

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1567

MICHAEL GREGG-WILSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN ROVERI; STUART A. LIDDELL; JO R. WHITE;
ZONA JEFFERSON; EDWARD ALSTON; FRANK BAKER;
WESLEY BLANDING; CHARLES BURNS; TOM GARRITY;
JAMES GRIFFIN; KAY RAFFIELD; KURT WELDAY,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ELMER EDWIN JACKSON, Machine Tool Instructor
SCCC; LARRY CULICK; WILLIAM DYSON; CHARLES J.
BOYKIN,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge.
(3:04-cv-23132-MBS)

Submitted: April 16, 2007

Decided: April 20, 2007

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Gregg-Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Charles J. Boykin, Jamila B. Minnicks, BOYKIN, DAVIS, HAWKINS & CALDWELL, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Gregg-Wilson appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his civil complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, 1985(3) (2000). 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 on all but Gregg-Wilson's First Amendment claim and advised Gregg-Wilson that failure to file specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Gregg-Wilson failed to object specifically to the magistrate judge's recommendations.

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 of the consequences of noncompliance. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Gregg-Wilson has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. See Page v. Lee, 337 F.3d 411, 416 n.3 (4th Cir. 2003).

With regard to the First Amendment claim, the district court entered a subsequent order granting summary judgment in favor of Defendants on the ground that Defendants' interest in ensuring the efficient operation of the vocational school outweighed

Gregg-Wilson's right to free speech. Because Gregg-Wilson did not challenge this finding in his informal brief filed in this court, he has waived appellate review of that issue. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief.").

For these reasons, we affirm. 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