

UNPUBLISHED

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

No. 23-1203

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH,

Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Julie R. Rubin, District Judge. (1:15-mc-00369)

Submitted: July 25, 2023

Decided: July 27, 2023

Before WYNN and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, 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Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 or state a plausible cause of action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we 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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

*

IN RE: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH *

Miscellaneous No. 15-369


*

ORDER

On June 19, 2022, July 22, 2022, January 12, 2023, and January 23, 2023, the Court received documents from Catherine Denise Randolph, attempting to file suit against TJX, Inc., Walgreens Co., Regional Management, Inc., T-Mobile USA Inc., and MedStar Franklin Square Medical Center. Ms. Randolph provides no facts or evidence to support her allegations. This Court previously reviewed and denied the filing of similar documents due to Ms. Randolph's failure to state a claim, and her appeals from such denials have been dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, most recently on December 19, 2022. *See* ECF Nos. 163-168. Ms. Randolph's newly submitted documents have again been screened pursuant to the Order entered on August 11, 2015, *see* ECF 7, and they do not state a cognizable claim. *See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007) (stating that a complaint must contain "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face").

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, that the Clerk SHALL RETURN the documents to Ms. Randolph.

2/6/23
Date



Julie R. Rubin
United States District Judge

page 2 of 2

U.S. District Court of Maryland
January 12, 2023

Federal Question

Vacate inclined order

In RE Catherine Denise

FILED
LOGGED
ENTERED
RECEIVED
JAN 12 2023
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
DEPUTY

(Litigation)

Apply 1st Amendment - free of press

1. What constitutes a violation of my privacy rights according to Federal obscenity rules (go online reddit rules)

Define Preponderance of Evidence

2. Did you authorized prohibitory injunction and/or judicial forfeiture to refrain all unlawful obscene advertising with my name? via general public

Apply 18 USC 2521 18 USC 2513 to prevent intentional disclosure

3. Define, obscenity, intentional disclosure (unlawful sky drones) false pretense, preponderance of evidence, and cyber intrusion?

4. Did you apply Rule 3 commence an action and Rule 4 sign and seal summons with chief marshal to initiate prohibitory final injunction to stop intentional disclosure without my permission?

5. What is three prong Miller test - Did you conduct Miller test?

FILED: January 12, 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1818
(1:15-mc-00369)

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH

Appellant

ORDER

The court strictly enforces the time limits for filing petitions for rehearing and petitions for rehearing en banc in accordance with Local Rule 40(c). The petition in this case is denied as untimely.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

FILED: August 29, 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1203
(1:15-mc-00369)

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH

Appellant

ORDER

The court denies the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc and the supplemental petitions 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 Wynn, Judge Heytens, and Senior Judge Floyd.

For the Court

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk