UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| • | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| | No. 21-1690 | |
| JUNIUS J. JOYNER, III, | | |
| Plaintiff - App | pellant, | |
| v. | | |
| EMILY B. REDMAN, | | |
| Defendant - A | ppellee. | |
| | | |
| Appeal from the United States I Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Ser | | |
| Submitted: November 18, 2021 | | Decided: November 19, 2021 |
| Before MOTZ, THACKER, and H | ARRIS, Circuit Judg | es. |
| Affirmed as modified by unpublish | ned per curiam opinio | n. |
| Junius J. Joyner, III, Appellant Pro HORVATH & JUDKINS PC, Fair | • | |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind | ing precedent in this | circuit. |

PER CURIAM:

Junius J. Joyner, III, appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Joyner's state law claims. We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court correctly dismissed Joyner's § 1983 claim for failure to state a claim for relief. We further conclude that the court then properly declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3). However, when a district court dismisses state law claims over which the court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, that dismissal must be without prejudice. *See Farlow v. Wachovia Bank of N.C.*, 259 F.3d 309, 316-17 (4th Cir. 2001). We therefore affirm the district court's dismissal of the complaint, but modify the order to clarify that the dismissal of the state law claims is without prejudice. 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 AS MODIFIED