

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6498**

---

DONSURVI CHISOLM, a/k/a Don-Survi Chisolm,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JENNIFER FRANKLIN; JESSICA EDMUNDS, Postal/Mailroom  
Coordinator for South Carolina Dept. of Corr.; MICHAEL MCCOLL,  
Director of SCDC,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.  
(4:14-cv-04364-RBH)

---

Submitted: August 18, 2016

Decided: August 23, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

DonSurvi Chisolm, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Michael Pruitt,  
MCDONALD, PATRICK, POSTON, HEMPHILL & ROPER, LLC, Greenwood, South  
Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

DonSurvi Chisolm appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Chisolm that failure to file specific objections to this recommendation 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). Although Chisolm filed objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, he did not object to the magistrate judge's recommendation, adopted by the district court, that the defendants were entitled to qualified immunity and Eleventh Amendment immunity. He has therefore waived appellate review of his equal protection claim for damages. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 93-94 (4th Cir. 1984). We further conclude that Chisolm's claim for injunctive relief is moot, as the prison mailroom no longer forwards mail written in a foreign language for inspection unless there is an independent reason to believe it presents a security risk.

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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED