

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6668**

---

THOMAS LOUIS DAVIS, Rev,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHRISTINE WILSON; JAMES BUKOFFSKY; BRIAN CHAPMAN; ANTHONY  
DORE; LARRY WEIDNER; ERIC ERICKSON; STATE OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA; MATTHEW FRIEDMAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., Senior  
District Judge. (9:13-cv-00382-GRA)

---

Submitted: August 29, 2013

Decided: September 4, 2013

---

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas Louis Davis, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Louis Davis appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Davis's civil complaint. 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 Davis 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, Davis 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). Davis has waived appellate review of his 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