

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1202

ANNIE-GRACE KLINE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LEIDOS, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:24-cv-01343-LMB-WEF)

Submitted: October 16, 2025

Decided: October 20, 2025

Before KING, AGEE, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Annie-Grace Kline, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Joseph Murphy, OGLETREE DEAKINS,
Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Annie-Grace Kline appeals the district court's order denying the "Motion to Reopen Case" she filed after the district court dismissed Kline's employment-related action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(2).^{*} We have reviewed the record and affirm the district court's order on other grounds "apparent on the record." *Moore v. Frazier*, 941 F.3d 717, 725 (4th Cir. 2019). Namely, while the district court should have construed the motion as being brought pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) or Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), *see Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) ("A document filed pro se is to be liberally construed, and a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." (citation modified)); *see also, e.g., Waetzig v. Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc.*, 604 U.S. 305, 313, 319 (2025) (explaining that although a voluntary dismissal without prejudice "strips a court of its equitable power to revise its earlier rulings," a party can move for relief under Rule 60(b) because such a dismissal is a "final proceeding"), we conclude that the "Motion to Reopen Case" failed to establish grounds for relief under either Rule.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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

^{*} Kline has filed motions to expedite, which we deny as moot.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

ANNIE-GRACE KLINE,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEIDOS, INC.,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

1:24-cv-1343 (LMB/WEF)

ORDER

On February 19, 2025, plaintiff Annie-Grace Kline (“plaintiff” or “Kline”), proceeding pro se, filed a Motion to Withdraw Lawsuit in which she stated, “I have realized I cannot move forward with this case.” [Dkt. No. 47] at 1. The Court granted Kline’s request and ordered the civil action dismissed without prejudice on February 20, 2025. [Dkt. No. 49] at 1. In that order, the Court cautioned plaintiff that “[t]here are time limits for filing employment discrimination claims, and a new complaint filed in the future may be time-barred.” Id.

On February 24, 2025, Kline filed a Motion to Reopen Case and Response to Judge Order Re: Case Dismissed Without Prejudice (“Motion to Reopen”), in which she offered no good reasons for reopening this closed civil action. Instead, Kline reiterated her belief that she deserved a better settlement offer from defendant, Leidos, Inc., and she continued to protest the defendant’s discovery requests for her medical records. [Dkt. No. 52]. In addition to requesting a hearing, plaintiff asserts that her neighbors are working with Leidos, Inc.’s managers to harass her. Id. at 2. Because this civil action was dismissed by the Court at plaintiff’s request after plaintiff and defendant had engaged in motions practice and nearly completed discovery, she has

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