

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-2248**

---

JOSEPH WITCHARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRYAN M. ANTONELLI, Warden of FCI Williamsburg; UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 19-2317**

---

JOSEPH WITCHARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRYAN M. ANTONELLI, Warden of FCI Williamsburg; UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Anderson. Bruce H. Hendricks, District Judge. (8:19-cv-01609-BHH)

---

Submitted: April 14, 2020

Decided: April 16, 2020

---

Before WILKINSON, QUATTLEBAUM, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Joseph Witchard, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, federal inmate Joseph Witchard appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his civil action challenging his confinement and denying his postjudgment motion for reconsideration. 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 Witchard 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 Witchard received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, he has waived appellate review because the 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)).

Moreover, Witchard failed to meet the standard for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). See *Robinson v. Wix Filtration Corp. LLC*, 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010)

(setting out Rule 59(e) standard). We therefore affirm the district court's orders dismissing Witchard's civil action and denying reconsideration. We also deny Witchard's pending motions. 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*