

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6631

WILLIE J. HARRISON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JIM HODGES, Governor of South Carolina; DOUG
CATOE, Director; RICKIE HARRISON, Warden of
Kershaw Correctional Institution et al con-
cerned parties,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (CA-99-2168)

Submitted: July 27, 2000

Decided: August 4, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN, WILKINS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Willie J. Harrison, Appellant Pro Se. Terry B. Millar, Rock Hill,
South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Willie J. Harrison appeals from the district court's order granting summary judgment for Defendants in his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) action. Harrison'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 Harrison that failure to file timely objections to the recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Harrison failed to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny relief on his claim of sub-standard water. Harrison has waived appellate review of this issue by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

Harrison also challenges the district court's order denying relief on his claims of an interference with access to medical services and the denial of his discovery motions. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Harrison v. Hodges, No. CA-99-2168 (D.S.C. Apr. 20, 2000). 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