Freddie Jones v. Dennis Bush Appeal: 15-6808 Doc: 11 Filed: 11/23/2015 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 405721808

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6808

FREDDIE RICHARD JONES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DENNIS BUSH, Warden Lee Correctional Institution,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (0:14-cv-01760-TLW)

Submitted: October 26, 2015 Decided: November 23, 2015

Before MOTZ and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Freddie Richard Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Melody Jane Brown, Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Freddie Richard Jones seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. 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 petition be dismissed as untimely and advised Jones 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). Jones has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

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.

DISMISSED