

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-2223

ESTATE OF LOUIS DALENKO, by Personal
Representative and Executrix; CAROL BENNETT,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

GILBERT W. FILE, IV, Wake Cty Clerks of
Superior Court, and individually; ROBERT
MONROE; LOU A. NEWMAN, Individually; CORINNE
G. RUSSELL, Wake Cty Deputy Attorney; NARLY
CASHWELL, Sr.; JOHN C. MARTIN, Justice of NC
COA; SIDNEY S. EAGLES, JR., Justice of NC COA;
MARTHA A. GEER, Justice of NC COA; UNNAMED
RESEARCH ASSISTANT, Each also in their
individual capacities; WAKE COUNTY; NARLY L.
CASHWELL; DONALD W. STEPHENS; HENRY W. HIGHT,
JR., individually; JANET I. PUESCHEL; MICHAEL
R. FERRELL, Wake Cty Attorney, and
individually; HUGH STEVENS, d/b/a G,H&S
Everett, individually; EVERETT, GASKINS,
HANCOCK & STEVENS, LLP; THE NEWS AND OBSERVER
PUBLISHING COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard,
District Judge. (CA-03-550-5-H; CA-04-438-5-H; CA-04-811-5-H; CA-
04-301-5-H)

Submitted: June 7, 2006

Decided: June 23, 2006

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Estate of Louis Dalenko; Carol Bennett, Appellants Pro Se. Grady L. Balentine, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Gary S. Parsons, Patricia Pursell Kerner, Hannah Gray Styron, TROUTMAN & SANDERS, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Michael R. Ferrell, Corinne Griffin Russell, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE COUNTY OF WAKE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Hugh Stevens, EVERETT, GASKINS, HANCOCK & STEVENS, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Carol Bennett and the Estate of Louis Dalenko appeal the district court's orders and judgments dismissing the complaints and sanctioning Bennett. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Dalenko v. File, Nos. CA-03-550-5-H; CA-04-301-5-H; CA-04-438-5-H; CA-04-811-5-H (E.D.N.C. Feb. 5, 2004; Mar. 2, 2004; Dec. 21, 2004; Mar. 16, 2005; Aug. 26, 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