

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-13367
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 3:12-cv-00617-HLA-TEM

NELLIE ANNETTE BROWN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

PUTNAM COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT HEALTHY FAMILIES, et al.,

Defendants,

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, GOVERNMENT AGENCY,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

(January 2, 2014)

Before HULL, MARCUS and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Nellie Brown appeals pro se the dismissal of her third amended complaint. The district court dismissed Brown's complaint for failure to perfect service of process, and Brown does not challenge that ruling. See Timson v. Sampson, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). The district court instructed Brown how to perfect service of process and what party to name as the proper defendant, gave her three opportunities to comply with those instructions, and warned her that the failure to perfect service of her third amended complaint would result in dismissal. Although we treat pro se litigants like Brown leniently, "we nevertheless ... require[] them to conform to procedural rules." Albra v. Advan, Inc., 490 F.3d 826, 829 (11th Cir. 2007) (quoting Loren v. Sasser, 309 F.3d 1296, 1304 (11th Cir. 2002)).

We **AFFIRM** the dismissal of Brown's third amended complaint.