

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1627

KUMAR NAHARAJA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THOMAS KENNETH KOCH, individual, an employee of Medical University of South Carolina; THOMAS GREGORY COONEY, Portland VA Medical Center; CARTER DAVIDSON WRAY, individual, a member of OHSU Practice Plan; ERIKA LEE FINANGER, individual, a member of OHSU Practice Plan; DONALD E. GIRARD; PATRICK BRUNETT; JOSEPH PINTER; DANIEL GIBBS; JEFF KRAAKEVIK; JASON CORYELL; DANA BRANER; STEPHEN A. BACK; BARRY RUSSMAN; FRANCES BIAGIOLI; COLIN ROBERTS; MICHELE MASS; CYNTHIA FERRELL; SUE SIMMONS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:23-cv-00100-RMG)

Submitted: March 12, 2024

Decided: March 14, 2024

Before GREGORY, RICHARDSON, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kumar Naharaja, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kumar Naharaja appeals the district court's order dismissing Naharaja's complaint for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with the court's order, and failure to state a claim. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Naharaja 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).

Naharaja has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. 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