

UNPUBLISHED

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

No. 20-1338

RANDY WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP, INC.; AMERICAN HOME
ASSURANCE COMPANY; MCANGUS, GOUDELOCK & COURIE LLC;
COVENTRY HEALTHCARE,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

VAL STRONG; MATTHEW S. MOSER,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:19-cv-01616-MGL)

Submitted: May 21, 2020

Decided: May 27, 2020

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 his civil complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. 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 the complaint be dismissed 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