## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

\_\_\_\_

No. 00-50416 Conference Calendar

JAMES EDWARD WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

WAYNE SCOTT, Executive Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Institutional Division; UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL MANAGED HEALTH CARE; JOHN/JANE DOE,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. W-00-CV-61

-----

October 18, 2000

Before SMITH, BARKSDALE, and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

James Edward Williams, Texas prisoner number 739898, has filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) on appeal following the district court's dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit for lack of standing. By moving for IFP status, Williams is challenging the district court's certification that IFP status should not be granted on appeal because his appeal is

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

frivolous and is not taken in good faith. <u>See Baugh v. Taylor</u>, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997).

Williams has not shown that he has standing to bring this action and thus has not shown that he will raise a nonfrivolous issue on appeal. Accordingly, the district court's order certifying that the appeal is frivolous is upheld. Williams' request for IFP status is DENIED, and his appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous. See Baugh, 117 F.3d at 202 & n.24; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2

The dismissal of this appeal as frivolous counts as a "strike" for purposes of § 1915(g). See Adepegba v. Hammons, 103 F.3d 383, 385-87 (5th Cir. 1996). Williams is warned that if he accumulates three "strikes" pursuant to § 1915(g), he may not be able to proceed IFP 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).

IFP DENIED; APPEAL DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS; SANCTIONS WARNING ISSUED.