

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 92-9588
Summary Calendar

DEETE MARIE BILLIOT,

Plaintiff,

VERSUS

NATIONAL TEA COMPANY,

Defendant-Appellee,

VERSUS

CRAIG J. HATTIER,

Movant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
CA 91 3133 A

April 16, 1993

Before KING, DAVIS and WIENER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:¹

Craig J. Hattier, former counsel for plaintiff, Deete Marie Billiot, filed this appeal from the district court's order of November 24, 1992, assessing sanctions against Mr. Hattier. The

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

sanctions were imposed after Mr. Hattier cancelled fourteen depositions on the morning of June 15, 1992, the day they were set to be taken. The district court concluded that expenses and attorney's fees incurred in connection with the preparation of these witnesses for their depositions justified sanctions in the amount of \$1,151.10.

Hattier jumped the gun by filing a notice of appeal after the district court ordered sanctions but before the district court determined the amount of those sanctions. In that appeal, we affirmed the sanctions order but did not consider the propriety of the amount. **Billiot v. National Tea Company**, No. 92-3694 (5th Cir. 1993)(unpublished). Hattier filed a second notice of appeal December 24, 1992.

The appellant, in his brief, presents a litany of objections to the district court's order. These objections are primarily leveled at routine orders of the district court extending time within which the defendant was permitted to file affidavits and other supporting documentation for sanctions as directed by the district court. We have carefully reviewed the record and find that the orders objected to were well within the discretion of the district court. Considering Mr. Hattier's performance during his representation of Ms. Billiot, we consider the district court's treatment of Mr. Hattier as remarkably patient. Because we find the sanction order reasonable and well within the district court's discretion, it's order is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.