

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2368

CENTAURI SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEANNE E. OWENS, Guardian ad Litem Defendant for Mary Cotton Owens,
Deceased,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (2:24-cv-00559-DCN)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Leanne E. Owens, Appellant Pro Se. Michael D. Freeman, Sr., GRIFFITH, FREEMAN &
LIIPFERT, LLC, Beaufort, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Leanne E. Owens seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant Centauri Specialty Insurance Company's motion for summary judgment and dismiss the civil action. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge advised Owens 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). Owens has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. Owens also filed a motion for exemption from electronic filing fees. We deny that motion and dismiss the appeal.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED