

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 18-1993**

---

SABRINA D. DAVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KIA MOTORS AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (6:08-cv-01937-RBH)

---

Submitted: January 17, 2019

---

Decided: January 22, 2019

---

Before WILKINSON and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sabrina D. Davis, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sabrina D. Davis appeals the district court's text order denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3) motion to vacate the court's 2009 order dismissing her civil action for lack of jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Davis v. Kia Motors America, Inc.*, No. 6:08-cv-01937-RBH (D.S.C. Aug. 10, 2018). 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*

MIME-Version: 1.0  
From: SCDBfilingstate@scd.uscourts.gov  
To: scd\_ecf\_nef@localhost.localdomain  
Bcc:  
--Case Participants: David Christopher Marshall (david@landblawfirm.com, elizabeth@landblawfirm.com), Curtis L Ott (cott@gwblawfirm.com, kharbison@gwblawfirm.com, ljordan@gwblawfirm.com, murch@gwblawfirm.com), Honorable R Bryan Harwell (harwell\_ecf@scd.uscourts.gov)  
--Non Case Participants:  
--No Notice Sent:

Message-ID:<8574339@scd.uscourts.gov>  
Subject:Activity in Case 6:08-cv-01937-RBH Davis v. Kia Motors America, Inc Order on Motion to Vacate  
Content-Type: text/html

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\* Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

District of South Carolina

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 8/10/2018 at 11:26 AM EDT and filed on 8/10/2018

Case Name: Davis v. Kia Motors America, Inc

Case Number: 6:08-cv-01937-RBH

Filer:

WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 08/18/2009

Document Number: 104 (No document attached)

Docket Text:

**TEXT ORDER** denying [103] Motion to Vacate: In 2009, the Court dismissed this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and in 2014, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion to reopen. See ECF Nos. [77] & [94]. Plaintiff has now filed a motion to vacate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3). See ECF No. [103].

"The savings clause in Rule 60(d)(3) permits a court to exercise its inherent equitable powers to obviate a final judgment after one year for 'fraud on the court.'" *Fox ex rel. Fox v. Elk Run Coal Co.*, 739 F.3d 131, 135-36 (4th Cir. 2014) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3)). "[F]raud on the court is a nebulous concept that should be construed very narrowly" because it "involves corruption of the judicial process itself and thus the doctrine cannot support allegations involving a routine evidentiary conflict." *Id.* at 136 (internal quotation marks omitted).

"Because the power to vacate a judgment for fraud upon the court is so free from procedural limitations, it is limited to fraud that seriously affects the integrity of the normal process of adjudication[;]" *In re Genesys Data Techs., Inc.*, 204 F.3d 124, 130 (4th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks omitted). "Proving fraud on the court thus presents, under Supreme Court and circuit precedent, a very high bar for any litigant." *Elk Run Coal*, 739 F.3d at 136-37.

Here, the allegations in Plaintiff's motion do not satisfy the high standard of Rule 60(d)(3), and therefore no basis exists to set aside the Court's prior judgment. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's [103] motion to vacate.

**Signed by the Honorable R. Bryan Harwell on 8/10/2018.(ene, )**

6:08-cv-01937-RBH Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Curtis L Ott cott@gwblawfirm.com, kharbison@gwblawfirm.com, ljordan@gwblawfirm.com, murch@gwblawfirm.com

David Christopher Marshall david@landblawfirm.com, elizabeth@landblawfirm.com

6:08-cv-01937-RBH Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

Sabrina D Davis  
PO Box 238  
Clinton, SC 29325

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**