

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 26-6056**

---

MARSHALL LEON WATKINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION DENTAL OFFICE;  
DENTIST,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (0:25-cv-10369-MGL)

---

Submitted: May 28, 2026

Decided: June 2, 2026

---

Before WYNN, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marshall Leon Watkins, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marshall Leon Watkins appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 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 and advised Watkins 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). Watkins has forfeited appellate review by failing to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice. 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*