

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 93-3853
Summary Calendar

CHARLES JOSEPH, JR.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

CHARLES C. FOTI, JR., ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
(CA-93-1397-N c/w 93-2043, 93-2044, 93-3502)

(August 9, 1994)

Before DAVIS, JONES, and DUHÉ, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:¹

Charles Joseph, Jr., an inmate of the Orleans Parish Prison sued the Criminal Sheriff of Orleans Parish, and others, under 28 U.S.C. § 1983 complaining of the nutritional quality of the meals served in the parish prison, the general living conditions in the prison and related matters. In the course of working up the file, the magistrate judge learned that Appellant has been transferred to the Feliciana Forensic Facility having been adjudged in a state

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

court proceeding as incompetent to assist in his defense of the criminal charges pending against him. She recommended that the matter be stayed pending the Appellant's release from the forensic facility and adjudication of competence. The district court accepted the recommendation and ordered the proceedings stayed.

Appellant has filed a notice of appeal but has not complained to this Court of the stay. In fact, Appellant has filed a brief in this Court which is largely a copy of the argument made by him in the matter of Joseph v. Barthelemy, No. 94-30011 of the docket of this Court. Nowhere does he brief the only issue which could be appealed in this case, namely that the district court erred in staying the proceeding. Matters inadequately briefed are considered abandoned. Villanueva v. CNA Ins. Cos., 868 F.2d 684, 687 n.5 (5th Cir. 1989). Accordingly, this appeal is DISMISSED.