Eric Morrison v. Eric Wilson Appeal: 15-6812 Doc: 10 Filed: 07/28/2015 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 405560783

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6812

ERIC WILFORD MORRISON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN ERIC WILSON, CEO; FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL COMPLEX, LOW; PETERSBURG LOW, INC.; FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (4:14-cv-03672-TMC)

Submitted: July 23, 2015 Decided: July 28, 2015

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Wilford Morrison, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Wilford Morrison appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his civil action seeking relief under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b)(1), 2671-2680 (2012). 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 case be dismissed and advised Morrison 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). Morrison has waived appellate review by failing to file timely, specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

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