

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-1121**

---

JACOB BAKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

REGISTRATION AND ELECTION OFFICE; SHERIFF STEVE LOFTIS;  
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION; BARACK OBAMA, Democratic Party;  
JOE BIDEN; OPRAH WINFREY; MARK STANFORD; PRINCE CHARLES,  
London the British; FRANCE THE COUNTRY; SADDIE HUSSAN; MITT  
ROMNEY, Republican Party; GARY JOHNSON, Libertarian Party;  
VIRGIL GOODE, Constitution Party; JILL STEIN, Green Party;  
MICHAEL A. BAKER; GREENVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT; GEORGE W.  
BUSH,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge.  
(6:12-cv-03221-TMC)

---

Submitted: March 28, 2013

Decided: April 2, 2013

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jacob Baker, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jacob Baker appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2006). 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 Baker that failure to file timely and specific 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). Baker has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice.

We deny Baker's motion for default judgment. 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