

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 93-1520
Conference Calendar

BUFFORD McDONALD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

JIMMY DON BOYDSTON, Sheriff,
Potter County, Texas, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 2:91-CV-0008
- - - - -
(March 22, 1994)

Before KING, DAVIS, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Bufford McDonald, a Texas state prison inmate, has appealed the dismissal of his civil rights action against Sheriff Jimmy Don Boydston of Potter County, Texas, and the Commissioners of the Potter County Commissioners Court. McDonald alleged numerous claims concerning conditions in the Potter County Correctional Center and how he was treated when he was confined there during 1990 and 1991. The district court dismissed most of McDonald's

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

claims and granted summary judgment to the appellees relative to his First Amendment claims.

McDonald asserts in his brief that the district court abused its discretion by dismissing his action rather than allowing him a jury trial. He argues that the district court did this "so as to save face with the local state government." Being unsupported by anything in the record, this argument is frivolous. McDonald presents no other argument or citation to legal authority, although he refers this Court to two lists of legal authorities which he filed in the district court. These lists state only general legal propositions without adverting to the specific factual allegations of McDonald's complaints.

Relevant issues on appeal would be (1) as to most of McDonald's claims, whether they failed to allege constitutional violations as the district court held; (2) whether McDonald's response to the district court's order relative to appellees' defense of qualified immunity from other claims was insufficient, justifying dismissal of those claims; (3) whether the district court erred by granting summary judgment dismissing McDonald's First Amendment claims; and (4) whether McDonald is entitled to monetary damages as to any of his claims. Because McDonald has not briefed any of the relevant issues, this Court will affirm the district court's judgment without determining the merits of the appeal. See Weaver v. Puckett, 896 F.2d 126, 128 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 966 (1990); Thompkins v. Belt, 828 F.2d 298, 302 (5th Cir. 1987).

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED.