

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1135

TIGRESS SYDNEY ACUTE MCDANIEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREEN DOT CORPORATION; GREEN DOT BANK; FINGERHUT;
BLUESTEM SALES, INC.; EXPERIAN DATA CORP.; EXPERIAN SERVICES
CORP.; TRANSUNION DATA SOLUTIONS LLC; TRANSUNION LLC;
EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES LLC; DOES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 23-1218

TIGRESS SYDNEY ACUTE MCDANIEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREEN DOT CORPORATION; GREEN DOT BANK; FINGERHUT;
BLUESTEM SALES, INC.; EXPERIAN DATA CORP.; EXPERIAN SERVICES
CORP.; TRANSUNION DATA SOLUTIONS LLC; TRANSUNION LLC;
EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES LLC; DOES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina,
at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (3:23-cv-00021-GCM-DCK)

Submitted: August 29, 2023

Decided: August 31, 2023

Before KING, AGEE, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tigress Sydney Acute McDaniel, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Tigress Sydney Acute McDaniel appeals the district court's orders of (a) January 26, 2023, which denied McDaniel leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) as a matter of discretion and directed McDaniel to pay the filing fee and respond to the court's intent to impose a prefiling review system to screen McDaniel's future filings ("January Order") (No. 23-1135); and (b) February 27, 2023, which dismissed McDaniel's civil action without prejudice for failure to comply with the court's January Order and imposed a prefiling review system (No. 23-1218). We affirm.

First, upon review, we discern no abuse of discretion in the district court's rationale for denying McDaniel leave to proceed IFP. *See Dillard v. Liberty Loan Corp.*, 626 F.2d 363, 364 (4th Cir. 1980) (providing standard of review). Next, the record confirms that McDaniel neither paid the filing fee after being denied IFP status nor responded to the district court's direction, in the January Order, to show cause why the prefiling review system should not be imposed. We therefore conclude that the court did not err in dismissing without prejudice McDaniel's civil action for failure to comply with the January Order or imposing the prefiling review system for the reasons explained in the January Order, which McDaniel did not substantively challenge. Accordingly, we affirm the appealed-from orders. *McDaniel v. Green Dot Corp.*, No. 3:23-cv-00021-GCM-DCK (W.D.N.C. Jan. 26, 2023 & Feb. 27, 2023). 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.

AFFIRMED