

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7283**

---

WILLIAM T. COLEMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

YORK COUNTY 16 CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COURT; JUDGE JOHN C. HAYES,  
III, Judge Code 2049,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District  
Judge. (0:12-cv-01967-JFA)

---

Submitted: December 27, 2013

Decided: January 16, 2014

---

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William T. Coleman, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William T. Coleman 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) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Coleman 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). Coleman has waived appellate review as to his claim against the York County court by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. We conclude, however, that Coleman's objections adequately preserved his claim against Judge Hayes, but that the claim fails because the judge is immune from suit. See Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978).

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 this Court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED