

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1426

JACQUELINE R. HUMPHRIES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HADEN, JLB MCLEAN, LLC, Douglas Crawford, Leasing Director, et al; GLENN YOUNGKIN, Governor of Virginia; GERALD E. CONNOLLY, U.S.; JEFF OLIVET, Executive Director; JOE SAVAGE, Executive Director; DIPTI PIDIKITI-SMITH, Judge, Judicial Officer - Fairfax General District Court; SCOTT TURNER, Secretary of HUD; THOMAS FLEETWOOD, Director Fairfax County Housing Authority; JANELL DIAZ, Director of Asset Mgt. Alexandria Housing Authority; KAITLYN MASSA, Compliance Analyst; MARGARET GREGORY, Director of Rental Assistance; AMY GINGER, Operations Manager; BENJAMIN WAGNER, Compliance Manager; KALVAITHA PONRAJEH; TRUVONDA BOONE; ANNJANETTE RODRIQUEZ,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:23-cv-01744-CMH-IDD)

Submitted: December 23, 2025

Decided: December 30, 2025

Before WILKINSON and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jacqueline R. Humphries, Appellant Pro Se. Meghan Elizabeth Loftus, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia; Brett Anna Callahan, Assistant County Attorney, FAIRFAX COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax, Virginia; Louise Gitcheva, REES BROOME, PC, Tysons Corner, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jacqueline R. Humphries appeals the district court's orders dismissing her civil action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and denying her postjudgment motions. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders and deny Humphries's pending motions to strike material from the record and for default judgment. *Humphries v. Haden, JLB McLean, LLC*, No. 1:23-cv-01744-CMH-IDD (E.D. Va. Mar. 29, 2024; Mar. 10, 2025). 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