

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1519

STEVEN EUGENE SHARPE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, a Trustee for Structured
Asset Investment Loan Trust Mortgage Pass Through Certificate series 2004-1;
WELLS FARGO HOME MORTGAGE; AMERICA'S SERVING COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (3:19-cv-03334-TLW)

Submitted: December 13, 2021

Decided: December 28, 2021

Before THACKER and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Orin G. Briggs, Lexington, South Carolina, for Appellant. M. Todd Carroll, WOMBLE
BOND DICKINSON (US) LLP, Columbia, South Carolina; John C. Hawk, IV, WOMBLE
BOND DICKINSON (US) LLP, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Steven Eugene Sharpe appeals the district court's order dismissing his complaint without prejudice. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Sharpe that failure to file timely, specific 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. *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 846-47 (4th Cir. 1985); see also *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 154-55 (1985). Sharpe stated that he had received the magistrate judge's recommendation, which included proper notice, and he filed a document that the district court construed as objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation. Because the objections were not specific to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge, however, Sharpe has waived appellate review of the district court's order. See *Martin*, 858 F.3d at 245 (holding that, "to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge's report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. 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