

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

No. 13-51066

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 11, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JOSHUA ADAM CONLAN,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; JUDGE ANDREW AUSTIN; ELIZABETH
COTTINGHAM; DANIEL CASTILLO; RICHARD DURBIN; JOSEPH H. GAY, JR.,

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 1:13-CV-641

Before DAVIS, CLEMENT, and COSTA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Joshua Adam Conlan, federal prisoner # 81084-280, seeks authorization to appeal in forma pauperis (IFP) from the dismissal of his civil action. Conlan sued several defendants and asserted various improper actions arising from his arrest, detention, and federal prosecution for interstate stalking. The district court denied Conlan leave to appeal IFP and certified that the appeal was not in good faith. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 24(a).

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 13-51066

By moving in this court to appeal IFP, Conlan challenges the district court's certification that his appeal is not taken in good faith. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997). His IFP request "must be directed solely to the trial court's reasons for the certification decision," *id.*, and our inquiry "is limited to whether the appeal involves 'legal points arguable on their merits (and therefore not frivolous).'" *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983) (citation omitted). We may dismiss the appeal "when it is apparent that an appeal would be meritless." *Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 & n.24; *see* 5TH CIR. RULE 42.2.

Conlan says in a single curt and conclusional paragraph that he thinks the district court's ruling was wrong. The rest of his application concerns only his financial condition. Conlan's bare assertions do not identify any nonfrivolous issue for appeal. *See Beavers v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 566 F.3d 436, 439 (5th Cir. 2009) (concerning dismissal for failure to state a claim). The motion for leave to appeal IFP is DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 & n.24; 5TH CIR. RULE 42.2