

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7571**

---

CHRISTOPHER A. ODOM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DUNLAP, Associate Warden; MINGO, Sergeant; LIS  
ANDRELLI, Sergeant; J. BROWN, DHO; WARDEN  
FAULKENBERRY, Kershaw Correctional  
Institution; IGC HARDIN, SCDC Medical;  
LIEUTENANT HARTWELL; CAPTAIN HUDSON; MR.  
ARMSTRONG, Counsel; SERGEANT BARNES; SERGEANT  
BOWERS; SERGEANT CALLOWAY; OFFICER COLLINS;  
DORIS ANN COOKE; LIEUTENANT DUBOIS; LIEUTENANT  
DURANT; OFFICER GORDON; MRS. HASTING; MAJOR  
NEISMITH; SHARON PATTERSON; MR. SANDERS;  
SERGEANT SAPP; LIEUTENANT SMITH; SERGEANT  
THOMPSON; USDA; LIEUTENANT WALTZ; MRS. WEST;  
D. WHITFORD; MICHELLE USHER, Nurse; SOUTH  
CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS MEDICAL  
FACILITY; CAPTAIN SEWARD; OFFICER TAYLOR;  
OFFICER PLOW; MRS. HENSON; SERGEANT CATOE;  
SERGEANT ROLLINS; JON OZMINT, Director;  
KERSHAW CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, Medical  
Staff; OFFICER RAY; OFFICER EDEN; SERGEANT  
MURRAY; SAMANTHA GARDNER; OFFICER DAILEY;  
OFFICER DAVIS; LIEUTENANT RICHARDSON; MR.  
STEVENS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Patrick Michael Duffy, District Judge. (3:05-cv-01611-PMD)

---

Submitted: December 21, 2006

Decided: January 5, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher A. Odom, Appellant Pro Se. Ruskin C. Foster, Charles Jonathan Bridgmon, MCCUTCHEN, BLANTON, JOHNSON & BARNETTE, LLP, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher A. Odom appeals the district court's order accepting the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint without prejudice. 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 Odom 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, Odom 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 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). Odom 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