

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 08-7111

---

GREGORY LAFARAL FORD, a/k/a Gregory L. Ford,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SIMON MAJOR, Director, Sumter Lee Regional Detention Center;  
JACKIE RICHARDS, Head Nurse, Sumter Lee Regional Detention  
Center,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Anderson. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District  
Judge. (8:07-cv-01581-HMH)

---

Submitted: October 14, 2008

Decided: October 20, 2008

---

Before KING, GREGORY, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gregory Lafaral Ford, Appellant Pro Se. James M. Davis, Jr.,  
Joel Steve Hughes, DAVIDSON & LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South  
Carolina; Andrew S. Halio, Elliott T. Halio, HALIO & HALIO,  
Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Lafaral Ford 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 Ford 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, Ford 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). Ford has waived appellate review by failing to timely file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we deny Ford's motion for transcript at government expense and affirm the judgment of the district court.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

---

\*Ford's objections were filed July 1, 2008, over a month after the court entered its judgment.

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED