

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6882

JOEVAUGHN LEON MEREDITH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MINDY HERVEY LIPINKSI, Head Public Defender; STATE OF SOUTH
CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, Chief District Judge. (6:25-cv-09189-TMC)

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 28, 2026

Before THACKER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.*

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joevaughn Leon Meredith, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

* This opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

Joevaughn Leon Meredith appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss, on 28 U.S.C. § 1915 review, Meredith's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. 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 Meredith's action be dismissed and advised Meredith 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 Meredith's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, he 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 Meredith received proper notice and filed timely objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, he 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 Meredith 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