

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1744

RAMAN K. SINGH,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GARY HASS, a/k/a Gary Van Hass, a/k/a Gary Hollywood,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:09-cv-00386-HEH)

Submitted: March 28, 2011

Decided: May 5, 2011

Before MOTZ, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James E. Bowman, II, FERRISBOWMAN PLLC, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellant. Stacie C. Bordick, HIRSCHLER FLEISCHER, P.C., Fredericksburg, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gary Hass appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying his motion to dismiss the Appellee's complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2006 & Supp. 2010). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and the district court subsequently adopted that recommendation. However, the timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997) (forfeiture rule enforced where report fails to inform party of consequences of failure to object if party is represented by counsel). Hass has waived appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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.

AFFIRMED