

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-2235

HELENE MARIA RILEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SETH BARTLETT, IRS Field Agent,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (6:14-cv-00350-TMC)

Submitted: August 27, 2015

Decided: September 10, 2015

Before GREGORY and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Helene Maria Riley, Appellant Pro Se. Gretchen M. Wolfinger, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.; George John Conits, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Helene Maria Riley appeals the district court's order denying relief on her civil action against Seth Bartlett. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Riley that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Riley filed no objections, and the district court adopted the magistrate judge's report.

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). Riley has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice.

Accordingly, although we deny Bartlett's motion to dismiss because the district court extended Riley's time to note an appeal, 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