IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

> No. 93-7247 Conference Calendar

KELVIN LEE WILLIS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

JAMES A. COLLINS, Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Institutional Division, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. CA-G-92-598 (November 1, 1993)

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, and SMITH and WIENER, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Kelvin Lee Willis, an inmate of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), Darrington Unit, appeals pro se the dismissal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), of his 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986 action against three TDCJ employees. We review the dismissal for abuse of discretion. <u>Denton v.</u> <u>Hernandez</u>, ____ U.S. ___, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 1733, 118 L.Ed.2d 340 (1992).

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Willis argues that the district court overlooked his allegations that his requested witness did not testify at the disciplinary hearing and that one witness made false statements at the hearing. These omissions in the process due Willis were corrected administratively by the overturned ruling through the grievance procedures. Willis has not stated facts giving rise to a due process violation. <u>See Denton</u>, 112 S.Ct. at 1733-34.

Willis argues that his alleged facts, taken as a whole, show that the defendants conspired to punish him for being a writ writer. The district court, however, concluded that the facts alleged by Willis "d[id] not raise any inference of retaliation." Our review indicates that the district court did not abuse its discretion in its conclusion. <u>See Denton</u>, 112 S.Ct. at 1734; <u>Whittington v. Lynaugh</u>, 842 F.2d 818, 819 (5th Cir.), <u>cert.</u> <u>denied</u>, 488 U.S. 840 (1988).

AFFIRMED.