

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-30389
Summary Calendar

ANTHONY A. EDWARDS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

R.L. PROSPER, Corrections Officer (FDC Oakdale);
SENEGAL, Unit Disciplinary Team (FDC Oakdale);
KOSCO, Member Unit Disciplinary Team (FDC Oakdale);
HAM, District Hearing Officer (FDC Oakdale);
R.D. MILES, Warden FDC Oakdale; JANET RENO,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 98-CV-928

January 17, 2000

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DeMOSS, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Anthony A. Edwards (#26325) appeals the district court's dismissal of his complaint filed pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388, 389 (1971). Edwards' motion for leave to file a supplemental brief is GRANTED.

Edwards has not shown that the district court abused its discretion by denying his motion for recusal. See *Liteky v.*

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994)(judicial rulings alone do not constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion).

Edwards has not challenged sufficiently the district court's reasons for dismissing his due process claims. See *Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987)(when appellant fails to identify error in district court's analysis, it is the same as if appellant had not appealed judgment). Edwards also has abandoned his conspiracy, alienage discrimination, involuntary servitude, and supervisory liability claims by failing to assert them properly and by failing to challenge the district court's reasons for dismissing them.

Edwards has not shown the type of injury required to allege a denial of access claim. See *Lewis v. Casey*, 116 S. Ct. 2174, 2179-80 (1996). Edwards has not made the required showing to sustain a retaliation claim that "but for the retaliatory motive the complained of incident . . . would not have occurred." *Woods v. Smith*, 60 F.3d 1161, 1166 (5th Cir. 1995).

Edwards has not shown that the district court erred in dismissing his complaint. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment on alternate grounds.

MOTION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF GRANTED; DISMISSAL AFFIRMED.