

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 22, 2008

No. 07-10914

Summary Calendar

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

LAKEITH AMIR-SHARIF

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

DALLAS COUNTY JAIL SRT UNIT; DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF; TEXAS
DALLAS COUNTY; SRT OFFICER NFN MARTIN, Team Leader Dallas County
Jail; SRT JOHN DOE, No 1; SRT JOHN DOE, No 2; SRT JOHN DOE, No 3;
SRT OFFICER NFN WEATHERTON; SRT OFFICER NFN CASTILLO;
LIEUTENANT MARK WOOTEN, North Tower Shift Commander Dallas County
Jail; SERGEANT JOHN DOE, 1st watch North Tower Shift Supervisor Dallas
County Jail; CAPTAIN JAMES HOWELL, North Tower Facility Commander
Dallas County Jail; CHIEF DEPUTY DOWNS, Jail Administrator; DALLAS
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS; SRT NFN LOCKWOOD, Dallas County Jail;
TEXAS COMMISSION ON JAIL STANDARDS, TCJS

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:07-CV-310

Before KING, DAVIS, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

* 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should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited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.

Lakeith Amir-Sharif moves this court for authorization to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) following the district court's dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit as duplicative. One who wishes to proceed IFP on appeal must show that he is impecunious and that he will raise a nonfrivolous appellate issue. *Carson v. Polley*, 689 F.2d 562, 586 (5th Cir. 1982).

Amir-Sharif argues that the district court erred by dismissing his suit as duplicative without first specifying exactly which claims were duplicative of the claims filed in an earlier suit. He also maintains that his claims, which pertain to cell and body cavity searches, have merit. Amir-Sharif has not shown that the district court abused its discretion by dismissing his suit as duplicative. See *Bailey v. Johnson*, 846 F.2d 1019, 1021 (5th Cir. 1988). He likewise has not shown that he will raise a nonfrivolous claim in his appeal. See *Carson*, 689 F.2d at 586. Accordingly, his motion to proceed IFP on appeal is DENIED, and his appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous. See 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.