

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-2214**

---

WILLIE GRAVES, JR.; JOHNNY GRAVES; HENRY  
FELDER; DONALD O. WILLIAMS; L. J. BARTELL;  
PAUL E. WILLIAMS; EARLY WALKER, JR.; WILLIE  
PETERSON; ARTHUR HANNA; GILBERT RICHARDSON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

WELLMAN, INCORPORATED; THOMAS DUFF,  
individually and in his official capacity as  
CEO; DONALD CARTWRIGHT, individually and as  
Vice President of Fiber Strategy and New  
Product Development and the Engineering Resin  
Division; AUDIE DUPUIS, individually and in  
his official capacity; JERRY CHASTAIN,  
individually and in his official capacity; J.  
DALVIN AVANT, individually and in his official  
capacity; JEFF SEALS, individually and in his  
official capacity; JOHN HOBSON, individually  
and in his official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.  
(CA-03-2098-4-TLW)

---

Submitted: February 16, 2006

Decided: February 21, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Willie Graves, Jr., Johnny Graves, Henry Felder, Donald O. Williams, L.J. Bartell, Paul E. Williams, Early Walker, Jr., Willie Peterson, Arthur Hanna, Gilbert Richardson, Appellants Pro Se. George Daniel Ellzey, Jonathan Pharr Pearson, FISHER & PHILLIPS, LLP, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiffs/Appellants appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and granting summary judgment for Defendants/Appellees in this Labor Management Relations Act action. On appeal, Appellants allege that the magistrate judge lacked jurisdiction to adjudicate their action. As noted by the district court, however, this claims fails because the magistrate judge had jurisdiction to make a recommendation to the district court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (2000); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Graves v. Wellman, Inc., No. CA-03-2098-4-TLW (D.S.C. Sept. 27, 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