IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-20533
Conference Calendar

STAN HUNT, of himself as an individual and on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

GARY JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, INSTITUTIONAL DIVISION; JANIE COCKRELL,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. H-01-CV-3443

February 19, 2003

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

PER CURIAM:[*]

Stan Hunt, Texas prisoner number 363715, has filed this interlocutory appeal to challenge the district court's denial of his motion for a preliminary injunction in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 case. Hunt first argues that the district court erred by declining to hold a hearing prior to denying his motion and by giving insufficient factual findings and legal conclusions in its order denying Hunt's motion. Hunt has not shown reversible error

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

in connection with either of these issues, as there is no dispute concerning the basic facts underlying the case, and the district court's order denying the motion is sufficient to permit us to review it. See Kaepa v. Achilles Corp., 76 F.3d 624, 628 (5th Cir. 1996); see also FED. R. CIV. P. 52(a).

Hunt also argues that the district court erred in relying on Hay v. Waldron, 834 F.2d 481, 484 (5th Cir. 1987), in its order denying his motion. Because this case gives the standard for analyzing whether a preliminary injunction should issue, the district court did not err in relying upon it. Finally, Hunt contends that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion because he has made a satisfactory showing as to all of the required factors. Hunt has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion, as he has not shown that he has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of his suit. See Lakedreams v. Taylor, 932 F.2d 1103, 1107 (5th Cir. 1991). The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.