

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7257**

---

RAYMOND EDWARD CHESTNUT, a/k/a Snoop, a/k/a Ray,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

K. SINGLETON, Officer, individual capacity,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (1:13-cv-02250-RBH)

---

Submitted: March 17, 2016

Decided: March 21, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Raymond Edward Chestnut, Appellant Pro Se. Marshall Prince, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Edward Chestnut appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his complaint filed pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and denying his motion to alter or amend the judgment. 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 Chestnut 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). Chestnut has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice.\* Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

---

\* Although Chestnut contends that he timely filed objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, no such objections were docketed, and Chestnut failed to substantiate his claims.

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