## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

\_\_\_\_\_

No. 96-31021 Summary Calendar

FELIX ORIAKHI,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

PARSONS ET AL.,

Defendants,

HUVAL INSURANCE CO.,

Defendants-Appellees.

## Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana (94-CV-1595)

\_\_\_\_\_\_

## August 25, 1997

Before WIENER, BARKSDALE, and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Felix Oriakhi, federal inmate #51338-079, challenges the summary judgment awarded the defendants. He contends that genuine issues of material fact exist as to the following: (1) the quality of the information in the affidavit supporting the warrant seizing

<sup>\*</sup>Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

the \$3,104; (2) the adequacy of the forfeiture notice given by the DEA; (3) the apparent discrepancy between the time of issuance of the money order and the issuance of the seizure warrant; (4) his demand of the return of his deposit from Huval prior to the DEA's notice to Huval of the impending forfeiture of that money; and (5) Huval's failure to notify Oriakhi of the impending seizure.

Pursuant to our *de novo* review of appellate record, and for essentially the reasons relied upon by the district court, through the adoption of the magistrate judge's reports, *see Oriakhi v. Parsons*, No. 94-1595 (W.D. La. Sept. 17, 1996 & Sept. 27, 1995), we conclude that the defendants were entitled to summary judgment.

**AFFIRMED**