

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7297**

---

TONY DELOACH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; BERNARD MCKIE;  
DAVID TARTARSKY; MS. HILL, IGC; JOHN AND JANE DOES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Florence. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior  
District Judge. (4:08-cv-03113-HMH)

---

Submitted: November 13, 2009

Decided: December 3, 2009

---

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tony DeLoach, Appellant Pro Se. Roy F. Laney, Heath McAlvin  
Stewart, III, RILEY, POPE & LANEY, LLC, Columbia, South  
Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tony DeLoach appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2006). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised DeLoach that failure to timely file specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, DeLoach failed to timely file specific objections to the magistrate judge's report and 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). DeLoach 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