

Decided: August 6, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Gabriel, Appellant Pro Se. Jeffrey Allen Bunda, HUTCHENS LAW FIRM, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Gabriel appeals the district court's orders dismissing his civil action and denying his motion to file an amended complaint. To the extent Gabriel sought to challenge the result of a state foreclosure action, the district court concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the *Rooker-Feldman** doctrine. The court further concluded that Gabriel's claims that survived *Rooker-Feldman* failed to state a plausible claim for relief and that amendment would be futile because Gabriel's amended complaint similarly failed to state a plausible claim for relief. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we grant Gabriel's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, and we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Gabriel v. Frye*, No. 1:18-cv-00354-TDS-LPA (M.D.N.C. Jan. 8, 2019 & May 21, 2019). 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

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