

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2435

YU HIN CHAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RE/MAX; KEVIN C. MCCLANAHAN; KAREN MAY BACDAYAN;
SHANTONU BASU; CARMEN A. PACHECO; DAWN HILL-KEARSE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Charleston. Bruce H. Hendricks, District Judge. (2:25-cv-10356-BHH)

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 27, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yu Hin Chan, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yu Hin Chan seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss his complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the complaint because Chan failed to allege sufficient facts to state a claim. The magistrate judge advised Chan that failure to file timely, specific objections to the 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). Chan has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we 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