UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6186

JOHN JAMES BELL, a/k/a Omar Abdel-Al-Mumit,

              Plaintiff - Appellant,

        v.

CECILIA REYNOLDS, Warden of Kershaw Correctional
Institution,

              Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Anderson. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., Senior
District Judge. (8:08-cv-03799-GRA)

Submitted: May 20, 2009   Decided: June 15, 2009

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John James Bell, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John James Bell appeals the district court's order denying relief on his petition for writ of mandamus. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2006). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Bell that failure to file timely and specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Bell failed to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation. Rather, Bell filed objections that did not address the magistrate judge's findings and were construed by the district court as a general objection to the magistrate judge's report and 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). Bell 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