

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-1882

JACQUELINE R. HUMPHRIES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

OAKCREST TOWERS APT., Individual and Official Capacity, agent of National Registered Agents; TIM CUTORA, Owner; KAREN DWARYA, Owner; JOSHUA GREEN, Abusive Atty.; PORTIA QUARTERLY, Discrimination; HAPGC, Housing Authority for Prince George's County, MD Department of Social Services Official and Individual Capacities; MICHELLE CRITTENDEN; GLORIA BROWN; RENEE POPE; LATANYA BROWN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. George Jarrod Hazel, District Judge. (8:21-cv-00067-GJH)

Submitted: September 22, 2022

Decided: September 26, 2022

Before WILKINSON, DIAZ, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jacqueline R. Humphries, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jacqueline Humphries appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice her civil complaint for failure to comply with the court's prior order, namely to either pay the filing fee or file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis and to file a particularized complaint in compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a).¹ We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. *Humphries v. Oakcrest Towers Apt.*, No. 8:21-cv-00067-GJH (D. Md. filed Aug. 9, 2021; entered Aug. 10, 2021). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order.² We also deny Humphries' motions to appoint counsel, for a hearing, and to clarify issues for review on appeal. 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

¹ The district court's order is final and appealable because the court dismissed Humphries' complaint without providing leave to amend. *Britt v. DeJoy*, 45 F.4th __, __, No. 20-1620, 2022 WL 3590436, at *5 (4th Cir. Aug. 17, 2022) (en banc) (published order).

² Although Humphries claims that she never received the district court's order directing her to supplement her initial complaint, she clarifies that she still intends to stand on her complaint and does not challenge the part of the court's order dismissing her complaint for failure to pay a filing fee or file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Additionally, the district court dismissed her complaint without prejudice to Humphries' right to refile a complaint.