

**UNPUBLISHED****UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 20-1157**

---

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH,

Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
James K. Bredar, Chief District Judge. (1:15-mc-00369)

---

Submitted: May 21, 2020

Decided: May 27, 2020

---

Before AGEE and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Catherine Denise Randolph, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Catherine Denise Randolph appeals the district court's order returning her pleadings because the pleadings did not comply with the prefiling injunction and did not state a plausible cause of action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny Randolph's motion to expedite discovery and appoint an expert witness, and dismiss the appeal. 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.

*DISMISSED*

FILED: August 25, 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 20-1157  
(1:15-mc-00369)

---

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH

Appellant

---

O R D E R

---

The court denies the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc. No judge requested a poll under Fed. R. App. P. 35 on the petition for rehearing en banc.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Agee, Judge Quattlebaum, and Senior Judge Traxler.

For the Court

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

In re  
Catherine Denise Randolph - Prose  
Exhibit #1

To Supreme Court United States

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT  
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, Virginia 23219

September 21, 2020

NOTICE

No. 20-1157, In re: Catherine Randolph  
1:15-mc-00369

TO: Counsel and Parties

The parties are advised that the supplemental petition for rehearing is considered moot and that the court does not intend to take action on the supplement.

Anisha Walker, Deputy Clerk  
804-916-2704