

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1983

In re: BEVERLEY D. WILSON,

Debtor,

BEVERLEY D. WILSON, a/k/a Beverley Deloris Duncan-Wilson,
a/k/a Beverley Deloris Duncan-Stewart, a/k/a Beverley
Deloris Stewart, d/b/a/ Wilson Pediatrics Incorporated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JASON T. MOSS; MOSS AND ASSOCIATES PA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Margaret B. Seymour, Senior
District Judge. (5:15-cv-02230-MBS)

Submitted: January 14, 2016

Decided: January 19, 2016

Before AGEE, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Beverley D. Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Jason T. Moss, MOSS &
ASSOCIATES, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Beverley D. Wilson appeals the district court's order dismissing as untimely her appeal from the bankruptcy court's order dismissing her complaint for failure to prosecute. 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 the appeal be dismissed and advised Wilson 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). Wilson has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Therefore, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

Wilson also appeals the district court's order denying her motion for extension of time to note her appeal from the bankruptcy court's order. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Wilson v. Moss, No. 5:15-cv-02230-MBS (D.S.C. Aug. 26, 2015).

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