UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6473

LAWRENCE CORNELIUS PAULIN, JR., a/k/a Lawrence C Paulin,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

RAY NASH, Sheriff,

Defendant – Appellee.

No. 09-6474

LAWRENCE CORNELIUS PAULIN, JR.,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

FRANKLIN SMITH, former Chief Jailer,

Defendant – Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:07-cv-03753-GRA; 6:08-cv-00067-GRA)

Submitted: July 23, 2009 Decided: July 29, 2009

Before WILKINSON and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Cornelius Paulin, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. William J. Thrower, STUCKEY LAW OFFICES, PA, Charleston, South Carolina; for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Lawrence Cornelius Paulin, Jr., appeals the district court's orders dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) actions. The district court referred the cases to a magistrate judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2006). The magistrate judge recommended granting Defendants' summary judgment motions in the respective actions, and advised Paulin that failure to file timely and specific objections to the recommendations could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendations. Despite this warning, and despite receiving extensions of time to file his objections, Paulin failed to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendations.

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, 845-47 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 147-48 (1985). Paulin has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. Paulin v. Nash, No. 6:07-cv-03753-GRA (D.S.C. Feb. 17, 2009); Paulin v. Smith, No. 6:08-cv-00067-GRA (D.S.C. Feb. 18, 2009). 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