

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1718

TERESA MILLER, an individual,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

OFFICER HELMS, an individual; MORGANTOWN CITY POLICE
DEPARTMENT, a law enforcement agency; ERIC POWELL; OFFICER
BRADFORD,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at
Clarksburg. Thomas S. Kleeh, Chief District Judge. (1:23-cv-00026-TSK-MJA)

Submitted: July 18, 2025

Decided: August 18, 2025

Before AGEE, QUATTLEBAUM, and BERNER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Teresa Miller, Appellant Pro Se. Keith C. Gamble, PULLIN, FOWLER, FLANAGAN,
BROWN & POE, PLLC, Morgantown, West Virginia; Margaret Lewis, MANCHIN
INJURY LAW GROUP, PLLC, Morgantown, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Teresa Miller appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and dismissing Miller's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the district court's dismissal of Miller's complaint as untimely. *See Smith v. Travelpiece*, 31 F.4th 878, 883, 886-88 (4th Cir. 2023). We also discern no abuse of discretion in the denial of Miller's motion for a venue transfer. *See Trs. of the Plumbers & Pipefitters Nat'l Pension Fund v. Plumbing Servs., Inc.*, 791 F.3d 436, 443-44 (4th Cir. 2015) (stating standard of review and discussing applicable factors); *see also Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) (describing limited circumstances in which recusal is warranted based on judge's opinions formed through prior judicial involvement). Accordingly, we deny Miller's motions for appointment of counsel, Miller's motions to submit additional evidence and for court order clarification, Miller's motion to address deficient pleadings and for relief due to denied PACER access, and Appellants' motions to strike, and we affirm the district court's judgment. 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