

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-7059**

---

BETTY J. CHAMBERLAIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District  
Judge. (2:07-cv-00276-RAJ-JEB)

---

Submitted: September 16, 2008                      Decided: September 24, 2008

---

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Betty J. Chamberlain, Appellant Pro Se. Donald Eldridge Jeffrey,  
III, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Betty J. Chamberlain seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. 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 Chamberlain 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, Chamberlain 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). Chamberlain has waived appellate review by failing to timely file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal.

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.

DISMISSED