

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6034

DEMETRIUS GLENN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ADAM SINCLAIR RUFFIN, Attorney; MICHAEL HENTHORNE, Attorney; MS.
WILLIAMS, Lt SCDC; MS. MEGITT; MS. BARBER; MS. MRS. BROWN,
Caseworker,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Greenville. Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (6:22-cv-01320-DCC)

Submitted: April 25, 2023

Decided: April 28, 2023

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, THACKER, Circuit Judge, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Demetrius Glenn, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Demetrius Glenn appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge advised Glenn that his complaint was subject to summary dismissal for failure to state a claim and provided Glenn the opportunity to file an amended complaint. After Glenn failed to do so, the magistrate judge recommended that the district court dismiss the complaint. The magistrate judge advised Glenn 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). Glenn has waived appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. 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