

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-7533

NICHOLAS DEALY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RICHARDSON, Captain; COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY;
JUDGE LEARNER, Hampton City Circuit Court;
DIRECTOR, VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;
JOHN & JANE DOE, and all deputies that worked
the floor,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District
Judge. (CA-05-125-HEH)

Submitted: January 26, 2006

Decided: February 3, 2006

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nicholas Dealy, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Nicholas Dealy seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action. 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 Dealy 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, Dealy 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). Dealy 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