

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-7138

September Term, 2024

1:23-cv-03940-UNA

Filed On: June 20, 2025

Joi M. Kelly,

Appellant

v.

C&F Mortgage Corporation,

Appellee

**ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

BEFORE: Pillard, Katsas, and Rao, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief and appendix filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order entered March 27, 2024, be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed the case for failure to demonstrate subject-matter jurisdiction. Appellant was required to include in her complaint a short and plain statement of the grounds for the district court's jurisdiction, Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1), but she failed to do so. Nothing in appellant's complaint suggests that this case presents a federal question. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331. And both appellant and the named defendant are citizens of Virginia, meaning that complete diversity is lacking. See id. § 1332(a); In re Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust Litig., 631 F.3d 537, 541 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (“[D]iversity jurisdiction does not exist unless *each* defendant is a citizen of a different state from *each* plaintiff.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-7138

September Term, 2024

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk