

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1827

EUGENNA AILEEN TAYLOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE; MARY HAACK; ANNE MECH, Assistant Professor, OS & AH Coordinator, Legal Affairs, SPI; IRMA ROBINS; JEFFREY JOHNSON, Professor, FCH and Director, Office of Global Health; JANET KAPUSTIN; KRISTIN BUSSELL; THOMAS SAWYER; MALINDA ORLIN, Academic Vice President; CONRAD GORDON; GAIL LEMAIRE; JOAN DAVENPORT; TYREE MORRISON; DAVID RAMSEY; WILLIAM E. KIRWAN, Chancellor and/or Executive Officer, University System of Maryland; JOHN DOE(S) OF STATE OF MARYLAND; JOHN DOE(S) OF MARYLAND BOARD OF NURSING; PATRICIA MORTON, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; KATHRYN MONTGOMERY, Assistant Dean for the BSN Program; TOM FARLEY; JANA GOODWIN, a/k/a Jane Goodwin; MELANIE BAZENSKY COFFMAN, a/k/a Melanie Coffman; JANET DAVIDSON ALLAN, University of MD School of Nursing Dean; JOHN DOE(S) OF BLUECROSS BLUE SHIELD,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JOHN DOE(S) OF HOWARD COUNTY COMMUNITY GENERAL HOSPITAL;
SUSAN GILLETTE,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:11-cv-03008-AW)

Submitted: October 11, 2012

Decided: October 15, 2012

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eugenna Aileen Taylor, Appellant Pro Se. Sara Slaff, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eugenna Aileen Taylor appeals the district court's orders dismissing her complaint and denying her motions for sanctions and to amend the judgment. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Taylor v. Univ. Md., No. 8:11-cv-03008-AW (D. Md. May 2, 2012; July 2, 2012). We deny Taylor's motions to amend her informal brief and to extend the time period to obtain counsel. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED