

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-2308

GWEN HURT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA BAC HOME LOAN SERVICING, LP; RECONTRUST
COMPANY, NA; ALG TRUSTEE LLC; DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST
COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

FIRST FRANKLIN MORTGAGE LOAN TRUST,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior
District Judge. (3:12-cv-00184-REP-DJN)

Submitted: February 19, 2013

Decided: February 26, 2013

Before WILKINSON, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gwen Hurt, Appellant Pro Se. Catherine Bobick, Jacob Scott
Woody, MCGUIREWOODS, LLP, Charlottesville, Virginia; Robert
William Loftin, MCGUIREWOODS, LLP, Richmond, Virginia; Dean L.

Robinson, ATLANTIC LAW GROUP, LLC, Leesburg, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gwen Hurt appeals from the district court's order denying relief on her civil action. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2012). The magistrate judge recommended that the district court grant the motions to dismiss Hurt's amended complaint, deny Hurt's self-styled "Motion Demurrer for Non Consent and Objections," and deny as moot Hurt's motions seeking injunctive relief, a temporary restraining order, and to strike the motions to dismiss her original complaint. The magistrate judge also advised Hurt that failure to file objections to this recommendation in a timely manner could bar appellate review of a district court order based on the recommendation.

The district court adopted the recommendation, granted the motions to dismiss Hurt's amended complaint, denied Hurt's Motion Demurrer, dismissed the amended complaint, and denied as moot Hurt's motions for injunctive relief and a temporary restraining order. The court also denied Hurt's motions to strike the motions to dismiss her original complaint, denied as moot Hurt's motion for a restraining order, denied as moot Hurt's motions to amend and correct the spelling of a defendant's name, and denied as moot the motions to dismiss Hurt's original complaint. The court further denied Hurt's

self-styled "Affidavit of Fact and Motion for Disqualification of Judge" and denied as moot Hurt's motions for summary judgment and default judgment. We affirm.

A litigant who fails to file specific written objections to a magistrate judge's recommendations waives her right to appellate review of a district court order adopting the recommendations. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845 (4th Cir. 1985) (noting the "general rule that a party who fails to object to a magistrate[] [judge's] report is barred from appealing the judgment of a district court adopting the magistrate[] [judge's] findings"); see United States v. Benton, 523 F.3d 424, 428 (4th Cir. 2008) (holding that a "general objection" to a magistrate judge's finding is insufficient to preserve a claim for appellate review). Hurt has waived her right to appellate review of the district court's rulings granting the motions to dismiss the amended complaint, denying the Motion Demurrer, dismissing the amended complaint, and denying as moot the motions for injunctive relief and a temporary restraining order by failing to file specific written objections to the magistrate judge's report in a timely manner.

Next, on appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Hurt's informal brief does not challenge the district court's rulings denying her motions to strike the motions to

dismiss her original complaint, denying as moot her motion for a restraining order, denying as moot her motions to amend and correct the spelling of a defendant's name, denying as moot the motions to dismiss her original complaint, and denying her Affidavit of Fact and Motion for Disqualification of Judge, Hurt has forfeited appellate review of those rulings.

Finally, with respect to the district court's denial as moot of Hurt's motions for summary judgment and default judgment, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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