

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-6594

DENNIS TEMPLE, a/k/a Dennis Maurice Temple,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN SCOTT LEWIS; ASSOCIATE WARDEN CURTIS EARLY;
ASSOCIATE WARDEN SARAH DUFFY; CAPTAIN ADAM BRADBURN;
LIEUTENANT ROBERT BLACKBURN; SERGEANT KEVIN BOREM;
OFFICER KAYLA SHERVEY; PROGRAM DIRECTOR RACHEL
SALTSBURG; CBU COMMITTEE MEMBER GREGORY MASON,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Anderson. Joseph Dawson, III, District Judge. (8:19-cv-02659-JD)

Submitted: June 23, 2022

Decided: June 27, 2022

Before WYNN and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dennis Temple, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dennis Temple appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Defendants and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil action. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Temple that failure to file timely and 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 Temple received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, he has waived appellate review of the district court's dismissal of his request for declaratory and injunctive relief, dismissal of his claims for gross negligence, dismissal of his claims challenging the deprivation of personal property and complaining of violations of institutional policy, and dismissal of any effort to bring a claim for an Eighth Amendment violation because 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)).

We also have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the remainder of the district court’s dismissal decision. 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