

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7271

DARRELL GREEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

LOW CUT LAWNCARE AND PRESSURE WASHING,

Plaintiff,

v.

S/A TREVOR HOWLETT; S/A GLENN WOODS; AGENT DERRICK SUGGS;
AGENT CASEY JONES; OFC. SHANE KEITH,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION; 15TH CIRCUIT DRUG
ENFORCEMENT UNIT; FLORENCE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:18-cv-00114-MGL)

Submitted: December 3, 2019

Decided: December 20, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, KEENAN, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Darrell Green, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Darrell Green appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Defendants in Green's civil action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012). 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 granting Defendants' summary judgment motion and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Green's state law claims. The magistrate judge advised Green that failure to file timely, specific objections to the 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 the 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). Green has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge after receiving proper notice. *See United States v. Midgette*, 478 F.3d 616, 621 (4th Cir. 2007) (holding that a litigant "waives a right to appellate review of particular issues by failing to file timely objections specifically directed to those issues"). Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We also deny Green's motion to appoint counsel.

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