

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-7766

JASON HUGH DENALT HUNT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

COLIE RUSHTON; CHARLES M. CONDON, Attorney
General of the State of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Patrick Michael Duffy, District
Judge. (CA-00-3375-3-23)

Submitted: February 13, 2002

Decided: April 23, 2002

Before WIDENER, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jason Hugh Denalt Hunt, Appellant Pro Se. Derrick K. McFarland,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jason Hugh Denalt Hunt seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his petition filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (West 1994 & Supp. 2001). Hunt'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 Hunt 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 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); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Further, a litigant may forfeit the right to de novo review if he fails to file timely objections, if the objections are to strictly legal issues and no factual issues are challenged, or if the objections are general or conclusory and do not relate to a specific error in the report and recommendation. Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

In his objections to the magistrate judge's report, Hunt addressed eight areas of disagreement with the findings and recommendation of the magistrate judge. However, we concur with the district court's determination that only two may be considered objections for review purposes. Of these remaining two objections,

we have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error.

Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. Hunt v. Rushton, No. CA-00-3375-3-23 (D.S.C. Sept. 26, 2001). 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