

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1602**

---

JAMES DAVID WHITE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KAREN STACHER, Doctor; EVAN VOGEL, Doctor;  
NELA LAUGHRIDGE; IVAN J. TONEY, Esquire; JAMES  
W. SEGURA, Esquire; KIM R. VARNER, Esquire;  
MIKE SANDERS; RUTH ANN EARL; JIM AIKEN, Police  
Officer No. 1; J. F. HAMLETT, Police Office  
No. 2; T. T. THOMPSON, Police Officer No. 3;  
M. S. HUNTINGTON, Police Officer No. 4,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District  
Judge. (6:05-cv-01737-GRA)

---

Submitted: September 28, 2006

Decided: October 4, 2006

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James David White, Appellant Pro Se. Kevin William Sturm,  
Spartanburg, South Carolina; Marshall Winn, WYCHE, BURGESS, FREEMAN  
& PARHAM, PA, Greenville, South Carolina; Charles Franklin Turner,  
Jr., TURNER, PADGET, GRAHAM & LANEY, PA, Greenville, South  
Carolina; Debra J. Gammons, CITY OF GREENVILLE, Greenville South  
Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James David White appeals the district court's order denying relief on 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 White that failure to file timely specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, White failed to file specific objections 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 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). White has waived appellate review by failing to timely file specific 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