

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-6052

JAIME LUEVANO, family members in general - et,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

C.I.A. PODCAST IN D.C.; C.I.A., in General in VA; TEXAS CRIMES RING
MOBS INC., drones, satellites, etc., beams, rays, force entry,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at
Charleston. Thomas E. Johnston, Chief District Judge. (2:23-cv-00637)

Submitted: June 13, 2024

Decided: June 18, 2024

Before RUSHING and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jaime Luevano, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jaime Luevano, a Texas inmate, seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition. 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 Luevano 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 Luevano 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 deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

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.

DISMISSED