

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-6149**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

OBAR MAJETTE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr., District Judge. (CR-92-283-G, CA-97-169-2)

---

Submitted: July 2, 1998

Decided: July 22, 1998

---

Before NIEMEYER and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges, and HALL, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Obar Majette, Appellant Pro Se. Scott Patrick Mebane, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order denying his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West 1994 & Supp. 1998). Appellant's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Appellant that the failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Appellant failed to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

The timely filing of 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 that failure to object will waive appellate review. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 93-94 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Appellant has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. We accordingly deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. 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.

DISMISSED