

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7412**

---

CHRISTOPHER LANCASTER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

J. TODD, Officer; OFFICER ARTRIP; B. KUNKLE, Officer; OFFICER FERELL;  
M. DOYLE, Lieutenant; NURSE MYERS; NURSE FOWLER; NURSE  
HILEMAN; LIEUTENANT HARRISON; WARDEN TERRY O'BRIEN;  
ASSOCIATE WARDEN ODOM; EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT THOMPSON;  
NURSE DAWSON; CAPTAIN GILLY; D. JONES, Counselor; SHERK; C.  
TROOPMAN, Position Officer; C. BENNET, Position Counselor; B. MICHAELS,  
Position Officer; MERKERGO; BRADLY, Position Officer; ALLISON, Position  
Officer; ANDREWS, Position Officer; BOYARD, Position Officer; AND ALL  
UNKNOWN NOT LISTED IN COMPLAINT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at  
Clarksburg. Irene M. Keeley, Senior District Judge. (1:16-cv-00200-IMK)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2018

Decided: February 2, 2018

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher Lancaster, Appellant Pro Se. Erin K. Reisenweber, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Lancaster appeals the district court's order denying relief on his complaint filed pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). 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 Lancaster 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). Lancaster has waived appellate review by failing to file objections in the district court after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment.

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*