IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 92-2653 Conference Calendar

RODNEY LLOYD GRANVILLE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

DONNA DAVIS,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. CA H-92-2035

- - - - - - - - -

March 16, 1993

Before KING, HIGGINBOTHAM, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Appellant Rodney Granville, a Texas state prison inmate, has appealed the district court's dismissal without prejudice of his civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. We affirm.

In his complaint, Granville alleged that a female prison correctional officer, the sole defendant, has violated his constitutional rights by performing unreasonable pat-down searches of his person. The district court dismissed the action

^{*} Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

without prejudice on grounds that a similar action was pending in that court, its No. H-89-277, <u>Aranda v. Lynaugh</u>. The court stated that <u>Aranda</u> involves similar claims, that counsel has been appointed, and that class certification is under consideration. The court advised Granville that he may file a motion to intervene in Aranda.

Granville's appellate brief is devoted to arguing the merits of his Fourth Amendment claim. Although he mentions the district court's legal basis for the judgment, he does not discuss it in his brief. For that reason, this Court will not now consider it. Thompkins v. Belt, 828 F.2d 298, 302 (5th Cir. 1987). Since the correctness of the district court's reasons for judgment is the sole issue validly presented upon this appeal, the judgment must be affirmed.

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED.