

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-2223**

---

ESTATE OF LOUIS DALENKO, by Personal  
Representative and Executrix; CAROL BENNETT,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

GILBERT W. FILE, IV, Wake Cty Clerks of  
Superior Court, and individually; ROBERT  
MONROE; LOU A. NEWMAN, Individually; CORINNE  
G. RUSSELL, Wake Cty Deputy Attorney; NARLY  
CASHWELL, Sr.; JOHN C. MARTIN, Justice of NC  
COA; SIDNEY S. EAGLES, JR., Justice of NC COA;  
MARTHA A. GEER, Justice of NC COA; UNNAMED  
RESEARCH ASSISTANT, Each also in their  
individual capacities; WAKE COUNTY; NARLY L.  
CASHWELL; DONALD W. STEPHENS; HENRY W. HIGHT,  
JR., individually; JANET I. PUESCHEL; MICHAEL  
R. FERRELL, Wake Cty Attorney, and  
individually; HUGH STEVENS, d/b/a G,H&S  
Everett, individually; EVERETT, GASKINS,  
HANCOCK & STEVENS, LLP; THE NEWS AND OBSERVER  
PUBLISHING COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard,  
District Judge. (CA-03-550-5-H; CA-04-438-5-H; CA-04-811-5-H; CA-  
04-301-5-H)

---

Submitted: June 7, 2006

Decided: June 23, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Estate of Louis Dalenko; Carol Bennett, Appellants Pro Se. Grady L. Balentine, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Gary S. Parsons, Patricia Pursell Kerner, Hannah Gray Styron, TROUTMAN & SANDERS, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Michael R. Ferrell, Corinne Griffin Russell, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE COUNTY OF WAKE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Hugh Stevens, EVERETT, GASKINS, HANCOCK & STEVENS, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Carol Bennett and the Estate of Louis Dalenko appeal the district court's orders and judgments dismissing the complaints and sanctioning Bennett. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Dalenko v. File, Nos. CA-03-550-5-H; CA-04-301-5-H; CA-04-438-5-H; CA-04-811-5-H (E.D.N.C. Feb. 5, 2004; Mar. 2, 2004; Dec. 21, 2004; Mar. 16, 2005; Aug. 26, 2005). 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