

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6545

JAMEL WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CARMEN T. MULLEN, in her individual and official capacity; REED EVANS, in his individual and official capacity; KATIE MCCALLISTER, in her individual and official capacity; ERVIN FORD, in his individual and official capacity; TIM KOSCH, in his individual and official capacity; CHRIS HILGENDORF, in his individual and official capacity; BRYAN P. STIRLING, in his individual and official capacity; KEVIN SHWEDO, in his individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:25-cv-01072-RMG)

Submitted: December 23, 2025

Decided: December 31, 2025

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jamel Williams, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jamel Williams appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice and without leave to amend his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 amended complaint and the order denying his "Motion to Change Jurisdiction and Venue Pursuant to Rule 82(b)," which the court construed as a Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion and denied. The district court referred Williams's § 1983 complaint to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended dismissing without prejudice Williams's § 1983 claims and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims. The magistrate judge advised Williams 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 Williams received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, Williams's 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 Williams'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