

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 20-1317**

---

TITO LEMONT KNOX,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ELIZABETH G. MAGERA, US Probation Officer in her Individual and official capacity; SERGIO A. SANCHEZ, Psychiatric in his Individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:20-cv-00228-HMH)

---

Submitted: July 21, 2020

Decided: July 23, 2020

---

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tito Lemont Knox, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tito Lemont Knox appeals the district court's orders dismissing his civil rights complaint filed pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2018). After informing Knox of several pleading deficiencies and allowing him to amend his complaint, the magistrate judge recommended that the complaint as amended be dismissed for failure to state a claim. The magistrate judge further advised Knox 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 Knox received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, he has waived appellate review because, as the district court ruled, 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 amended 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*