

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1873**

---

CURTIS STEELE; YOLANDA HARRINGTON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CAPITAL ONE HOME LOANS, LLC; HSBC FINANCE CORPORATION; JP  
MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.; US BANK TRUST, N.A., as Trustee;  
HSBC HOME EQUITY LOAN CORPORATION I; MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC  
REGISTRATION SYSTEM, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad,  
Jr., District Judge. (3:13-cv-00704-RJC-DSC)

---

Submitted: February 18, 2015

Decided: March 10, 2015

---

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Curtis Steele and Yolanda Harrington, Appellants Pro Se. Dennis  
Kyle Deak, TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina;  
Donald Richard Pocock, NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP,  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Steele and Yolanda Harrington appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss their civil complaint and the magistrate judge's order denying their motion for leave to file an amended complaint. We affirm.

First, after a thorough review with an eye toward the liberal reading afforded their filings, see Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), we conclude that the Appellants have asserted no error on appeal aside from the denial of their motion for leave to amend. Any discussion concerning the dismissal of the original complaint in Appellants' informal brief arises only incidentally, as Appellants assert that dismissal of their case was in error only because they were denied leave to amend their complaint. Moreover, Appellants abandoned their original complaint below after conceding that it did not properly present their claims. We therefore decline to review the district court's order dismissing Appellants' complaint, see 4th Cir. R. 34(b), and in so doing, we have "focus[ed] . . . on discerning the expressed intent of the [pro se] litigant." Williams v. Ozmint, 716 F.3d 801, 811 (4th Cir. 2013), cert. denied, 134 S. Ct. 1294 (2014).

Second, we conclude that Appellants have forfeited appellate review of the magistrate judge's denial of their

motion to amend their complaint. The timely filing of objections to a magistrate judge's order in a nondispositive matter is necessary to preserve appellate review of that order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); Solis v. Malkani, 638 F.3d 269, 274 (4th Cir. 2011). Appellants have forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections. Accordingly, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm.

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