

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1610

HEPHZIBAH BATES, a/k/a Hattie Tea Jenkins Bates,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF RICHMOND,

Defendant - Appellee,

No. 15-1611

HEPHZIBAH BATES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LISA HICKS THOMAS,

Defendant - Appellee,

No. 15-1612

HEPHZIBAH BATES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CBS NEWS,

Defendant - Appellee,

No. 15-1613

HEPHZIBAH BATES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

VIRGINIA STATE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendant - Appellee,

No. 15-1614

HEPHZIBAH BATES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOEY JENKINS, III,

Defendant - Appellee,

No. 15-1615

HEPHZIBAH BATES, a/k/a Hattie Bates,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LACEY NUNLEY, P.A., Deputy General Counsel, Legal
Department, The Federal Bank of Richmond,

Defendant - Appellee,

No. 15-1616

HEPHZIBAH BATES, a/k/a Hattie Bates,
Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LACEY NUNLEY,
Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:14-cv-00320-REP; 3:14-cv-00164-REP; 3:14-cv-00165-REP; 3:14-cv-00193-REP; 3:14-cv-00322-REP; 3:14-cv-00380-REP; 3:14-cv-00381-REP)

Submitted: August 27, 2015 Decided: August 31, 2015

Before GREGORY, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hepzibah Bates, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Hepzibah Bates appeals the district court's orders dismissing her complaints in her consolidated civil suits as frivolous and entering a prefiling injunction preventing Bates from filing further complaints related to the issues raised in the instant complaints. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeals for the reasons stated by the district court. See Bates v. Fed. Reserve Bank of Richmond, 3:14-cv-00320-REP (E.D. Va. May 15, 2015); see also Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Amer., Inc., 390 F.3d 812, 817 (4th Cir. 2004) (setting forth standard of review of prefiling injunction). 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.

DISMISSED