IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 95-31018
Conference Calendar
_____

WARREN S. MURPHY,

                                        Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

CHARLES C. FOTI, JR., Sheriff;
K. WINFIELD, Lieutenant;
GARY BORDELON, Chief,

                                        Defendants-Appellees.

                      - - - - - - - - - -
            Appeal from the United States District Court
                for the Eastern District of Louisiana
                     USDC No. CA-94-1776-J-5
                      - - - - - - - - - -
                        April 19, 1996
Before DUHÉ, DeMOSS, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:[*]

     Warren Murphy's motion for leave to proceed *in forma
pauperis* (IFP) is DENIED as unnecessary. *See* FED. R. APP. P.
24(a).

     Murphy contends that his disciplinary hearing did not comply
with the Due Process Clause and that his confinement in
administrative segregation also violated the Due Process Clause.

     Murphy has not provided us with a copy of the trial
transcript, nor has he requested a copy at government expense.
We therefore cannot review the district court's factual findings.

Alizadeh v. Safeway Stores, Inc., 910 F.2d 234, 237 (5th Cir. 1990).

Regarding his argument that his disciplinary proceedings were deficient, Murphy does not elaborate on his contention beyond merely stating it. He has failed to brief the issue for appeal and has abandoned it. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Murphy's placement in administrative segregation and the conditions of administrative segregation were legitimately related to the interest of prison officials in preventing escape. *See Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 538-39 (1979). Murphy's stay in administrative segregation did not violate the Due Process Clause.

Murphy's appeal is frivolous. We caution Murphy that any additional frivolous appeals filed by him or on his behalf will invite the imposition of sanctions. To avoid sanctions, Murphy is further cautioned to review any pending appeals to ensure that they do not raise arguments that are frivolous because they have been previously decided by this court.

APPEAL DISMISSED. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. SANCTION WARNING ISSUED.