

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1818

CAROLYN E. REED-SMITH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SEVEN,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (7:11-cv-00970-JMC)

Submitted: November 20, 2012

Decided: November 29, 2012

Before AGEE, DAVIS, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carolyn E. Reed-Smith, Appellant Pro Se. Carlos C. Johnson, Kenneth William Nettles, Jr., LYLES DARR & CLARK, LLP, Spartanburg, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carolyn E. Reed-Smith appeals the district court's order denying relief on her civil action alleging retaliation and race and sex discrimination claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 2003 & Supp. 2012), and violations of several other federal statutes and constitutional provisions. 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 the district court grant Defendant's motion for summary judgment and decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any remaining claims for relief asserted under state law. While represented by counsel, Reed-Smith filed objections to the magistrate judge's recommendations. The district court adopted the recommendations and denied relief to Reed-Smith.

A counseled litigant who fails to file specific written objections to a magistrate judge's recommendations waives her right to appellate review of a district court order adopting the recommendations. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845 (4th Cir. 1985) (noting the "general rule that a party who fails to object to a magistrate[] [judge's] report is barred from appealing the judgment of a district court adopting the magistrate[] [judge's] findings"); see United States v. Benton,

523 F.3d 424, 428 (4th Cir. 2008) (holding that a "general objection" to a magistrate judge's finding is insufficient to preserve a claim for appellate review). Reed-Smith has waived her right to appellate review of the district court's order by failing to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendations.*

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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

* On appeal, Reed-Smith appears to contend that we should exercise our discretion to permit her appeal under the so-called "interests of justice" exception to the waiver rule recognized by the Supreme Court. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985). However, because Reed-Smith does not suggest any reason for excusing the failure of her counsel to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendations, no "interests of justice" exception is warranted in this case.