

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1298

CURLEE SHERMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, Charleston
Division,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 04-1299

CURLEE SHERMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, Greenville
Division,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 04-1300

CURLEE SHERMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, Columbia
Division,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston, Greenville, and Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CA-04-116-2; CA-04-117-6; CA-04-118-3)

Submitted: June 9, 2004

Decided: June 28, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Curlee Sherman, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Curlee Sherman seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his consolidated 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaints. The district court referred these cases to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2000). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Sherman that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Sherman failed to object to the magistrate judge's 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 that failure to object will waive appellate review. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Sherman has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny Sherman's motions for general relief, and dismiss the appeals.

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.

DISMISSED