

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Aijoma-Pyna: Conoco (f/k/a Antonya-Darrell Lindsey) v. Fran Johnson, Director, Prince George's County Child Support Administration, et al.

Conoco · No. Civ. No. DLB-26-599 · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland dismissed without prejudice a pro se civil rights complaint challenging child-support-related suspension of the plaintiff’s driver’s license and passport. The court held that the Rooker-Feldman doctrine deprived it of subject-matter jurisdiction because the claims sought review and rejection of state-court judgments. The court granted the plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis and closed the case without reaching the motions for temporary or preliminary relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	Civ. No. DLB-26-599
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a federal civil-rights complaint alleging Fourteenth Amendment violations arising from the suspension of his driver's license and passport for child-support arrears, along with motions to proceed in forma pauperis, for a preliminary injunction, and for a temporary restraining order. The district court granted in forma pauperis status and dismissed the complaint without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently determines whether subject-matter jurisdiction exists and must dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) whenever jurisdiction is lacking. The court also liberally construes the complaint of a self-represented plaintiff.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court memorandum opinion; precedential value not established in the document.

PARTIES

Aijoma-Pyna: Conoco (f/k/a Antonya-Darrell Lindsey) v. Fran Johnson, Director, Prince George's County Child Support Administration, Judge Darren Johnson, Stenise Rolle, Maxwell Cohen of Robert A. Ades & Associates, P.C., Kimberly Vanessa Handon-Lindsey

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction child support fourteenth amendment civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure family law constitutional law civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the federal district court had subject-matter jurisdiction over a civil-rights action challenging state-court child-support judgments and related license and passport suspensions.
2. Whether the Rooker-Feldman doctrine barred the federal claims because Conoco was seeking review and rejection of state-court judgments.
3. Whether the court should reach Conoco's motions for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction after determining that subject-matter jurisdiction was lacking.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction because Conoco's claims challenged state-court judgments and sought federal review and rejection of those judgments.
2. The court did not reach the motions for a temporary restraining order or preliminary relief because it lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, federal courts lack jurisdiction over “cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments.””

“This dismissal does not prejudice Conoco’s right to seek relief in state court.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Conoco alleged that his driver's license and passport were suspended for child-support arrears despite records showing regular payments. He further alleged that the administrative judges failed to consider his present ability to pay and his status as an Indigenous American Indian, and denied him constitutionally adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard. The challenged matters had been fully adjudicated against him in state court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Conoco filed the action on February 13, 2026, challenging state child-support-related judgments and enforcement actions. The court concluded that the claims sought federal review and rejection of state-court judgments, dismissed the complaint without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction, declined to reach the motions for interim relief, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77, 94 (2010)
- Robb Evans & Assocs., LLC v. Holibaugh, 609 F.3d 359, 362 (4th Cir. 2010)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
- T.M. v. Univ. of Maryland Med. Sys. Corp., 139 F.4th 344, 348–49, 354 (4th Cir. 2025)
- Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005)
- Adkins v. Rumsfeld, 464 F.3d 456, 463–64 (4th Cir. 2006)
- Rooker v. Fid. Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923)
- D.C. Ct. of App. v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
AIJOMA-PYNA: CONOCO (f/k/a Antonya- * Darrell:Lindsey), * Plaintiff, * Civ. No. DLB-26-599 v. * FRAN JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT * ADMINISTRATION, et al., * Defendants. MEMORANDUM OPINION On February 13, 2026, Aijoma-Pyna: Conoco filed a complaint against Fran Johnson, in her official capacity as the Director of the Prince George’s County Child Support Administration; Judge Darren Johnson, in his official capacity as an administrative judge; Stenise Rolle, in his official capacity as an administrative judge; Maxwell Cohen of Robert A. Ades & Associates, P.C.; and Kimberly Vanessa Handon-Lindsey.

He alleges that the defendants violated his constitutional rights to due process and equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment by suspending his driver’s license and passport “for alleged child support arrears without constitutionally adequate notice, a meaningful opportunity to be heard, or required findings regarding Plaintiff’s present ability to pay.” ECF 1, at 2.

He also filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF 2, which is granted, and motions for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order, ECF 3 & 4. Because the Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the complaint, the case is closed. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). A federal district court does not hear all matters.

The Court has “an independent obligation to determine whether subject-matter jurisdiction exists, even when no party challenges it.” *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 94 (2010); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (stating that if at any time a court determines that it does not have subject-matter jurisdiction, “the court must dismiss the action”).

The party filing suit in this Court bears the burden of establishing the Court’s subject-matter jurisdiction. *Robb Evans & Assocs., LLC v. Holibaugh*, 609 F.3d 359, 362 (4th Cir. 2010); see *Hertz*, 559 U.S. at 96. This Court must construe liberally complaints filed by self-represented plaintiffs such as Conoco. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972).

Conoco alleges his driver’s license and passport were suspended on the basis he had not paid child support when, in fact, there was a record of the regular payments he had made. ECF 1, at 5, 9–10. He also asserts that the administrative judges did not consider his ability to pay or his status as an Indigenous American Indian. *Id.* at 9–10. He claims the defendants violated his Fourteenth Amendment rights by not affording him notice and the opportunity to be heard.

Id. at 5, 9. Conoco filed this suit as a civil rights complaint raising federal questions over which federal courts generally have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, but the claims do not end the Court’s jurisdictional inquiry. Conoco challenges a state court order regarding child support payments.

Under the Rooker-Feldman¹ doctrine, federal courts lack jurisdiction over “cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments.” *T.M. v. Univ. of Maryland Med. Sys. Corp.*, 139 F.4th 344, 349 (4th Cir.

2025) (quoting *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005)); see *Adkins v. Rumsfeld*, 464 F.3d 456, 463–64 (4th Cir. 2006). The doctrine applies if the plaintiff asks the federal court to assume the state appellate court’s role. See *T.M.*, 139 F.4th at 348, 354; *Exxon 1 Rooker v. Fid. Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *D.C. Ct. of App. v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983).

Mobil Corp., 544 U.S. at 284. The issues raised in the complaint—whether Conoco must pay child support as ordered and whether his driver’s license and passport can be suspended for failure to pay—have been fully adjudicated against Conoco by the state court.

Because Conoco asks this Court to undo the state court’s judgments, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine applies, and this Court does not have jurisdiction. Conoco may seek appellate review of state court decisions in the state appellate courts.

Accordingly, it is, this 18th day of February, 2026, hereby ORDERED: 1. Conoco’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF 2, IS GRANTED; 2. Conoco’s complaint IS DISMISSED without

prejudice for lack of jurisdiction pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3); and 3.

The Clerk SHALL MAIL a copy of this Order to Conoco and CLOSE this case. This dismissal does not prejudice Conoco's right to seek relief in state court." United States District Judge? Because the Court lacks jurisdiction over this action, the Court does not reach Conoco's motions for a temporary restraining order or preliminary relief.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-maryland/2026/aijoma-pyna-conoco-f-k-a-antonya-darrell-lindsey-v-fran-v0diq8q0>