

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1881

MARY C. RANDALL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RICHARD M. TIERNEY, CPCU, ACI Branch Manager; MICHAEL C.
PEDERSEN, Amica Adjuster,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken.
J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (1:16-cv-00255-JMC)

Submitted: January 18, 2018

Decided: January 22, 2018

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mary C. Randall, Appellant Pro Se. Brandon R. Gottschall, William Oglesby Sweeny,
III, SWEENY, WINGATE & BARROW, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mary C. Randall appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and granting Defendants' motion to dismiss her civil 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 Defendants' motion to dismiss be granted and advised Randall that a failure to timely file specific 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. *See Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245-46 (4th Cir. 2017), *petition for cert. filed*, __ U.S.L.W. __ (U.S. Sept. 25, 2017) (No. 17-539). Randall has waived appellate review by failing, after receiving proper notice, to file objections that were specific to the basis of the magistrate judge's recommendation. Rather, she generally asserted that she was receiving unfair treatment in South Carolina courts.

In the absence of the requisite specific objections, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and 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