

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1577

TRESSA R. GLOVER, formerly Parker,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ORANGEBURG, SOUTH CAROLINA CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL
DISTRICT FIVE,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (5:05-cv-01207-JFA)

Submitted: October 11, 2007

Decided: October 15, 2007

Before MICHAEL and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tressa R. Glover, Appellant Pro Se. David Leon Morrison, DAVIDSON,
MORRISON & LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tressa R. Glover seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendant's summary judgment motion on her retaliation and sex discrimination and harassment claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2000), and her disability discrimination claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 (2000), and dismissing her remaining state law claims without prejudice. 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 Defendant's summary judgment motion be granted and advised Glover that failure to file timely specific objections to this recommendation would waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Glover failed to file specific objections 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. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Glover has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

We deny Glover's motions for a restraining order against Defendant's employees, for an investigation of Defendant's employees, for seizure of the employees' personal property, for suspension of their employment, and for investigation of identity theft. 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