

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DONALD J. STRABLE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant-Appellee.

ü

ý

þ

No. 00-1887

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville.
G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge.
(CA-00-886-6)

Submitted: October 12, 2000

Decided: October 25, 2000

Before WILLIAMS and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Donald J. Strable, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See
Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION**PER CURIAM:**

Donald J. Strable appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action. Strable's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Strable that failure to file specific and timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Strable failed to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

Pursuant to § 636(b)(1), a district court is required to conduct a de novo review of those portions of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection has been made. The court need not conduct de novo review, however, "when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). 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 that failure to so object will waive appellate review. See *Orpiano*, 687 F.2d at 47. Strable has waived appellate review by failing to direct the district court to specific errors in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. See *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 93-94 (4th Cir. 1994) (failure to file objections waives appellate review). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DONALD J. STRABLE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant-Appellee.

ü

ý

þ

No. 00-1887

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville.
G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge.
(CA-00-886-6)

Submitted: October 12, 2000

Decided: October 25, 2000

Before WILLIAMS and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Donald J. Strable, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See
Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION**PER CURIAM:**

Donald J. Strable appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action. Strable's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Strable that failure to file specific and timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Strable failed to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

Pursuant to § 636(b)(1), a district court is required to conduct a de novo review of those portions of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection has been made. The court need not conduct de novo review, however, "when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). 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 that failure to so object will waive appellate review. *See Orpiano*, 687 F.2d at 47. Strable has waived appellate review by failing to direct the district court to specific errors in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. *See United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 93-94 (4th Cir. 1994) (failure to file objections waives appellate review). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED