

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1653

VERNON J. LEFTRIDGE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 25-1655

VERNON J. LEFTRIDGE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:25-cv-01292-DKC)

Submitted: September 25, 2025Decided: September 29, 2025

Before GREGORY and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Vernon J. Leftridge, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Ann M. Sheridan, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In 2024, Vernon J. Leftridge filed suit in state court challenging the calculation of welfare benefits. He then filed notice of removal to the district court. The court remanded the action to state court for lack of jurisdiction because Leftridge, as the plaintiff, could not remove the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). Leftridge then filed a Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion, arguing that the remand order was based on Defendant's fraud. The district court denied the motion insofar as it was brought pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3), finding the remand order was not procured by any fraud, and dismissed the remainder of Leftridge's requested relief for lack of jurisdiction. *See Barlow v. Colgate Palmolive Co.*, 772 F.3d 1001, 1007-12 (4th Cir. 2014) (concluding that, while remand orders based on lack of jurisdiction are not reviewable on reconsideration, district courts have jurisdiction to review requests to vacate remand orders under Rule 60(b)(3)). Leftridge filed a notice of appeal of the remand order and the order denying his Rule 60(b)(3) motion to vacate that order.

We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court correctly denied Leftridge's Rule 60(b)(3) motion. Moreover, the remand order is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d). Accordingly, we deny all of Leftridge's pending motions, dismiss his appeal of the remand order, and affirm the district court's order denying Leftridge's motion to vacate the remand order. *Leftridge v. Md. Dep't of Human Servs.*, No. 8:25-cv-01292-DKC (D. Md. May 30 & June 5, 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 IN PART,
DISMISSED IN PART*