

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1961

SAKIMA IBAN SALIH EL BEY, a/k/a Francis Marion
Savall,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ROBERT W. DAVIS, Trial Officer; TIM CECIL,
Police Officer; JEFF MEEKS, Police Officer;
MAYOR OF LANCASTER; GEORGE BUSH, President of
the United States of America; MARK SANFORD,
State of South Carolina Governor,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Sol Blatt, Jr., Senior District
Judge. (0:05-cv-03461-SB)

Submitted: December 21, 2006

Decided: December 28, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sakima Iban Salih El Bey, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sakima Iban Salih El Bey ("Appellant") appeals the district court's order denying relief in his pro se civil action alleging denial of various rights and privileges. 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 Appellant 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, Appellant failed to timely 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 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). Appellant 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 note that the district court considered the merits of Appellant's objections even though they were late. Even if Appellant's late objections did not waive appellate review, we agree with the court's conclusion that Appellant's objections were meritless and largely incoherent.

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