

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 92-8367  
Conference Calendar

---

DAVID FANCHER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

J. BYRD, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. W-90-CV-335  
- - - - -

March 18, 1993

Before KING, HIGGINBOTHAM, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Fancher filed a pro se, in forma pauperis § 1983 complaint against several prison officials alleging that he was denied due process during the disciplinary proceedings because he did not receive an adequate written statement of the disciplinary board's decision and reasoning. The district court dismissed the complaint as frivolous.

The federal courts have a narrow role in the review of prison proceedings. Stewart v. Thiqpen, 730 F.2d 1002, 1005 (5th

---

\* 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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Cir. 1984). If a prisoner is provided with a procedurally adequate hearing prior to the imposition of disciplinary sanctions, there is no constitutional violation. Id. at 1005-06. When a prisoner is subject to the loss of good-time credits, procedural due process requires that the prisoner receive written notice of the charges at least 24 hours before the hearing; that he receive a written statement of the decision and evidence relied on by the disciplinary board; and that he be permitted to call witnesses and present documentary evidence if doing so would not present a hazard to institutional safety or correctional goals. Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 564-66, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 41 L.Ed.2d 935 (1974).

Fancher argues that the disciplinary board's written statements for each of his disciplinary actions are insufficient. The disciplinary board must provide a written statement of the decision and the evidence relied on. Wolff, 418 U.S. at 564-65. For each disciplinary proceeding the board provided Fancher with a written statement of its findings and the evidence relied on, and also explained the reason for the particular punishment imposed. The board complied with Wolff.

Fancher is warned that the filing of further frivolous appeals could result in the imposition of sanctions, including financial penalties and limiting his access to the judicial system. See Smith v. McCleod, 946 F.2d 417, 418 (5th Cir. 1991).

AFFIRMED.