

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

November 28, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 21-20514
Summary Calendar

WILLIAM HENRY KRIEG,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

DONALD AVANT; MARK THURSTON; JOHN FUENTES; JOHN
DOE, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE-MEDICAL
DIRECTOR; STATE OF TEXAS; JOHN DOE, TEXAS DEPARTMENT
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE-ENGINEER; JOHN DOE, TEXAS
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE-TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION SUPERVISOR; TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL
JUSTICE; LANNETTE LINTHICUM; BRYAN COLLIER; JOHN DOE,
COFFIELD MEDICAL DIRECTOR; JOHN DOE, MICHAEL MEDICAL
DIRECTOR; DONNA SOLLENBERGER; ROBERT KNOTH; ADAPBI
NWAFOR; FOLASADE OJO; JOHN DOE, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
MEDICAL BRANCH; LIEUTENANT PARKER; MEDICAL DIRECTOR
ERIN A. JONES,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:17-CV-774

Before JONES, HAYNES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff William Henry Krieg is an inmate in the custody of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. He sustained injuries to his back and head in March 2015 while riding in a TDCJ transport bus that crashed into another vehicle. This action arises out of that accident and related medical care Krieg received.

Krieg, proceeding *pro se*, brought Section 1983 claims against the State of Texas and multiple individuals for violations of his Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. The district court in two orders dismissed those claims for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim. Krieg now appeals those orders, largely rehashing the arguments he made before the district court.¹ He has also moved to appoint counsel.

Krieg's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED. *See Cooper v. Sheriff*, 929 F.2d 1078, 1084 (5th Cir. 1991) (requiring movant show "exceptional circumstances" warrant appointment of counsel).

The court has carefully considered this appeal in light of the briefs, the record, and the opinion of the district court. Having done so, we find no reversible error of fact or law and affirm for essentially the reasons stated in the district court's thorough and well-reasoned opinions.

For the foregoing reasons, the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

¹ Krieg has not raised any challenge to the district court's jurisdictional holdings. He has therefore forfeited any argument in that regard. *See United States v. Fernandez*, 48 F.4th 405, 412 (5th Cir. 2022).