

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1675

LORETTA L. SAMUEL; WILLIAM R. SAMUEL,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

ESPN, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

FIFA, 8044 Zurich Switzerland; ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES,
INC., St. Louis; ADIDAS AMERICA, INC., Portland, Oregon;
HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA, F. Valley Ca.; FEDERATION
INTERNATIONALE DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (3:11-cv-00423-JFA)

Submitted: September 30, 2013 Decided: October 15, 2013

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Loretta L. Samuel, William R. Samuel, Appellants Pro Se. Tamar
Y. Duvdevani, DLA PIPER US LLP, New York, New York; Larry Dwight
Floyd, Jr., Lawrence Michael Hershon, PARKER, POE, ADAMS &

BERNSTEIN, LLP, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Loretta L. and William R. Samuel appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on the Samuels's copyright infringement action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2013). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Plaintiffs that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Plaintiffs failed to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's 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). The Plaintiffs have waived appellate review of their claims by failing to file specific 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