UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

─────────

No. 18-7203

─────────

DAREN KAREEM GADSDEN,

        Petitioner - Appellant,

    v.

WARDEN SMITH,

        Respondent - Appellee.

─────────

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (5:17-hc-02029-D)

─────────

Submitted: December 18, 2018   Decided: December 21, 2018

─────────

Before AGEE, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

─────────

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

─────────

Daren Kareem Gadsden, Appellant Pro Se.

─────────

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Federal prisoner Daren Kareem Gadsden appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss Gadsden's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (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 Gadsden that failure to file timely objections to the recommendation would 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). Gadsden waived appellate review of the district court's dispositive holdings by failing to meaningfully object to the magistrate judge's dispositive recommendations. Moreover, Gadsden fails to challenge the district court's dispositive holdings in his informal brief, which further supports the conclusion that he has waived appellate review of the appealed-from order. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b).

We thus affirm the district court's judgment. We deny Gadsden's motion for a transcript at government expense. 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

2