

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1210

OZIE M. WARE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RODNEY PRUITT; J. E. PATSOURAKOS, Officer,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JUDGE A W FLYNN; OFFICER GRIFFIN,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Aiken. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge.
(1:09-cv-02360-MBS)

Submitted: July 28, 2011

Decided: August 1, 2011

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ozie M. Ware, Appellant Pro Se. Evan Markus Gessner, LIDE &
PAULEY, LLC, Lexington, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ozie M. Ware appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant Defendants' summary judgment motion on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action against them. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in Ware's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Ware's informal brief does not challenge the district court's dispositive holdings, Ware has forfeited appellate review of the district court's order. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment.* See Ware v. Pruitt, No. 1:09-cv-02360-MBS (D.S.C. Feb. 22, 2011). 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

* Because the timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of a district court order adopting that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance, see Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985), Ware also waived appellate review over the district court's order by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice.