

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1663

NICHOLE MCGILL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LOUDOUN COUNTY TRANSIT,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 25-1962

NICHOLE MCGILL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LOUDOUN COUNTY TRANSIT,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 25-2181

NICHOLE MCGILL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LOUDOUN COUNTY TRANSIT,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:25-cv-00721-LMB-IDD)

Submitted: June 18, 2026

Decided: June 23, 2026

Before GREGORY and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nichole McGill, Appellant Pro Se. Gilda Bethany Ingle, Anthonia Remi Omidiji, LITTLER MENDELSON PC, Tysons Corner, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Nichole McGill appeals several district court orders entered in her action alleging that Loudon County Transit (“LCT”) failed to accommodate her health issues, in violation of the American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 to 12213, and Virginia law.* The district court dismissed McGill’s action, without prejudice, because McGill failed to comply with her discovery obligations and to comply with the district court’s order directing McGill to respond to LCT’s discovery requests.

We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error by the district court. *See, e.g., United States v. Shaffer Equip. Co.*, 11 F.3d 450, 462-63 (4th Cir. 1993) (listing factors that should be considered before dismissing a case as a sanction, including “the degree of the wrongdoer’s culpability” and “the prejudice to the judicial process and the administration of justice”). Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s judgment. *McGill v. Loudon Cnty. Transit*, No. 1:25-cv-00721-LMB-IDD (E.D. Va. Sep. 15, 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

* McGill has several motions pending in this court, which we deny.