

this lawsuit. See Adams v. Rice, 40 F.3d 72, 74 (4th Cir. 1994) (requiring more than conclusory allegations of retaliation to state § 1983 claim). Indeed, Rhudy does not indicate how any jail employees even could have known about his lawsuit when his sister requested visitation. Thus, the court concludes that Rhudy has not shown a likelihood of success on the merits of a retaliation claim and will, therefore, deny his motion for preliminary injunctive relief.¹ An appropriate order will enter this day.

The Clerk is directed to send copies of this memorandum opinion and accompanying order to the parties.

ENTER: This 26th day of June, 2018.



Senior United States District Judge

¹ Because Rhudy's submission fails to allege facts sufficient to state a retaliation claim against anyone, the court will not construe it as a motion to amend to add any new claim to the lawsuit.