

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1699**

---

CAROLYN E. O'CONNOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM G. YOUNG, individually and in his  
capacity as Chief Judge; JOSEPH L. TAURO,  
individually and in his capacity as a federal  
employee/judge; CHOICEPOINT/CP COMMERCIAL  
SPECIALISTS, INCORPORATED; COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 06-1791**

---

CAROLYN E. O'CONNOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM G. YOUNG, individually and in his  
capacity as Chief Judge; JOSEPH L. TAURO,  
individually and in his capacity as a federal  
employee/judge; CHOICEPOINT/CP COMMERCIAL  
SPECIALISTS, INCORPORATED; COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

No. 06-1851

---

CAROLYN E. O'CONNOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM G. YOUNG, individually and in his capacity as Chief Judge; JOSEPH L. TAURO, individually and in his capacity as a federal employee/judge; CHOICEPOINT/CP COMMERCIAL SPECIALISTS, INCORPORATED; COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:06-cv-00330-HEH)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2006

Decided: November 28, 2006

---

Before TRAXLER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Carolyn E. O'Connor, Appellant Pro Se. Debra Jean Prillaman, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Carolyn E. O'Connor appeals the district court's orders dismissing as frivolous her employment discrimination complaint and denying her motions for reconsideration and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeals for the reasons stated by the district court. See O'Connor v. Young, No. 3:06-cv-00330-HEH (E.D. Va. May 31, 2006; June 27, 2006; June 28, 2006). 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.

DISMISSED