

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6772

OLANDIO RAY WORKMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN VANDERMOSTEN, Assistant Administrative Director, in individual and official capacity; ROY STRICKLAND, Commissary, in individual and official capacity; SERGEANT COUCH, in individual and official capacity; MR. BODIFORD, Deputy Director Greenville County Detention Center, in individual and official capacity; T. URICK, Officer, in individual and official capacity; MR. BUCHAN, Officer, in individual and official capacity; TRACY H. KREIN, Medical Administrator, in individual and official capacity; ZEQHARRE, 4993, in individual and official capacity; MALAONE, in individual and official capacity; JIMMY THOMPSON, in individual and official capacity; CPL NELMS, in individual and official capacity; C. LABORDE, in individual and official capacity; C. ANGELLO, in individual and official capacity; SMITH, in individual and official capacity; J. FRANCIS; BRAVO SHIFT,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL, in individual and official capacity; GREENVILLE COUNTY FOOD AND MAIL SERVICES, in individual and official capacity,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (6:17-cv-00766-RBH)

Submitted: October 23, 2018

Decided: October 26, 2018

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Olandio Ray Workman, Appellant Pro Se. Russell W. Harter, Jr., CHAPMAN, HARTER & HARTER, PA, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Olandio Ray Workman appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) 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 relief be denied and advised Workman 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). Workman has waived appellate review by failing to file 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