



---

2015 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

9-29-2015

## Anthony Mina v. Dawson Muth

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2015](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Anthony Mina v. Dawson Muth" (2015). *2015 Decisions*. 1033.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2015/1033](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015/1033)

This September is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2015 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 15-1643

---

ANTHONY STOCKER MINA,  
Appellant

v.

DAWSON R. MUTH; GOLDBERG MEANIX  
MUTH & MCCALLIN LAW FIRM;  
JUDGE HOWARD RILEY;  
COURT REPORTER HANDY

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(E.D. Pa. 2-14-mc-00222)  
District Court Judge: Honorable Edward G. Smith

---

Submitted for Possible Dismissal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)  
or Summary Action Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6  
September 17, 2015  
Before: FISHER, SHWARTZ and GREENBERG, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: September 29, 2015)

---

OPINION\*

---

PER CURIAM

---

\* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

Anthony Stocker Mina sought permission to file in forma pauperis a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) to overturn a state-court judgment dismissing his civil action in the Court of Common Pleas in Chester County, Pennsylvania. The District Court granted Mina's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, and, pursuant to its screening obligations under 28 U.S.C. 1915A, denied the Rule 60 motion and dismissed the case. The District Court concluded that it could not overturn a state court's judgment under Rule 60(b), and that Mina's requested relief was barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. Mina appeals.

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We exercise plenary review over the District Court's dismissal order. See Allah v. Seiverling, 229 F.3d 220, 223 (3d Cir. 2000). We may summarily affirm if the appeal presents no substantial questions. See 3d Cir. L.A.R. 27.4; I.O.P. 10.6.

The District Court properly dismissed Mina's Rule 60(b) motion seeking to set aside the state court's judgment. As the District Court reasoned, a federal district court cannot overturn a state court judgment under Rule 60(b). Moreover, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine bars Mina's attempt invalidate the Court of Common Pleas' judgment dismissing his case for failure to prosecute. The Rooker-Feldman doctrine deprives federal district courts of jurisdiction "over suits that are essentially appeals from state-court judgments." Great W. Mining & Mineral Co. v. Fox Rothschild LLP, 615 F.3d 159, 165 (3d Cir. 2010). The Rooker-Feldman doctrine applies when four requirements are met: "(1) the federal plaintiff lost in state court; (2) the plaintiff 'complain[s] of

injuries caused by [the] state-court judgments’; (3) those judgments were rendered before the federal suit was filed; and (4) the plaintiff is inviting the district court to review and reject the state judgments.” Id. at 166 (alterations in original) (quoting Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005)). Mina’s claims satisfy these four requirements. Therefore the District Court correctly dismissed his case with prejudice.

Accordingly, we will summarily affirm the judgment of the District Court.