

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-2221

RANDY WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP, INC.; AMERICAN HOME
ASSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:17-cv-03396-MGL)

Submitted: May 21, 2020

Decided: May 26, 2020

Before AGEE and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randy Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Lauren Glazer Trask, MCKAY FIRM, P.A.,
Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Randy Williams appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action stemming from the administration of his workers' compensation benefits. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2018). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Williams that failure to file timely, specific 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. *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 846-47 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 154-55 (1985). Although Williams received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, he has waived appellate review because the district court determined that his objections were not specific to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge. *See Martin*, 858 F.3d at 245 (holding that, "to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge's report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection" (internal quotation marks omitted)). 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