

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6530**

---

TIMOTHY L. HAMLET,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES PAGE, Deputy; CHARLENE WILSON, Sergeant,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

KEVIN WASHINGTON, Sheriff of WCSD;  
WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.  
(4:04-cv-22051-RBH)

---

Submitted: September 26, 2006

Decided: September 29, 2006

---

Before WIDENER and WILKINSON, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Timothy L. Hamlet, Appellant Pro Se. Benjamin Albert Baroody,  
AIKEN, BRIDGES, NUNN, ELLIOTT & TYLER, PA, Florence, South

Carolina; Robert E. Lee, MCLAIN LAW FIRM, Florence, South Carolina,  
for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Timothy L. Hamlet seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2000). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Hamlet that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Hamlet failed to timely object to the magistrate judge's 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). Hamlet has waived appellate review by failing to timely file specific objections after receiving proper notice.

Accordingly, we affirm. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED