

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 3, 2011

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 10-30873
Summary Calendar

STEVEN L. RUTHERFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARD ADMINISTRATION, Office of Worker
Compensation,

Defendant - Appellee

STEVEN L. RUTHERFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT; JIM LETTEN, Attorney, U.S.
Justice Department; THOMAS L. WATSON, Assistant U.S. Attorney Chief, Civil
Division,

Defendants - Appellees

STEVEN L. RUTHERFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, Branch of Hearing and Review,

Defendant - Appellee

No. 10-30873

STEVEN L. RUTHERFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

Defendant - Appellee

STEVEN L. RUTHERFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD,

Defendant - Appellee

STEVEN L. RUTHERFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE; UNITED STATES POSTAL
INSPECTION SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
USDC No. 2:09-CV-5436

No. 10-30873

Before DAVIS, SMITH and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Steven L. Rutherford has applied for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) in his appeal from the district court's dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction of his consolidated lawsuit relating to the denial of his Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA) claim. The district court also dismissed with prejudice Rutherford's related claims against two defendants based on qualified immunity. Rutherford has also filed in this court motions seeking "Injunction of Relief," a writ of habeas corpus, a "Writ of Release," a "Writ of Seizure," and expedited consideration of two of these motions.

To proceed IFP, Rutherford must show that he is a pauper and that the appeal is taken in good faith, *i.e.*, that he will raise a nonfrivolous issue on appeal. *See Carson v. Polley*, 689 F.2d 562, 586 (5th Cir. 1982).

Rutherford has not shown that he is financially eligible to proceed IFP in his appeal. *See Adkins v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339-40 (1948). His motion for leave to proceed IFP on appeal is denied.

Examination of the record, Rutherford's appellate brief, and his various motions and responses show that this appeal is frivolous. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. *See* 5th Cir. R. 42.2; *Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 n.24 (5th Cir. 1997). Rutherford's remaining motions are also denied.

ALL MOTIONS DENIED; APPEAL DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS.

* 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.