## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| -  |                      |            |                   |
|--|----------------------|------------|-------------------|
| _  | No. 23-6429          |            |                   |
| FREDERICK STINSON,   |                      |            |                   |
| Plaintiff - App  | ellant,              |            |                   |
| V.   |                      |            |                   |
| VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CO  | ORRECTIONS; COM      | MMISSARY & | SECURITY,         |
| Defendants - A   | Appellees.           |            |                   |
| -  |                      |            |                   |
| Appeal from the United States D<br>Richmond. David J. Novak, Distric |                      |            | _                 |
| Submitted: August 29, 2023   |                      | Decided:   | September 1, 2023 |
| Before KING, AGEE, and BENJA   | MIN, Circuit Judges. |            |                   |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curiar                                   | m opinion.           |            |                   |
| Frederick Stinson, Appellant Pro S                                   | e.                   |            |                   |
| Unpublished opinions are not bindi                                   | ng precedent in this | circuit.   |                   |

## PER CURIAM:

Frederick Stinson appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action without prejudice for failure to comply with the magistrate judge's order directing Stinson to submit certain documents within 30 days. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). After reviewing the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Stinson's complaint. *See Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93, 95-96 (4th Cir. 1989) (holding that district court did not abuse discretion when it dismissed case for failure to comply with prior order after explicitly warning that dismissal would result from failure to comply). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Stinson v. Va. Dep't of Corr.*, No. 3:22-cv-00771-DJN-MRC (E.D. Va. Apr. 5, 2023). 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**