UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 17-7027

_____

JOHN C. ROBINSON,

                    Petitioner - Appellant,

         v.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION
PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES; WARDEN, BROAD RIVER
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

                    Respondents - Appellees.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken.
Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (1:16-cv-03324-TMC)

_____

Submitted: December 19, 2017   Decided: December 21, 2017

_____

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

John C. Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. Tommy Evans, Jr., SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE & PARDON SERVICE, Columbia, South
Carolina; Christina Catoe Bigelow, SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John C. Robinson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on 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 relief be denied and advised Robinson 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). Robinson 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