

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-2177

THOMAS PAUL BOLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner Social Security
Administration,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Party-in-Interest.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District
Judge. (3:08-cv-00798-HEH)

Submitted: August 19, 2010

Decided: August 26, 2010

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas Paul Boland, Appellant Pro Se. Jonathan Holland
Hambrick, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Paul Boland appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and affirming the Commissioner's decision to deny Boland's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. We affirm.

The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Boland that failure to file timely objections to the magistrate judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations could waive appellate review of a district court's order based upon those 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 his objection to the magistrate judge's report, Boland raised a single issue: whether the Administrative Law Judge should have heard testimony from a vocational expert. On appeal of the district court's order, however, Boland seeks to raise three new issues that he did not present in his objections. A party "waives a right to appellate review of particular issues [in a magistrate judge's report] by failing to

file timely objections specifically directed to those issues." United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 621 (4th Cir. 2007). To preserve an issue for appeal, an objection must have "sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection." Id. at 622. Because Boland failed to file objections "specifically directed to" these issues, he has waived these claims on appeal.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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