

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2092

GISELLE MONIQUE RAMSEUR, sui juris, in her capacity and as equitable
successor and next of kin of Melvin Ramseur, Sr.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DAVITA NORTH CHARLOTTE DIALYSIS CENTER; NOVANT HEALTH,
INC.; PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL; PIEDMONT MEDICAL CENTER;
HOSPICE OF CHARLOTTE; DR. SANGHANI; UNKNOWN TRUSTEES,
FIDUCIARIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE AGENTS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at
Charlotte. Kenneth D. Bell, District Judge. (3:25-cv-00319-KDB-DCK)

Submitted: January 22, 2026

Decided: January 28, 2026

Before AGEE, RICHARDSON, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Giselle Monique Ramseur, Appellant Pro Se. J. Matthew Little, TEAGUE, CAMPBELL,
DENNIS & GORHAM, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Tamura Dawn Coffey, Christopher
Thomas Hood, COFFEY LAW PLLC, Bermuda Run, North Carolina; Chance Michael
Farr, Timothy Maio, HOLCOMBE BOMAR, PA, Spartanburg, South Carolina;
Christopher M. Hinnant, Wilmington, North Carolina, Jessica Wilds Stratta, BARNWELL

WHALEY PATTERSON & HELMS, LLC, Charleston, South Carolina; Phoebe N. Coddington, LINCOLN DERR PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Giselle Monique Ramseur appeals the district court's orders granting Defendants' motions to dismiss her civil complaint and denying reconsideration. 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 Defendants' motions be granted and advised Ramseur 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 Ramseur 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" (citation modified)). Particularly, Ramseur failed to address the magistrate judge's findings regarding subject matter jurisdiction and the applicable statutes of limitations.

Even if Ramseur's objections could be liberally construed as sufficiently specific, Ramseur's informal brief merely reasserts her unsubstantiated claim that the magistrate

judge lacked neutrality and does not otherwise challenge the dispositive bases for the district court's disposition. She has therefore also forfeited appellate review of the court's orders. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we deny Ramseur's motion to strike 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