

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-1622**

---

LAWRENCE VERLINE WILDER, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, US Attorney General; WILMINGTON NC POLICE; FEDERAL PROBATION OFFICE; PAM THORNTON, Federal Probation Officer; FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE; DEBRA GRAVES, Federal Public Defender; JAMES TODD, Federal Public Defender; STEPHEN GORDON, Federal Public Defender; THOMAS McNAMARA, Federal Public Defender; FELICIA SARNER, Federal Public Defender; TOBIN LATHAN, US Attorney; DAVID MEMEGER, US Attorney; ROD ROSENSTEIN, US Attorney; THOMAS WALKER, US Attorney; JENNIFER MAY-PARKER, US Attorney; BEN DAVID, New Hanover County NC District Attorney; US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; US ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; VIRGINIA STATE TROOPERS; MALCOLM JONES HOWARD, Federal District Judge; ROBERT B. JONES, Federal District Judge; LEGROME DAVIS, Federal District Judge; TERRENCE BOYLE, Federal District Judge; ELIZABETH HEY, Federal Magistrate Judge; DIANA MOTZ, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE WYNN, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE TRAXLER, Federal Circuit Chief Judge; JUDGE THACKER, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE FLOYD, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE SHEDD, Federal Circuit Judge; ANDRE DAVIS, Federal Circuit Judge; UNKNOWN FEDERAL AGENTS; UNKNOWN STATE AGENTS; PROBATION OFFICER THORNTON, Federal Probation Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 16-1623**

---

LAWRENCE VERLINE WILDER, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WILMINGTON, NC POLICE; NEW HANOVER COUNTY, NC, SHERIFF'S OFFICE; FEDERAL PROBATION OFFICE; PAM THORNTON, Federal Probation Officer; FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE; DEBRA GRAVES, Federal Public Defender; JAMES TODD, Federal Public Defender; STEPHEN GORDON, Federal Public Defender; THOMAS McNAMARA, Federal Public Defender; FELICIA SARNER, Federal Public Defender; TOBIN LATHAN, US Attorney; DAVID MEMEGER, US Attorney; ROD ROSENSTEIN, US Attorney; THOMAS WALKER, US Attorney; JENNIFER MAY-PARKER, US Attorney; BEN DAVID, New Hanover County NC District Attorney; US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; US ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; VIRGINIA STATE TROOPERS; MALCOLM JONES HOWARD, Federal District Judge; ROBERT B. JONES, Federal District Judge; LEGROME DAVIS, Federal District Judge; TERRENCE BOYLE, Federal District Judge; ELIZABETH HEY, Federal Magistrate Judge; DIANA MOTZ, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE WYNN, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE TRAXLER, Federal Circuit Chief Judge; JUDGE THACKER, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE FLOYD, Federal Circuit Judge; JUDGE SHEDD, Federal Circuit Judge; ANDRE DAVIS, Federal Circuit Judge; UNKNOWN FEDERAL AGENTS; UNKNOWN STATE AGENTS; PROBATION OFFICER THORNTON, Federal Probation Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (7:15-cv-00235-FL; 7:15-cv-00236-FL)

---

Submitted: October 28, 2016

---

Decided: November 3, 2016

---

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Lawrence Verline Wilder, Sr., Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Verline Wilder, Sr., appeals the district court's order and judgments denying relief on his 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 that relief be denied and advised Wilder that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the 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). Wilder has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgments of the district court.

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