

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1740

GAIL E. PACE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CROSSMARK; DEBBIE RIDGEWAY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:10-cv-02797-HMH)

Submitted: November 17, 2011

Decided: November 22, 2011

Before KING, DAVIS, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gail E. Pace, Appellant Pro Se. Lucas James Asper, Thomas Howard Keim, Jr., FORD & HARRISON, LLP, Spartanburg, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gail E. Pace appeals the district court's order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss her claims pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 2003 & Supp. 2011). The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2011). The magistrate judge recommended that the complaint be dismissed and advised Pace that failure to timely file specific objections to this recommendation would waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the 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). Pace has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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