

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-41279
Conference Calendar

CHARLES W. CALVERLY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

JESSIE CRAVEN; HUEL FONTENOT, Sheriff;
UNKNOWN DUVAL, Officer; UNKNOWN STEPHENSON,
Officer; EASTER ADAMS, Lieutenant,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 1:94-CV-528

- - - - -
December 9, 1998

Before DAVIS, DeMOSS, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Charles W. Calverly, Texas inmate # 630407, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (IFP), appeals the dismissal of his civil rights complaint. He argues that the defendants violated his constitutional rights by failing to protect him from injury inflicted by another prisoner. Calverly's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED.

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

We have reviewed the record and the briefs of the parties and find no reversible error in the magistrate judge's dismissal of Calverly's claim against Lieutenant Adams. See *Calverly v. Orange County Jail, et al.*, No. 1:94-CV-528 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 21, 1996).

Calverly has abandoned the claims he raised in the district court against Officers Duval and Stephenson and against inmate Craven by failing to argue error in the district court's reasons for dismissing his claims. See *Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987) (when appellant fails to identify any error in the district court's analysis, it is as if appellant had not appealed that judgment). Calverly has abandoned his housing claim and the claims that he raised against the Orange County Jail and Sheriff Fontenot by failing to raise them in this court. See *Brinkmann*, 813 F.2d at 748 (the court will not raise and discuss legal issues that the appellant has failed to assert).

Calverly's allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel are without merit. There is no Sixth Amendment right to effective representation in civil cases. See *Sanchez v. United States Postal Serv.*, 785 F.2d 1236, 1237 (5th Cir. 1986).

This appeal is without arguable merit and thus frivolous. It is DISMISSED. See *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983); 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

Calverly is warned that future frivolous appeals will invite the imposition of sanctions. Calverly should review any pending appeals to ensure that they do not raise frivolous arguments.

No. 96-41279

-3-

APPEAL DISMISSED; SANCTION WARNING ISSUED; MOTION DENIED.