

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-2327

PAUL M. BLOWE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KIMBERLY R. PATTERSON,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 96-2328

PAUL M. BLOWE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JEFFREY L. STREDLER,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 96-2329

PAUL M. BLOWE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

VIRGINIA STATE BAR, Second District Committee,
Section II,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 96-2330

PAUL M. BLOWE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, Department of Trans-
portation Roads Right of Way VDOT Engineering
by James C. Cleveland,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca B. Smith, District Judge.
(CA-96-633-2, CA-96-634-2, CA-96-635-2, CA-96-636-2)

Submitted: January 23, 1997

Decided: January 28, 1997

Before RUSSELL, WILKINS, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Paul M. Blowe, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's orders dismissing his four 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994) complaints. Appellant's cases were referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Appellant that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Appellant failed to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

The timely filing of objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned that failure to object will waive appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). See generally Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Appellant has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgments of the district court. 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