UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1717

DAVID GREEN, JR.,	
Plaintiff - App	pellant,
v.	
America, Department of Justice Director, Executive Office for Im-	cting Attorney General of the United States of; KATHERINE H. REILLY, Acting Deputy migration Review; TERRYNE MURPHY, CIO, on Review; ANA KOCUR, Deputy Director, Review,
Defendants - A	Appellees.
	District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at District Judge. (1:17-cv-01365-LMB-TCB)
Submitted: November 29, 2018	Decided: December 6, 2018
Before MOTZ and AGEE, Circuit	Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.
Affirmed by unpublished per curia	m opinion.
~ ~	Se. Catherine M. Yang, Assistant United States FED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for
•	

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Green, Jr., appeals the magistrate judge's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel and the district court's order granting Appellees' motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Because the parties did not consent to proceed before a magistrate judge and Green did not challenge the magistrate judge's order by objecting in the district court, the denial of his motion to appoint counsel is not subject to our appellate review. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), (c) (2012); Colorado Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. B.B. Andersen Constr. Co., 879 F.2d 809, 811 (10th Cir. 1989); Gleason v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 777 F.2d 1324, 1324 (8th Cir. 1985). To the extent that Green seeks review of the Merit Systems Protection Board's decision sustaining his termination, we conclude that the decision should stand. See Hooven-Lewis v. Caldera, 249 F.3d 259, 266 (4th Cir. 2001) (providing standard of review). For the remainder of Green's claims, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Green v. Whitaker, No. 1:17-cv-01365-LMB-TCB (E.D. Va. May 1, 2018). We also deny Green's motion for appointment of counsel on appeal. 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.

AFFIRMED