

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1282

ANTHONY PARKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SHAWN OWENS,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Max O. Cogburn, Jr., District Judge. (3:17-cv-00720-MOC-DSC)

Submitted: August 31, 2018

Decided: September 20, 2018

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Parker, Appellant Pro Se. Melissa Robin Davis, Jason V. Federmack, JACKSON LEWIS PC, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Parker appeals the district court's orders (1) accepting in part and overruling in part the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his complaint, and (2) denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the district court's conclusions regarding removal, the magistrate judge's authority to issue a report and recommendation, and Parker's failure to exhaust administrative remedies. Accordingly, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm these rulings for the reasons stated by the district court. *Parker v. Owens*, No. 3:17-cv-00720-MOC-DSC (W.D.N.C. Mar. 8, 2018; Mar. 13, 2018).

Turning to Parker's claim under the North Carolina Equal Employment Practices Act, we conclude that he has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommended disposition of that claim. *See Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). Finally, Parker did not challenge in his informal appellate brief the district court's disposition of his remaining claims and, therefore, has forfeited appellate review of those claims. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). 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