

FILED: April 10, 2019

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 18-2264 (L)  
(2:18-cv-02217-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, FBI; ALCOHOL, FIREARMS, TOBACCO AND  
EXPLOSIVES, ATF; DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Defendants - Appellees

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US MARSHALS

Defendants

---

No. 18-2265  
(2:18-cv-02593-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; UNITED STATES  
MARSHAL; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Defendants - Appellees

and

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Defendant

---

No. 18-2266  
(2:18-cv-02582-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL; FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION;  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Defendants - Appellees

---

No. 18-2267  
(2:18-cv-01436-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, EPA; ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA; INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Defendants - Appellees

---

No. 18-2268  
(2:18-cv-00606-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT; UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE  
UNITED STATES

Defendants - Appellees

---

No. 18-2270  
(2:18-cv-02738-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

US SECRET SERVICE; US POSTAL SERVICE; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA

Defendants - Appellees

---

No. 18-2271  
(2:18-cv-02467-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, FCC; SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; FEDERAL DEPOSIT  
INSURANCE CORPORATION

Defendants - Appellees

---

No. 18-2337  
(2:18-cv-02159-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; HOMELAND SECURITY;  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Defendants - Appellees

---

No. 18-2373  
(2:18-cv-00607-MBS)

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT

Plaintiff - Appellant

BRYANT GROUP INC

Plaintiff

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; BETH DRAKE, U.S. Attorney for the  
District of South Carolina; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING &  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED  
STATES

Defendants - Appellees

---

J U D G M E N T

---

In accordance with the decision of this court, the judgment of the district  
court is affirmed.

This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in  
accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 41.

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, CLERK

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 18-2264**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, FBI; ALCOHOL, FIREARMS, TOBACCO AND  
EXPLOSIVES, ATF; DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US MARSHALS,

Defendants.

---

**No. 18-2265**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; UNITED STATES  
MARSHAL; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendant.

---

**No. 18-2266**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL; FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION;  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2267**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, EPA; ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA; INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2268**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT; UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE  
UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2270**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US SECRET SERVICE; US POSTAL SERVICE; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2271**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,



v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, FCC; SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; FEDERAL DEPOSIT  
INSURANCE CORPORATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2337**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; HOMELAND SECURITY;  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; US ATTORNEY FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 18-2373**

---

ANTHONY G. BRYANT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

BRYANT GROUP INC,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE; BETH DRAKE, U.S. Attorney for the District of South Carolina; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Margaret B. Seymour, Senior District Judge. (2:18-cv-02217-MBS; 2:18-cv-02593-MBS; 2:18-cv-02582-MBS; 2:18-cv-01436-MBS; 2:18-cv-00606-MBS; 2:18-cv-02738-MBS; 2:18-cv-02467-MBS; 2:18-cv-02159-MBS; 2:18-cv-00607-MBS)

---

Submitted: March 29, 2019

Decided: April 10, 2019

---

Before NIEMEYER, KEENAN, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony G. Bryant, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Anthony G. Bryant seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his civil complaints against a variety of federal agencies, entities, and officials. The court referred the cases to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that the complaints be dismissed and advised Bryant that failure to timely file specific objections to each recommendation could waive appellate review of the district court's orders based upon such recommendations. 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). "In order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge's report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection." *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks omitted), *cert. denied*, 138 S. Ct. 738 (2018).

Bryant has waived appellate review of all of the district court's orders by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice in each case. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgments. 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*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Anthony G. Bryant,	)	
	)	C/A No. 2:18-2217-MBS
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
US Department of Education,	)	
Federal Bureau of Investigation,	)	
Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosives,	)	
Drug Enforcement Administration,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff Anthony G. Bryant, a nonprisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a complaint on August 13, 2018. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker for pretrial handling.

The Magistrate Judge reviewed the allegations of the complaint, as amended on August 20, 2018, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and the court's inherent authority to dismiss frivolous cases. The Magistrate Judge observed that the allegations of the complaint are nonsensical and incoherent, and that (1) Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; (2) the complaint lacks any arguable basis in law or in fact, and therefore is frivolous; (3) the allegations are so disconnected and incoherent that it appears subject matter jurisdiction is lacking; and (4) Plaintiff's claims against Defendants US Department of Education; Federal Bureau of Investigation; Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosives; and Drug Enforcement Administration are barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity. Thus, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation on October 5, 2018, recommending that Plaintiff's complaint be summarily dismissed. Plaintiff filed

objections to the Report and Recommendation on October 5, 2018, October 9, 2018, October 10, 2018, October 12, 2018, October 15, 2018, and October 19, 2018.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). This court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. Id. This court is obligated to conduct a de novo review of every portion of the Magistrate Judge's report to which objections have been filed. Id. However, the district court need not conduct a de novo review when a party makes only general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings and recommendations. Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47-48 (4th Cir. 1982).

In this case, Plaintiff's objections are, like his complaint, not comprehensible. In the court's view, the objections do not direct the court to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Nevertheless, the court has thoroughly reviewed the record. The court concurs in the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. Plaintiff's complaint is summarily dismissed without prejudice, and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 19, 2018

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour  
Senior United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the  
District of South Carolina

Anthony G. Bryant

*Plaintiff*

v.

U.S. Department of Education, Federal Bureau of  
Investigation (FBI), Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and  
Explosive (ATF), Drug Enforcement Administration

*Defendants*

Civil Action No. 2:18-cv-02217-MBS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL ACTION

The court has ordered that (*check one*):

☐ the plaintiff (*name*) \_\_\_\_\_ recover from the defendant (*name*) \_\_\_\_\_ the amount of \_\_\_\_\_ dollars (\$\_\_\_), which includes prejudgment interest at the rate of \_\_\_ %, plus postjudgment interest at the rate of \_\_\_ %, along with costs.

☐ the plaintiff recover nothing, the action be dismissed on the merits, and the defendant (*name*) \_\_\_\_\_ recover costs from the plaintiff (*name*) \_\_\_\_\_.

☒ other: Plaintiff, Anthony G. Bryant, shall take nothing of Defendants—U.S. Department of Education, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosive (ATF), Drug Enforcement Administration—as to the complaint and this action is dismissed without prejudice.

This action was (*check one*):

☐ tried by a jury, the Honorable \_\_\_\_\_ presiding, and the jury has rendered a verdict.

☐ tried by the Honorable \_\_\_\_\_ presiding, without a jury and the above decision was reached.

☒ decided by the Honorable Margaret B. Seymour, United States District Judge, presiding. The court having adopted the Report and Recommendation set forth by the Honorable Mary Gordon Baker, United States Magistrate Judge.

Date: October 22, 2016

ROBIN L. BLUME, CLERK OF COURT

s/S. Samsa

*Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk*

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**