

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1264

BELINDA SLADE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DONALD E. SLADE; YVETTE SLADE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 15-1265

BELINDA SLADE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SEALO MICHAEL; LAVONNE MICHAEL,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 15-1266

BELINDA SLADE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CATHY HARRIS; SPENCE HARRIS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 15-1267

BELINDA SLADE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THEODORE MICHAEL,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 15-1268

BELINDA SLADE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TRUDY MICHAEL,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Loretta Copeland Biggs, District Judge. (1:14-cv-00968-LCB-LPA; 1:14-cv-00969-LCB-LPA; 1:14-cv-00970-LCB-LPA; 1:14-cv-00971-LCB-LPA; 1:14-cv-00973-LCB-LPA)

Submitted: May 21, 2015

Decided: May 26, 2015

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Belinda Slade, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Belinda Slade seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on her civil complaints. The district court referred these cases to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended in each case that relief be denied under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2012), and advised Slade that failure to file timely, specific objections to each recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon that recommendation.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Slade has waived appellate review in each case by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeals.

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.

DISMISSED