

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6689

JESSE M. JAMES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SHERIFF BARRY FAILE; MRS. DEBORAH HORNE,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

LANCASTER COUNTY DETENTION CENTER, in Lancaster, SC,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Aiken. David C. Norton, District Judge.
(1:13-cv-00211-DCN)

Submitted: January 26, 2016

Decided: February 8, 2016

Before WILKINSON and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jesse M. James, Appellant Pro Se. David Allan DeMasters,
DAVIDSON & LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jesse M. James appeals the magistrate judge's orders denying the appointment of counsel, the district court's order granting his motion for an extension of time to file objections but warning that no further extensions would be granted, and the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. We affirm.

With regard to the nondispositive orders James challenges on appeal, we have reviewed the record and find no abuse of discretion. See Carefirst of Md., Inc. v. Carefirst Pregnancy Ctrs., Inc., 334 F.3d 390, 396 (4th Cir. 2003) (reviewing order denying an extension); Miller v. Simmons, 814 F.2d 962, 966 (4th Cir. 1987) (reviewing order denying appointment of counsel). Turning to the dismissal order, 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 James 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). James has waived appellate review of the district court's dismissal order by failing to file objections.

Accordingly, we affirm. We deny James' motion for a breakdown of security logs. 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