

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2382

TONYA LOMAX,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WALGREEN'S CORPORATE SECRETARY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Anderson. Timothy M. Cain, Chief District Judge. (8:25-cv-04796-TMC)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tonya Lomax, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tonya Lomax appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss, on 28 U.S.C. § 1915 review, Lomax's discrimination and retaliation claims, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 to 634. 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 Lomax's action be dismissed and advised Lomax that failure to file specific objections to the recommendation would waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Lomax's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, she has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief.").

Moreover, 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). Although Lomax received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, she has waived appellate review because the objections were not specific to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge. *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)). This further supports the conclusion that Lomax has waived appellate review of the appealed order.

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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED