

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 94-50796  
Conference Calendar

---

RONALD DUNBAR,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

KEITH MEREDITH, County  
Attorney at Freestone County,  
Courthouse, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. W-94-CV-300  
- - - - -

March 21, 1995

Before GARWOOD, BARKSDALE, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

This case is here on a motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. This court may authorize Dunbar to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal if he is unable to pay the costs of the appeal and the appeal is taken in good faith, i.e., the appeal presents nonfrivolous issues. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a); Holmes v. Hardy, 852 F.2d 151, 153 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 931 (1988).

---

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Ronald Dunbar, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis (IFP), filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Robert W. Gage and Keith Meredith, County Attorneys for Freestone County, Texas, who represented the County in two state habeas actions filed by Dunbar, alleging that they abused their authority under state law by failing to present his habeas claims to the state court for a determination on the merits, and for not informing him of the disposition of his writ of habeas corpus. The district court dismissed his complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d).

Dunbar lists several issues in his appellate brief; however, he does not brief any issues or make any argument as to why the district court erred in dismissing his complaint as frivolous. Dunbar does not address the merits of the district court's opinion. This court will not raise and discuss legal issues that the appellant has failed to assert. Claims not pressed on appeal are considered abandoned. A recitation of case law citations without identification of any error in the district court's analysis or application to the facts of the case is the same as if the appellant had not appealed that judgment. Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Dunbar's appeal does not present any nonfrivolous issues. Dunbar's motion for IFP is DENIED and his appeal is DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS. See Clark v. Williams, 693 F.2d 381, 382 (5th Cir. 1982) (the court may dispose of the appeal on the merits on a motion for IFP); Fifth Cir. R. 42.2. Dunbar is warned that

filing further frivolous appeals in this court will result in the imposition of sanctions.