

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-2260**

---

CHRISTOPHER LEE JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

APPLE INC.; TIM COOK,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Greenville. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (6:19-cv-02548-MGL)

---

Submitted: March 12, 2020

Decided: March 16, 2020

---

Before KING, KEENAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher Lee Johnson, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Lee Johnson appeals the district court's order denying relief on his civil complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2018). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Johnson that failure to file timely, 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. *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 846-47 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 154-55 (1985). Although Johnson received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, he has waived appellate review because the objections were not specific to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge. *See Martin*, 858 F.3d at 245 (holding that, "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" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

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*