

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1993

JOYCE E. ROWLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF NORTH MYRTLE BEACH; JOEL DAVIS, Individually and in his capacity as employee of the City of North Myrtle Beach; KEVIN BLAYTON, Individually and in his capacity as employee of the City of North Myrtle Beach; JOHN SMITHSON, Individually and in his capacity as employee of the City of North Myrtle Beach; PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR FOR THE CITY OF NORTH MYRTLE BEACH; CATHY E. MADDOCK, Personal Representative of the Estate of Douglas Maddock, personal representative Douglas Maddock,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 09-2001

JOYCE E. ROWLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NORTH MYRTLE BEACH, CITY OF; JOHN SMITHSON, City Manager, Individually and in his representative capacity as employee of the City of North Myrtle Beach; JOEL DAVIS, Assistant City Manager, Individually and in his representative capacity as employee of the City of North Myrtle Beach; KEVIN BLAYTON, Public Works Director, Individually and in his representative capacity as employee of the City of North Myrtle Beach; PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR FOR THE CITY

OF NORTH MYRTLE BEACH; CATHY E. MADDOCK, Personal Representative of the Estate of Douglas Maddock, personal representative Douglas Maddock,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (4:07-cv-01636-TLW; 4:06-cv-01873-TLW)

Submitted: December 2, 2009 Decided: December 16, 2009

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joyce E. Rowley, Appellant Pro Se. Derwood Lorraine Aydlette, III, Christopher Wofford Johnson, GIGNILLIAT, SAVITZ & BETTIS, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Joyce Rowley appeals the district court's orders adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and dismissing her two consolidated cases. We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and affirm for the reasons cited by the district court. See Rowley v. City of N. Myrtle Beach, Nos. 4:06-cv-01873-TLW-TER; 4:07-cv-01636-TLW-TER (D.S.C. Aug. 21, 2009). We agree with the district court that Rowley's dilatory conduct during the course of the proceedings and willful disregard of the court's orders, specifically her failure to appear for depositions, warranted dismissal and an order that she pay attorneys' fees and costs related to the depositions. We have considered Rowley's arguments concerning other court orders issued during the course of the proceedings and find her arguments to be without merit and that, in most instances, the issues related to those orders had no bearing on the court's decision to dismiss the cases. 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