

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

---

No. 18-30886  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 19, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

SHENTELL GUILLOT,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

EDGARDO CASTRO, Detective; WILLIAM MEETZ, Detective; STEVEN  
ABADIE,

Defendants-Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 2:17-CV-6117

---

Before JONES, ELROD, and ENGELHARDT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Shentell Guillot filed the instant pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit to seek redress for actions connected to an undercover investigation into prostitution and her June 2016 arrest. The district court granted the defendants' Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c) motion, dismissed the suit, and denied Guillot authorization to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) on appeal. Now, Guillot

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 18-30886

moves this court for leave to proceed IFP on appeal, thereby challenging the district court's certification that her appeal is not taken in good faith. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997).

In this court, Guillot makes no legal argument, and she does not acknowledge or address the district court's reasons for dismissing her civil rights claims. By failing to identify any error in the district court's analysis, she has abandoned any challenge she might have raised regarding the decision, *see Brinkmann v. Dallas Cty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987), and has failed to demonstrate that her "appeal involves legal points arguable on their merits," *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Because Guillot has not shown that her appeal involves a nonfrivolous issue, we deny her motion to proceed IFP on appeal and dismiss her appeal as frivolous. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 & n.24; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

IFP MOTION DENIED; APPEAL DISMISSED.