

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-7060

LAWRENCE L. INGRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DOYET A. EARLY, III; J. CHRISTOPHER WILSON; WARDEN WILLIE
DAVIS; COURTNEY BENNETT; OFFICER ADKINSON; DEPARTMENT OF
PROBATION; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Orangeburg. Timothy M. Cain, Chief District Judge. (5:24-cv-06559-TMC)

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 28, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Ingram, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Ingram appeals the district court's order dismissing his amended 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 recommended that the action be dismissed and advised Ingram that failure to file timely and specific objections to this recommendation would 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). Although Ingram received proper notice and filed objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation, the objections were untimely and not specific to the particularized legal recommendations made by the magistrate judge, so appellate review is foreclosed. *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