UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7106

CURTIS RENA HILL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR JON OZMINT, South Carolina Department of Corrections; WARDEN ROBERT STEVENSON, Broad River Correctional Institution; KAREN Y. MCCULLOGH, LPN; MARIE A. SHERMAN, LPN; DONALD R. SAMPSON, Physician II,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:09-cv-00800-HMH)

Submitted: September 30, 2010 Decided: October 12, 2010

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Curtis Rena Hill, Appellant Pro Se. Janet Brooks Holmes, Daniel Roy Settana, Jr., MCKAY, CAUTHEN, SETTANA & STUBLEY, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Rena Hill 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.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2010). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Hill that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the 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). Hill has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

We deny Hill's motion for transcripts at government expense and 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