

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2359

MONESHA R. MITCHELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KPMG LLP; ARTECH, LLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Michael Stefan Nachmanoff, District Judge. (1:25-cv-01239-MSN-WBP)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Monesha R. Mitchell, Appellant Pro Se. Sebastian Brana, OGLETREE DEAKINS,
Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Monesha R. Mitchell appeals the district court's order (1) granting Defendant Artech, LLC's motion to compel arbitration and dismissing, without prejudice, Mitchell's complaint raising claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17; and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 to 634, as well as retaliatory wrongful termination claims; and (2) ruling on Mitchell's motions for a protective order, for leave to file a surreply, and for an expedited decision.* We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. *See, e.g., Adkins v. Lab. Ready, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 496, 501-02 (4th Cir. 2002) (rejecting argument that arbitration agreement was unconscionable because "courts cannot treat arbitration in general as an inferior or less reliable means of vindicating important substantive rights" and there was no "allegation that this specific arbitral forum is so procedurally unfair as to inject substantive bias into the process itself," and recognizing that, even in an at-will "employment relationship, each side bears reciprocal obligations to the other").

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Mitchell v. KPMG LLP*, No. 1:25-cv-01239-MSN-WBP (E.D. Va. Oct. 31, 2025). 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

* We deny as moot Mitchell's motion to expedite and her "Petition for Writ of Mandamus" in which she seeks an expedited decision.