

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1266

JOHN F. GODFREY; PATRICIA GODFREY; F. G.;
J. K. K. G.; J. H. G.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

DAVIE COUNTY AUTHORITIES; KAREN SMITH,
Director, Davie County DSS; CINDY JUSTICE,
Social Worker, DSS, Davie County; MARCHEETA
WILLIAMS, Supervisor, DSS, Davie County; BOB
DEWITT; LORIE HAMILTON DEWITT,

Plaintiffs - Appellees.

No. 04-1267

JOHN F. GODFREY; PATRICIA GODFREY; J. K. K. G.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

DAVIE COUNTY; DAVIE COUNTY AUTHORITIES;
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES; DIRECTOR,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 04-1268

JOHN F. GODFREY; PATRICIA GODFREY; F. G.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

DAVIE COUNTY; DAVIE COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICES;
DIRECTOR,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 04-1269

JOHN F. GODFREY; PATRICIA GODFREY; J. H. G.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

DAVIE COUNTY; DAVIE COUNTY DSS; DIRECTOR,
DAVIE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. Frank W. Bullock, Jr., District Judge. (CA-03-1222-1, CA-03-1223-1, CA-03-1224-1, CA-03-1225-1)

Submitted: September 16, 2004

Decided: September 21, 2004

Before LUTTIG, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John F. Godfrey, Patricia Godfrey, Appellants Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

John and Patricia Godfrey and minor children F. G., J. K. K. G., and J. H. G. appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing their 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint and habeas corpus petitions for lack of jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Godfrey v. Davie County, Nos. CA-03-1222-1, CA-03-1223-1, CA-03-1224-1, CA-03-1225-1 (M.D.N.C. filed Jan. 22 & entered Jan. 23, 2004). 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