

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-7355**

---

TRAVIS LASHAUN WATSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

MARK CARVER,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Loretta C. Biggs, District Judge. (1:17-cv-01067-LCB-LPA)

---

Submitted: April 20, 2023

Decided: April 25, 2023

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Travis L. Watson, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Travis Lashaun Watson appeals the district court's judgment denying his three Fed. R. Civ. P. 60 motions for relief from the court's judgment, entered four years prior, dismissing without prejudice his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition. The district court referred Watson's first two motions to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended that the court deny Watson's Rule 60 motions as untimely and advised Watson 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). Watson has waived appellate review of the denial of his first two Rule 60(b) motions by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. As to the third Rule 60(b) motion, which was referred directly to the district court, the court did not err in denying the motion. 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*