

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7786**

---

RAYMOND ALEXANDER FORD, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, District  
Judge. (2:09-cv-00143-RBS-JEB)

---

Submitted: November 19, 2009

Decided: December 4, 2009

---

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Raymond Alexander Ford, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Craig Stallard,  
Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond A. Ford seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. 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 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 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 a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

---

\* Although Ford contends on appeal that he timely filed in the district court a motion for extension of time to file objections, the district court docket sheet reflects no such filing.

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.

DISMISSED