

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

No. 13-20275
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 13, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

FELICIA N. JONES,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,

Defendant-Appellee

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:12-MC-634

Before DAVIS, SOUTHWICK, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Felicia N. Jones, who is subject to a preclusion order in the Southern District of Texas, has filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) to appeal the district court's order denying her motion seeking "reconsideration" of the court's order denying her motion for leave to file a complaint and to appeal the district court's subsequent order striking additional motions. Because Jones has failed to present any coherent challenge to the district

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 13-20275

court's orders, she has "effectively abandoned" those claims. *Mapes v. Bishop*, 541 F.3d 582, 584 (5th Cir. 2008). Jones has not shown that her appeal "involves 'legal points arguable on their merits (and therefore not frivolous).'" *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983) (citations omitted). Jones's motion to proceed IFP is denied. Because the appeal is frivolous, it is dismissed. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

This court has issued two prior sanction warnings to Jones, warning her that any future frivolous pleadings filed by her in this court or in any court subject to the jurisdiction of this court would subject her to sanctions and instructing Jones to review any pending matters to ensure that they are not frivolous. *See Jones v. Greenway Mercedes*, 534 F. App'x 244 (5th Cir. 2013); *Jones v. Vouitton*, No. 12-20562, 2013 WL 5916782, at *1 (5th Cir. May 28, 2013) (unpublished). In the light of Jones's failure to heed our previous warnings, we conclude that sanctions are appropriate. Jones is ordered to pay \$100 to the clerk of this court. Until this sanction is paid in full, Jones is barred from filing, in this court or any court subject to this court's jurisdiction, any pleading without first seeking and obtaining leave of the forum court. Jones is warned that future frivolous filings will invite the imposition of progressively more severe sanctions, which may include dismissal, monetary sanctions, and restrictions on her ability to file pleadings in this court and any court subject to this court's jurisdiction. Jones should review any pending matters and move to dismiss any that are frivolous.

APPEAL DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS; MOTION DENIED;
SANCTION IMPOSED; SANCTION WARNING ISSUED.