UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
_	No. 18-1532	
JUSTIN FERGUSON,		
Plaintiff - App	pellant,	
v.		
ELAINE X. WOOTON; LOWELL	B. COOPER,	
Defendants - A	Appellees.	
Appeal from the United States Dis James K. Bredar, Chief District Juc		
Submitted: October 31, 2018		Decided: November 14, 2018
Before NIEMEYER, WYNN, and	THACKER, Circuit	Judges.
Affirmed by unpublished per curia	m opinion.	
Justin Ferguson, Appellant Pro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Justin Ferguson appeals the district court's order finding his complaint frivolous and sua sponte dismissing his civil action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Frivolous complaints are subject to dismissal pursuant to the district court's inherent authority, even when the plaintiff has paid the filing fee. *See, e.g., Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 490 U.S. 296, 307-08 (1989); *Fitzgerald v. First E. Seventh St. Tenants Corp.*, 221 F.3d 362, 364 (2d Cir. 2000) (per curiam). Additionally, dismissal prior to service of process is permissible when a court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over a patently frivolous complaint. *See Surtain v. Hamlin Terrace Found.*, 789 F.3d 1239, 1248 (11th Cir. 2015) (per curiam); *Ricketts v. Midwest Nat'l Bank*, 874 F.2d 1177, 1180-83 (7th Cir. 1989); *Franklin v. Oregon*, 662 F.2d 1337, 1342-43 (9th Cir. 1981).

We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Ferguson's frivolous complaint for lack of jurisdiction. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327-28 (1989) (defining frivolous claims); *Nagy v. FMC Butner*, 376 F.3d 252, 254-55 & n.* (4th Cir. 2004) (stating standard of review). Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We deny Ferguson's motion to seal. 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