IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

No. 06-41109 Conference Calendar October 24, 2007

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

TOMMY FARL HARRELL

Plaintiff-Appellant

V.

D MOONEYHAM; N WEBB; KELLI WARD

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas USDC No. 6:06-CV-211

Before JOLLY, BENAVIDES, and STEWART, Circuit Judges. PFR CURIAM:*

Tommy Earl Harrell, Texas prisoner # 1017089, appeals from the district court's dismissal with prejudice of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuit as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Harrell argues that the district court erred in determining that he did not allege the deprivation of a protected liberty interest. The district court properly held that Harrell's lawsuit was barred because he had not shown that his disciplinary conviction

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

had been expunged or reversed. See Edwards v. Balisok, 520 U.S. 641, 648 (1997); Clarke v. Stalder, 154 F.3d 186, 189-91 (5th Cir. 1998) (en banc).

Harrell's appeal lacks arguable merit and therefore is dismissed as frivolous. See 5TH CIR. R. 42.2; Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983). The district court's dismissal of the § 1983 lawsuit and our dismissal of this appeal count as two strikes for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). See Adepegba v. Hammons, 103 F.3d 383, 388 (5th Cir. 1996). Harrell is cautioned that if he accumulates three strikes under § 1915(g), he will not be able to proceed in forma pauperis in any civil action or appeal filed while he is incarcerated or detained in any facility unless he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. See § 1915(g).

APPEAL DISMISSED; SANCTION WARNING ISSUED.