

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1107

ROSIE HOPKINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICE HEALTH CARE REGISTRY; VILLAGES OF APEX CLUB; APEX POLICE DEPARTMENT; KAREN BEATY; ZACHARY BEATY; PATHWAYS FOR PEOPLE, INC.; ACCIDENT FUND OF AMERICA; NC INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION WORKER COMP; ANTHONY SACCO; DEBORAH DEBBIE GABRILLE; GLORIA ALEREZ-ROTHROCK; JAMIE HADDOCK-WEST; MICHELE SULLIVAN; CAROLYN T. MARCUS; TAMARA NANCE; STELLA HAYS; PAMELA GILYARD; WILLIAM MADDREY; RITA HORTON; THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA WAKE COUNTY JUSTICE CENTER; KEITH GREGORY; MICHAEL J. DENNING; ERIN BECKER; AUSTIN BRAXTON; MARY ASHTON SLAGLE; SEAN MYERS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:24-cv-00197-FL-KS)

Submitted: March 27, 2025

Decided: April 1, 2025

Before THACKER and BERNER, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rosie Hopkins, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rosie Hopkins appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). 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 Hopkins that failure to file timely and 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). Hopkins has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we treat Hopkins' motion to review additional evidence as a motion to supplement her informal brief, grant the motion, and 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