

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 01-50219  
Summary Calendar

---

GILBERTO VALADEZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

EL PASO COUNTY; ET AL.,

Defendants,

EL PASO COUNTY; LEO SAMANIEGO,  
Sheriff, Individually and in  
His Official Capacity,

Defendants-Appellees.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. EP-00-CV-203-H  
-----

September 21, 2001

Before JONES, SMITH, and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Gilberto Valadez appeals the district court's grant of the defendants' motions for summary judgment and judgment on the pleadings. Valadez argues that the district court should not have granted summary judgment to the County and Sheriff Samaniego in his official capacity because the alleged illegal entry and search of his home was conducted pursuant to Samaniego's tacit

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

policy of ratification. He relies on Sharp v. City of Houston, 164 F.3d 923 (5th Cir. 1999) for this proposition. Valadez presents no argument on the other issues that were addressed in the district court's order granting the defendants' motions. Accordingly, these issues are abandoned. See Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993).

Valadez's reliance on Sharp is misplaced. Unlike Sharp, Valadez has not shown that the conduct of which he complains was so widespread that Samaniego and the County should have, in the exercise of reasonable care, known of and remedied it. Rather, Valadez has presented evidence of only a single, isolated incident of wrongdoing that was not undertaken in accordance with official policy. This is insufficient to establish liability on the part of the appellees. See Oklahoma City v. Tuttle, 471 U.S. 808, 823 (1985)(plurality opinion). Valadez has not shown that the district court erred in granting the defendants' motion for summary judgment. See Topalian v. Ehrman, 954 F.2d 1125, 1131 (5th Cir. 1992). Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.