

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 26-6068**

---

CORVIN JAUWAN YOUNG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KELLY GOTHARD, South Carolina Department of Mental Health Director; ERIN GAFFNEY, Residential Program (Superintendent), Wellpath Recovery Solutions; JENNIFER ALLEYNE, Forensic Assessment Psychologist/Forensic Examiner, Wellpath Recovery Solutions,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.  
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (9:24-cv-03757-MGL)

---

Submitted: April 28, 2026

Decided: May 1, 2026

---

Before WILKINSON and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Corvin J. Young, Appellant Pro Se. Mark Victor Gende, SWEENEY, WINGATE & BARROW, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Corvin Jauwan Young appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing with prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the complaint and advised Young that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation would 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). Young has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice.

Accordingly, we 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*