

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6210

MUHAMMAD AL-MUJAHIDIN, a/k/a John Hamilton,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

J. HARRIS; SHARONDA SUTTON; PERCY JONES; WARDEN STEVENSON;
LEROY CARTLEDGE; SERGEANT ESTERLINE; OFFICER BECKETT, et
al, In Their Indivd Capacitys; OFFICER JOE FANT,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

INV BEACH,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Beaufort. Bruce H. Hendricks, District
Judge. (9:13-cv-00022-BHH)

Submitted: June 30, 2015

Decided: August 6, 2015

Before NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Muhammad Al-Mujahidin, Appellant Pro Se. Roy F. Laney, Thomas Lowndes Pope, Jayme Leigh Shy, Damon C. Wlodarczyk, RILEY, POPE & LANEY, LLC, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Muhammad Al-Mujahidin appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. 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 Al-Mujahidin 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). Al-Mujahidin has waived appellate review of the district court's dismissal of his excessive-force claim based on collateral estoppel by failing to file specific objections on this issue after receiving proper notice.

With regard to Al-Mujahidin's other claims, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Al-Mujahidin v. Harris, No. 9:13-cv-00022-BHH (D.S.C. Jan. 27,

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