

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-1057**

---

MELVIN RICHARD ROBINSON, III,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRICKTON VILLAGE ASSOCIATION, INC., f/k/a Brickton Village HOA; LM  
PROPERTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 21-1845**

---

MELVIN RICHARD ROBINSON, III,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRICKTON VILLAGE ASSOCIATION, INC., f/k/a Brickton Village HOA; LM  
PROPERTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina,  
at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger, Chief District Judge. (1:20-cv-00030-MR-WCM)

---

Submitted: May 26, 2022

Decided: June 28, 2022

---

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Melvin Richard Robinson, III, Appellant Pro Se. Alexandra Cury, BALL BARDEN & CURY, P.A., Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Melvin Richard Robinson, III, appeals the district court's orders denying relief in his civil action. In No. 21-1057, Robinson appeals from the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss Robinson's complaint raising claims under the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601-3619, 3631, as well as various state law claims, and denying his motion for appointment of counsel. In No. 21-1845, Robinson appeals the district court's subsequent order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying Robinson's postjudgment motions to amend his complaint. We affirm.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Robinson's informal briefs do not challenge the basis for the district court's order on appeal in No. 21-1057, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief.").

Robinson's briefs do challenge the district court's orders denying his postjudgment motions to amend. When recommending that the district court deny Robinson's motions to amend, the magistrate judge explicitly warned Robinson that he had 14 days to file written objections and that a failure to object would waive appellate review. 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). Robinson failed to file objections to the magistrate judge's second recommendation. Thus, he has waived appellate review of the district court's order adopting the recommendation to deny his motions to amend.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. 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*