

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6477

JAMIE BRIAN KETCHAM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Senior District Judge. (4:25-cv-01115-JFA)

Submitted: September 18, 2025

Decided: September 23, 2025

Before THACKER and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jamie Brian Ketcham, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jamie Brian Ketcham appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 action because Ketcham was not in custody and his filings were frivolous.* The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended dismissal and advised Ketcham that failure to file timely 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). Ketcham has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we deny Ketcham's pending motions 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

* The district court's order is a final, appealable order because the court did not grant Ketcham leave to amend his complaint. *Britt v. DeJoy*, 45 F.4th 790, 796 (4th Cir. 2022) (en banc) (order).