UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1372

MARIE THERESE ASSA'AD-FALTAS, a/k/a Doctor Faltas, a/k/a Doctor Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ALAN MCCRORY WILSON, SC's Attorney General (SCAG), officially for prospective relief and individually for nominal damages; SARA HEATHER SAVITZ WEISS, officially and individually; BYRON E. GIPSON, officially for prospective relief; GARY WATTS, officially for prospective relief; RONALDO MYERS, officially for prospective relief; HUGH RYAN, officially for prospective relief; HERVERY YOUNG, officially and individually; ROBERT MICHAEL DUDEK, officially and individually; E. FIELDING PRINGLE, officially and individually; MARK SCHNEE, individually; APRIL W. SAMPSON, officially and individually; THEODORE N. LUPTON, individually; TRISTAN MICHAEL SHAFFER, individually; LARA M. CAUDY, individually; JOHN H. STROM, individually; CASSITY BREWER, individually; CHARLES RANDOLPH WHITE, individually; ANY AND ALL OF DEFENDANTS' NECESSARY AGENTS, each such agent solely officially and solely prospective relief where applicable,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (3:20-cv-02479-TLW)

Submitted: October 19, 2023

Decided: October 23, 2023

Before KING and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marie Therese Assa'ad-Faltas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marie Therese Assa'ad-Faltas appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss, after a review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, Assa'ad-Faltas' complaint raising several civil rights and state law tort claims against Defendants. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Assa'ad-Faltas v. Wilson*, No. 3:20-cv-02479-TLW (D.S.C. Mar. 6, 2023). We deny all pending motions. 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