

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1755

JAMES A. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL STUDIVENT, Official Capacity; DEBORAH LANKFORD,
Individual and Official Capacity; SAMUEL LANKFORD,
Individual and Official Capacity; LANKFORD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES, Official Capacity; TOMMY STEVENS, Individual and
Official Capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder,
District Judge. (1:09-cv-00414-TDS-LPA)

Submitted: August 13, 2012

Decided: August 17, 2012

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James A. Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Studivent, BEE AND
JAY MOTORS, Greensboro, North Carolina; Sarah Helen Roane,
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, PC, Greensboro, North
Carolina; William L. Hill, James Demarest Secor, III, FRAZIER
HILL & FURY, RLLP, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James A. Williams appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Williams that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could 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). Williams has waived appellate review by failing to file 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