

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-50761

Summary Calendar

Khidhr Sunna Muhammad, a/k/a/ Tommy Lee Powell

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

S.O. Wood,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Western District of Texas
(W-95-CA-168)

January 15, 1996

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DUHÉ, and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:*

Tommy Lee Powell, a Texas state prisoner, filed a complaint in the Western District of Texas under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging various violations of his constitutional rights. Powell used the name "Khidhr Sunnah Muhammad" in an apparant attempt to circumvent an order, entered by Judge Steger of the Eastern District of Texas in response to Powell's numerous previous lawsuits against various prison officials, prohibiting Powell from filing futher lawsuits without leave of the court. The

* Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

district court dismissed the case, noting that Western District Chief Judge Hudspeth had issued a general order requiring Western District judges to enforce sanctions imposed by other district courts against Texas prisoners unless the sanctioned prisoner establishes a change in circumstances or otherwise demonstrates that enforcing the previously imposed sanction would be unjust.

We affirm. Powell's brief to this court recites a factual scenario that we find impossible to credit, to the extent we are able to understand the allegations. Powell makes no attempt to establish a change of circumstances or substantial injustice; indeed, his complaint in this case appears to be based on facts identical to those in an earlier action that resulted in the sanction order. Powell makes no allegation that he has obtained any court's leave to file this complaint. See Green v. Carlson, 649 F.2d 285 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 454 U.S. 1087 (1981). For these reasons we affirm the district court's dismissal order. For similar reasons, we deny any motions made by Powell in conjunction with this appeal.