Calhoun v. SSA Doc. 920080311

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-2042

LEROY CALHOUN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Walter D. Kelley, Jr., District Judge. (2:06-cv-00362-WDK)

Submitted: February 26, 2008 Decided: March 11, 2008

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Leroy Calhoun, Appellant Pro Se. Joel Eric Wilson, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Leroy Calhoun appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Social Security Administration upon the determination that substantial evidence supported the denial of Calhoun's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. 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 Calhoun 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, Calhoun failed to specifically 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). Calhoun has waived appellate review by failing to timely file specific objections 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

<u>AFFIRMED</u>