

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1143

SARIA WALKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT; HOUSE OF RAEFORD FARMS,
INCORPORATED; PRISMA HEALTH; SAINT FRANCES DOWNTOWN;
SAINT FRANCES EASTSIDE; THE CAROLINA CENTER FOR BEHAVIORAL
HEALTH; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES;
GREER POLICE DEPARTMENT; GREENVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT;
GREENVILLE COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, Clerk of Court;
GREENLINK; GREENVILLE LIBRARY SYSTEM, Downtown and Anderson
Road Branches,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:22-cv-02946-HMH)

Submitted: August 24, 2023

Decided: August 28, 2023

Before QUATTLEBAUM and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Saria Walker, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Saria Walker appeals the district court's order dismissing her complaint. 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 the complaint be dismissed and advised Walker 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 Walker received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, her objections were not specific to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge, so appellate review is foreclosed. *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 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