

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7207

RAYMOND EDWARD CHESTNUT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RORY THOMPSON, Correctional Officer; T. MCGIRT, Correctional
Officer, individual and in their official capacities; LEROY
JONES; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

LARRY JONES, Lieutenant,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Aiken. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.
(1:13-cv-01870-RBH)

Submitted: November 20, 2014

Decided: November 25, 2014

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond Edward Chestnut, Appellant Pro Se. Marshall Prince, II,
Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for

Appellees.



Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Edward Chestnut appeals the district court's order denying relief on his complaint filed pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). 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 Chestnut that failure to file timely 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). Chestnut has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice.* Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

* Chestnut contends that the district court improperly denied his motion for an extension of time to file objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b).

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