

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-2264**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, FBI; ALCOHOL, FIREARMS, TOBACCO AND  
EXPLOSIVES, ATF; DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US MARSHALS,

Defendants.

---

**No. 18-2265**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; UNITED STATES  
MARSHAL; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendant.

---

**No. 18-2266**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL; FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION;  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2267**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, EPA; ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA; INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2268**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT; UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2270**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US SECRET SERVICE; US POSTAL SERVICE; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2271**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, FCC; SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; FEDERAL DEPOSIT  
INSURANCE CORPORATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2337**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; HOMELAND SECURITY;  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2373**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

BRYANT GROUP INC,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; BETH DRAKE, U.S. Attorney for the District of South Carolina; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Margaret B. Seymour, Senior District Judge. (2:18-cv-02217-MBS; 2:18-cv-02593-MBS; 2:18-cv-02582-MBS; 2:18-cv-01436-MBS; 2:18-cv-00606-MBS; 2:18-cv-02738-MBS; 2:18-cv-02467-MBS; 2:18-cv-02159-MBS; 2:18-cv-00607-MBS)

---

Submitted: March 29, 2019

Decided: April 10, 2019

---

Before NIEMEYER, KEENAN, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony G. Bryant, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Anthony G. Bryant seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his civil complaints against a variety of federal agencies, entities, and officials. The court referred the cases to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that the complaints be dismissed and advised Bryant that failure to timely file specific objections to each recommendation could waive appellate review of the district court's orders based upon such recommendations. 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). "In order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge's report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection." *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks omitted), *cert. denied*, 138 S. Ct. 738 (2018).

Bryant has waived appellate review of all of the district court's orders by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice in each case. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgments. 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*