

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-6080**

---

SAMUEL MCARTHUR WALLACE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GREENVILLE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER; MAJOR  
MELTON; JAMES M. DORRIETY, Administrator; DR.  
SHERMAN; DR. LANTZ; DR. MARTIN, Doctor of  
Mental Health; CRIST MCGRAW, Head Nurse at  
Greenville County Detention Center,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. David C. Norton, District Judge.  
(CA-03-3633-3)

---

Submitted: April 14, 2005

Decided: April 21, 2005

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Samuel McArthur Wallace, Appellant Pro Se. Russell W. Harter, Jr.,  
CHAPMAN, HARTER & GROVES, PA, Greenville, South Carolina; Edwin  
Brown Parkinson, Jr., Christopher R. Antley, DEVLIN & PARKINSON,  
PA, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Samuel McArthur Wallace appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. The district court referred this case 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 Wallace 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, Wallace 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). Wallace has waived appellate review by failing to file objections 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED