

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7551

CHARLES EDWARD THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; JON OZMINT, Former
Prison Director; MEDICAL DIVISION; FINANCIAL RECORDS, In
their individual and official capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. David C. Norton, District Judge.
(0:14-cv-00302-DCN)

Submitted: July 20, 2015

Decided: September 21, 2015

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Edward Thomas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Edward Thomas appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss, after a 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (2012) review, Thomas's claims brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012), the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12300 (2012), and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-9 (2012), and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Thomas's state law claims. Thomas has also filed with this Court several motions seeking additional relief. We deny the pending motions and affirm the district court's judgment.

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). Moreover, we limit our review to the issues raised in the appellant's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Thomas waived appellate review of the district court's dispositive holdings by failing to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's dispositive recommendations after receiving proper notice, and by failing to challenge the district court's dispositive holdings in his informal brief.

Accordingly, we deny the pending motions and affirm the district court's 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