

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-1520**

---

QIHUI HUANG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

SHIELD OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND JUSTICE, non-profit  
organization,

Plaintiff,

v.

ADAM MAURICE TIPPETT,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District  
Judge. (8:09-cv-00152-DKC)

---

Submitted: February 10, 2011

Decided: March 21, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Qihui Huang, Appellant Pro Se. John Edward Pueschel, WOMBLE,  
CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina,

Thomas Joseph Sawyer, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC,  
Vienna, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Qihui Huang appeals the district court's order denying her motion to reconsider the court's order dismissing her complaint for failure to state a claim. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Huang v. Tippett, No. 8:09-cv-00152-DCK (D. Md. Apr. 12, 2010). Furthermore, we deny Huang's motion "In reviewing a decision granting a motion to dismiss, appellate court must accept as true all of the factual allegations contained in the complaint," (emphasis in original); her motion "to permit Huang following U.S. Ct. of App. 4th Cir, Rule 28(f) for she alleged statement of facts" could "include exhibit, record, transcript, or appendix references showing the sources of the facts stated," and her motion "to supplement record, and accept Huang formerly filed Appendixes and coming exhibits." We also deny Huang's motion to rename the joint appendix as the appendix, grant Tippett's motion to strike the appendix, and grant Huang's motion to withdraw and destroy a document purportedly filed under seal in this court. 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