

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 00-21079  
Conference Calendar

---

DENNIS A. NASH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

PAUL F. MILLS, Doctor; NAIK, Doctor; L. ASCHBERGER,  
Physician Assistant; LE, Doctor; HIRSCH, Lieutenant;  
JAMES DANE, Doctor,

Defendants-Appellees.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. H-99-CV-1437  
-----

December 11, 2001

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, BARKSDALE, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Dennis A. Nash appeals the dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against the above-named defendants as frivolous and for failure to state a claim, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) & (ii).

Although Nash identifies seven points of error, the only issue he briefs is whether the district court abused its discretion in dismissing his deliberate indifference claims. Accordingly, because Nash does not brief his remaining issues, or

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

address his claim of excessive force, those issues are deemed abandoned. See Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993).

We have reviewed the record and briefs submitted by the parties and hold that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Nash's deliberate indifference claims. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976); Berry v. Brady, 192 F.3d 504, 507 (5th Cir. 1999); Varnado v. Lynaugh, 920 F.2d 320, 321 (5th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.

Nash has filed motions for the appointment of counsel, for an emergency temporary restraining order, and for an injunction pending appeal. All motions are DENIED.