IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

> No. 99-30316 Summary Calendar

ZORAN MATIC,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

DORIS MEISSNER, Individually & in her official capacity; IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE; EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION REVIEW; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; NANCY HOOKS, Individually & in her official capacity; JANET RENO, Individually & in her official capacity,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana USDC No. 99-CV-74

September 2, 1999

Before DAVIS, EMILIO M. GARZA, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Zoran Matic filed suit in the district court challenging the initiation of removal proceedings against him and seeking injunctive and monetary relief. The district court dismissed the action with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Matic moves in this court for release pending his appeal of the district court's judgment. We lack jurisdiction to order Matic's release. <u>See</u> 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e). The motion is DENIED.

Matic argues that under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(f), the district court could, despite the jurisdiction-limiting provisions of § 1252(g), enjoin the removal proceeding.<sup>\*\*</sup> This argument is foreclosed by the Supreme Court's decision in <u>Reno v.</u> <u>American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee</u>, 119 S. Ct. 936, 945 (1999).

Matic's motion to expedite the appeal is DENIED. AFFIRMED.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*\*</sup> Matic does not argue that the district court erred in dismissing the portion of his compliant which seeks monetary or any relief other than injunctive relief. Thus, he has abandoned on appeal any issue other than the district court's jurisdiction to issue an injunction or otherwise restrain the operation of the removal proceedings. <u>See Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy</u> <u>Sheriff Abner</u>, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987) (appellate court need not consider issues abandoned on appeal); <u>Yohey v. Collins</u>, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993)(arguments not briefed on appeal are deemed abandoned).