

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

November 1, 2011

No. 11-60194
Summary Calendar

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JOHN H. SLEDGE,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

MARSHALL COUNTY SHERIFF DEPARTMENT,

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Mississippi, Oxford
USDC No. 3:10-CV-12

Before KING, JOLLY, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Sledge filed a complaint against the Marshall County Sheriff's Department under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that the defendant discriminated against him because of his race when it ignored his complaints regarding trespassers and unlawful hunting on his property. The defendant filed a motion to compel Sledge to respond to discovery and appear for his deposition. The magistrate

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 11-60194

judge granted the motion, and warned Sledge that his complaint could be dismissed if he continued to refuse to participate in discovery.

Despite that warning, Sledge continued to refuse to appear for his deposition or to respond to the defendant's interrogatories. The magistrate judge concluded that Sledge's refusal to cooperate in discovery, his lack of response to the defendant, and his failure to abide by the court's rules, orders, and procedures established a clear record of willful non-compliance and failure to prosecute his case. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissed Sledge's complaint.

Sledge filed two motions for reconsideration and a motion for relief from judgment. In its order denying those motions, the district court stated that, after nearly a year of attempting to encourage Sledge to participate in discovery, it had dismissed the complaint because of Sledge's blatant disregard for the court's orders and bold refusal to cooperate with discovery. The district court observed that Sledge's arguments were illogical and could not be reconciled with one another.

Sledge's *pro se* brief on appeal is largely incomprehensible, and fails to establish any basis for reversal. Based on our review of the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Sledge's complaint for noncompliance with court orders regarding discovery. The judgment of the district court is

AFFIRMED.