

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-7221**

---

DARRELL DEVON HUNTER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

R. C. TURNER, DHO; SERGEANT HORN; OFFICER  
GLENN; TIM RILEY, Warden; BROCK; OFFICER  
GRANT, IGC; HERB JOHNS; OFFICER RICE; OFFICER  
BISHOP; W. CALHOUN, Sergeant; SERGEANT  
JOHNSON; OFFICER CAMPBELL; SERGEANT DAVIS;  
OFFICER GOSSETT; CAPTAIN ALEXANDER; DAVID  
CAMPBELL, Officer, B1 Shift; K. DAVIS,  
Sergeant, B2 night shift,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District  
Judge. (0:06-cv-03406)

---

Submitted: January 17, 2008

Decided: January 24, 2008

---

Before TRAXLER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Darrell Devon Hunter, Appellant Pro Se. John Evans James, III, LEE,  
ERTER, WILSON, JAMES, HOLLER & SMITH, Sumter, South Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Darrell Devon Hunter appeals 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 Hunter that failure to file timely specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Hunter 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. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Hunter 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.

AFFIRMED