

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1805

CALVIN EARL BROWN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,
(P & D Lodging, Inc.),

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 06-1815

CALVIN EARL BROWN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, Pitt
Co. Schools,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 06-1816

CALVIN EARL BROWN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, Sam's
Club, Inc.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Malcolm J. Howard,
Senior District Judge. (4:05-cv-00074-H; 4:05-cv-00075-H;
4:05-cv-00148-H)

Submitted: October 17, 2006

Decided: October 19, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Calvin Earl Brown, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Calvin E. Brown appeals from three separate actions alleging employment discrimination, which have been consolidated on appeal. In each case, the district court adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation to dismiss as frivolous the action, under 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915(A) (West Supp. 2006), and noted that despite clear notice, Brown failed to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation. Thus Brown has waived his right to appeal these orders. Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). We find no reversible error in the district court's orders in each case denying Brown's motion to reconsider and his motion to appoint counsel. Accordingly, we affirm the orders of the district court. See Brown v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, No. 4:05-cv-74-H (E.D.N.C. June 20, 2006 & July 7, 2006); Brown v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, No. 4:05-cv-75-H (E.D.N.C. June 20, 2006 & July 7, 2006); Brown v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, No. 4:05-cv-148-H (E.D.N.C. June 20, 2006 & July 7, 2006). 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