UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 92-3176
Summary Calendar

JAMMIE SHELTON, et al,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

VERSUS

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, et al,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
(CA 90 2412 I)

(January 27, 1993)

Before JOLLY, DUHÉ, and BARKSDALE, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:[1]

Appellant Jammie Shelton sued the City of New Orleans, its Police Department, and certain police officers under § 1983 and related federal statutes, and under state tort law, contending that during an altercation between her minor son and the officers he was injured and the constitutional rights of both were violated. A jury returned a verdict for all Defendants on all claims and Plaintiff appeals. We find no error and affirm.

---

[1] 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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Appellant first complains that the court erred by denying Plaintiff's challenges for cause of two jurors who were related to persons in law enforcement, and one juror who had, in years past, been employed in law enforcement and as a juvenile officer. We review for abuse of discretion[2] and find none here. The record clearly establishes that the challenged jurors who did serve could fairly serve. They were directly questioned about the effect, if any, that their connection with law enforcement would have on their impartiality and their answers show that they were not biased. Denial of challenges for cause was not an abuse of discretion. Appellant's reliance on Darbin v. Nourse, 664 F.2d 1109 (9th Cir. 1981) is misplaced. In that case the district court did not inquire into the juror's bias; in this case it did.

Next Appellant complains of the defense attorney's closing remarks about drugs since, she alleges, drugs were not an issue in this case. Appellant overlooks the fact that the officers' reason for stopping her son was suspicion of drug activity. The remarks were not improper.

Appellant also complains of defense counsel's reference in argument to the potential financial liability of the individual officers if a damage award was made. There was no contemporaneous objection to the remarks so we examine only for plain error.[3] In rebuttal Appellant's counsel made a counter argument and, when

---

[2] United States v. Gordon, 812 F.2d 965 (5th Cir. 1987).

[3] United States v. Lopez, 923 F.2d 47, 49 (5th Cir. 1991); see, Edwards v. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 512 F.2d 276, 286 (5th Cir. 1975).

viewing the closings in their entirety, we are unable to find any error, much less plain error.

Appellant's final complaint is that the evidence does not support the verdict. We disagree. No appropriate motions were filed at the close of the evidence. Therefore, we review only to see if any evidence supports the verdict. See Stewart v. Thigpen, 730 F.2d 1002, 1007 (5th Cir. 1984); Bartholomew v. CNG Producing Co., 832 F.2d 326, 329 (5th Cir. 1987). Our review of the record shows ample evidence to support the verdict.

AFFIRMED.