

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-51018
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 12, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

ERIC SAMUEL TUCKER,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

DAVID SCHENCK, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; BERT RICHARDSON, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; KEVIN P. YEARY, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; DAVID NEWELL, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; MARY LOU KEEL, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; SCOTT WALKER, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; JESSE F. MCCLURE, III, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; LEE FINLEY, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*; GINA PARKER, *Judge-Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas*,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 1:25-CV-1307

Before STEWART, GRAVES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

* This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-51018

Eric Samuel Tucker, Texas prisoner # 1983465, appeals the dismissal of his complaint as frivolous, for lack of jurisdiction, and as barred by judicial immunity, among other grounds. He also moves for the appointment of counsel.

Upon our review of the record and Tucker's appellate brief, we are unpersuaded that the district court erred in its determinations regarding judicial immunity. *See Boyd v. Biggers*, 31 F.3d 279, 284-85 (5th Cir. 1994) (per curiam). As a result, Tucker has not shown any error in the district court's dismissal of his claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). We are also unpersuaded that the district court abused its discretion in denying Tucker's motion for appointment of counsel. *See Thompson v. Tex. Dep't of Crim. Just.*, 67 F.4th 275, 283 (5th Cir. 2023).

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED. Tucker's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED.