

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-6736

THOMAS THOMPSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE, AND
PARDON SERVICES,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (9:21-cv-01145-TMC)

Submitted: May 18, 2023

Decided: May 22, 2023

Before NIEMEYER, RICHARDSON, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas Thompson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Thompson appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and granting the Defendant summary judgment on Thompson's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. In his complaint, Thompson alleged violations of his Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment and his Fourteenth Amendment rights to due process and equal protection based on the denial of state parole. 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 Thompson that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. The district court found that Thompson failed to raise specific objections to the magistrate judge's report and accepted the magistrate judge's recommendation. Thompson, however, does not challenge the district court's ruling on the specificity of the objections on appeal.

Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Thompson's informal brief, *see* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also 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."), we affirm the judgment of the district court, *Thompson v. S.C. Dep't of Prob., Parole, & Pardon Servs.*, No. 9:21-cv-01145-TMC (D.S.C. May 26, 2022). 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