

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-7108**

---

JULIUS WAYNE BAKER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

BRYAN K. DOBBS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.  
Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (9:20-cv-03383-HMH)

---

Submitted: October 19, 2021

Decided: October 22, 2021

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, AGEE, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Julius Wayne Baker, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Julius Wayne Baker, a federal prisoner, appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing for lack of jurisdiction his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition. 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 Baker 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 Baker 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)). Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We deny Baker's motion to appoint counsel.

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*