

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 3, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 18-31077
Summary Calendar

SHANTA G. PHILLIPS-BERRY,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

PATRICIA BLACKWELL SCURLOCK, Et Al.; JOSEPH ALBE, Attorney;
ROBERT LENTER, Attorney; THADDEUS L. TEAFORD, Doctor;
MAHMOUD M. SARMINI, Doctor; U.S. MILITARY; OCHSNER
HEALTHCARE SYSTEM, Et Al.; EAST JEFFERSON HEALTHCARE
SYSTEM, Et Al.; FACEBOOK; UBER; LYFT, L.L.C.; HOLLYWOOD
PRODUCTIONS; GULF COAST BANK & TRUST COMPANY; UNCLE BOB'S
STORAGE; ENTERPRISE LEASING COMPANY; OFFICE OF MOTOR
VEHICLE LOUISIANA; SOCIAL SECURITY OFFICE LOUISIANA;
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES LOUISIANA; HOUSING
AUTHORITY LOUISIANA; DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LOUISIANA; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF THE STATE OF
LOUISIANA,

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
USDC No. 2:18-CV-7738

Before OWEN, WILLETT, and OLDHAM, Circuit Judges.

No. 18-31077

PER CURIAM:*

Shanta G. Phillips-Berry moves to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) in her appeal of the dismissal of her pro se complaint, in which she alleged that the defendants conspired to violate her civil rights by implanting her body with a monitoring device. The district court dismissed her complaint as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), denied leave to proceed IFP, and certified that the appeal was not taken in good faith.

A movant for leave to proceed IFP on appeal must show that she is a pauper and that the appeal is taken in good faith, i.e., the appeal presents nonfrivolous issues. *See Carson v. Polley*, 689 F.2d 562, 586 (5th Cir. 1982). Although Phillips-Berry has filed an affidavit of poverty that indicates that she qualifies for IFP status, her allegations are frivolous. *See Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992). Accordingly, her motion is denied, and her appeal is dismissed as frivolous. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 & n.24 (5th Cir. 1997); 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. The claims made by Phillips-Berry are repetitive of other claims she has raised, and we have affirmed the dismissal of those claims as frivolous. *See Phillips-Berry v. Louisiana State, et al.*, No. 18-31068 (5th Cir. Apr. 18, 2019); *Phillips-Berry v. Kenner Police Dep't et al.*, No. 18-31067 (5th Cir. Jan. 22, 2019); *Phillips-Berry v. Trump, et al.*, No. 18-31073 (5th Cir. Mar. 15, 2019). Phillips-Berry is cautioned that any future, frivolous filings by her in this court or any court subject to the jurisdiction of this court will invite the imposition of sanctions.

MOTION DENIED; APPEAL DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS;
SANCTION WARNING IMPOSED.

* 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.