

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-2220

MCKINLEY WRIGHT, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND WORKFORCE;
SEFA TRANSPORTATION INC.; THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA; THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS; STATE OF
SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT; STEVEN A. JORDAN,
Attorney for the South Carolina Department of Employment and Workforce;
GRANT M. MILLS, Attorney for SEFA Transportation Inc.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Columbia. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (3:22-cv-03973-MGL)

Submitted: April 11, 2024

Decided: April 15, 2024

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

McKinley Wright, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

McKinley Wright, Jr., appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and advised Wright that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based on 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 Wright received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, his 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