

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1858

PATRICIA LEE GREENWAY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JACK DYE; A. H. SKARDON; T. T. THOMPSON,

Defendants - Appellees.

and

IVAN J. TONEY; KIM R. VARNER; JAMES W. SEGURA;
JANE DOE; LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER; NELA
LAUGHRIDGE,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (6:05-cv-01736-GRA)

Submitted: December 14, 2006

Decided: December 18, 2006

Before MICHAEL, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Patricia Lee Greenway, Appellant Pro Se. Debra J. Gammons, CITY OF
GREENVILLE, Greenville, South Carolina; Marshall Winn, WYCHE,
BURGESS, FREEMAN & PARHAM, PA, Greenville, South Carolina; David W.
Hartman, CLARKSON, WALSH, RHENEY & TERRELL, PA, Greenville, South

Carolina; Charles Franklin Turner, Jr., TURNER, PADGET, GRAHAM & LANEY, PA, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Patricia Lee Greenway appeals the district court's orders denying relief on her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2000). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Greenway that failure to file timely specific objections to the recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Greenway failed to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's 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). Greenway has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment 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