

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-2040

JOHN R. CLARK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; MECKLENBURG COUNTY; CITY OF
CHARLOTTE; FIRSTKEY MASTER FUNDING; HUTCHENS LAW FIRM;
JESSON & RAINS, PLLC; BLOSSOM LAW PLLC; OFFIT KURMAN, P.A.;
CERBERUS CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.; NORTH CAROLINA FINANCE
AGENCY; FIRSTKEY MASTER FUNDING (COLLATERAL TRUST);
SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICES, INC.; FIRSTKEY MORTGAGE LLC,
Corporate Office; ALL INSURANCE COMPANIES, who insure/bonds the
defendants,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (5:24-cv-00203-D-BM)

Submitted: February 25, 2025

Decided: May 20, 2025

Before KING, AGEE, and BERNER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John R. Clark, Appellant Pro Se. Laura Howard McHenry, Assistant Attorney General,
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Zipporah

Basile Edwards, Akysia La'shai Resper, OFFIT KURMAN, PA, Charlotte, North Carolina; Claire Collins Dickerhoff, HUTCHENS LAW FIRM, Fayetteville, North Carolina; Edward A. Jesson, JESSON & RAINS, PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina; Kenneth Love, Jr., KARRENSTEIN & LOVE, Matthews, North Carolina; Mark L. Garibyan, William Hayward Gussman, Jr., SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP, New York, New York; Stephanie L. Gumm, POYNER SPRUILL LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Matthew Adams Abee, NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John R. Clark appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint without prejudice. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Clark's claims relating to his parents' will are foreclosed by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.* The dismissal of his remaining claims was proper because Clark did not assert "sufficient facts to allow the court to infer liability as to *each* defendant." *Langford v. Joyner*, 62 F.4th 122, 126 (4th Cir. 2023). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Clark v. North Carolina*, No. 5:24-cv-00203-D-BM (E.D.N.C. Sept. 27, 2024). 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. Tr. Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *D.C. Ct. of App. v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983).