

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1078

RANDY WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION; T. SCOTT
BECK; GENE MCCASKILL; AISHA TAYLOR,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:19-cv-01340-MGL)

Submitted: May 19, 2020

Decided: May 21, 2020

Before NIEMEYER, HARRIS, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randy Williams, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Randy Williams appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his civil complaint challenging the administration of his workers' compensation benefits. The district court referred his case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2018). The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and advised Williams that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon these recommendations.

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