## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT United States Court

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

November 24, 2009

No. 08-50788 Summary Calendar

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

CHASE HOME FINANCE, LLC; JP MORGAN CHASE BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION; JP MORGAN CHASE & CO; MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC,

Plaintiffs-Appellees

v.

WALTER LEE HALL, JR.,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. 1:07-CV-1070

Before BENAVIDES, PRADO, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:\*

Walter Lee Hall, Jr., seeks leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) to appeal the grant of summary judgment against him and the denial of three different postjudgment motions. The district court denied IFP status and certified that Hall's appeal was not taken in good faith. By moving for leave to proceed IFP, Hall is challenging the district court's certification. See Baugh v.

 $<sup>^{*}</sup>$  Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.

Taylor, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997). However, Hall has not demonstrated any nonfrivolous ground for appeal.

The notice of appeal filed by Hall was timely with respect to only the denial of Hall's "reurged second motion to vacate" the district court's judgment. Hall's brief filed in support of his IFP motion does not contain any argument that indicates that the district court abused its discretion in denying this motion. See Edwards v. City of Houston, 78 F.3d 983, 995 (5th Cir. 1996); Railway Labor Executives' Ass'n v. City of Galveston, 898 F.2d 481, 481 (5th Cir. 1990); Seven Elves, Inc. v. Eskenazi, 635 F.2d 396, 402 (5th Cir. 1981).

This appeal does not involve legal points arguable on their merits, and it is therefore frivolous. *See Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983). Accordingly, Hall's IFP motion is DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.