UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7310

RICKY MCKINLEY INGRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DAVID P. FOLMAR, JR.; ANNA MILLS WAGONER; THE BAR ASSOCIATION, NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 19-7311

RICKY MCKINLEY INGRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREGORY DAVIS; FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, Chief District Judge. (1:19-cv-00124-TDS-JEP; 1:19-cv-00125-TDS-JEP)

Submitted: December 19, 2019 Decided: December 23, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ricky McKinley Ingram, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Ricky McKinley Ingram appeals the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and dismissing his civil rights actions under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b) (2012). The district court referred these cases to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied in each action and advised Ingram that failure to file timely objections to each of the recommendations could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation.

The timely filing of specific 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 of the consequences of noncompliance. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Ingram has waived appellate review by failing to file objections to either of the recommendations 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED