

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7343

DON BOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ANGELICA TEXTILE SERVICES INC; FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP;
REYBURN W. LOMINACK, III; C. FREDERICK W. MANNING, II; STATE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA, South Carolina Human Affairs Commission;
H. RONALD STANLEY, individually and proprietor; UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA, United States District Court for the
District of South Carolina; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (3:12-cv-00334-JFA)

Submitted: December 20, 2012 Decided: December 26, 2012

Before KING and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Don Boyd, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Don Boyd appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss his civil action against Defendants after a 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (2006) review. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in Boyd's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Boyd's informal brief does not challenge the district court's dispositive holdings, Boyd has forfeited appellate review of the district court's order. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment.* See Boyd v. Angelica Textile Servs., No. 3:12-cv-00334-JFA (D.S.C. June 15, 2012). 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

* Because the timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of a district court order adopting that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance, see Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985), Boyd also waived appellate review over the district court's order by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice.