

Bryant v. Watts, 3 F.3d 437 (1993)

3 F.3d 437

This case was not selected for publication in the
Federal Reporter.

Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter See
Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally
governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or
after Jan. 1, 2007. See also Fifth Circuit Rules 28.7,
47.5.3, 47.5.4. (Find CTA5 Rule 28 and Find CTA5
Rule 47)

United States Court of Appeals,
Fifth Circuit.

Curtis BRYANT, Jr., Plaintiff-Appellant,
v.

Michael J. WATTS and Kenneth P. Stripling,
Defendants-Appellees.

No. 93-1552. Summary Calendar. Aug. 13, 1993.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Texas (3:92 CV 2610 D).

Before [POLITZ](#), Chief Judge, [HIGGINBOTHAM](#) and
[DEMOSS](#), Circuit Judges.

Opinion

PER CURIAM.*

*¹ Curtis Bryant, Jr. appeals the dismissal as frivolous of
his civil rights action against Kenneth Stripling, the
Clerk of Court of the Texas Court of Appeals for the Fifth
Judicial District.

Bryant maintains that Stripling violated his
constitutionally guaranteed right to access to the courts
when he refused on three separate occasions to file a
petition for mandamus. In each of the three instances
Bryant was notified that his filing did not comply with
Rule 121 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.
Bryant invokes [42 U.S.C. § 1983](#) and seeks unspecified

Footnotes

* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

¹ [King v. Price](#), 750 S.W.2d 356 (Tex.App.-Beaumont 1988).

² [Williams v. Wood](#), 612 F.2d 982, 985 & n. 3 (5th Cir.1980).

damages and injunctive relief. The district court found
that Bryant's claims lacked any arguable basis in law or
fact and dismissed same; Bryant timely appealed.

Rule 121, as the Texas courts have noted, contains
detailed requirements. The rule mandates that "at the
commencement of an original proceeding for a writ of
mandamus ... in an appellate court, the Relator shall
deliver to the Clerk ... a substantial number of documents.
Rule 121 is a lengthy, detailed rule which provides how
an original proceeding ... is to be commenced...."¹ Bryant
does not suggest that his filings met the express
requirements of Rule 121. Rather, he contests the Clerk's
authority to reject his submissions.

Assuming, per arguendo, that Bryant is correct in his
assertion that under Texas law the Clerk may not reject
non-conforming pleadings, the question remains whether
Bryant has alleged a cognizable denial of federal rights.
Stripling is entitled to absolute immunity for refusing to
accept Bryant's writ of mandamus.² Accordingly,
Bryant's claim for damages lacked an arguable basis in
fact or law and was properly dismissed pursuant to [28
U.S.C. § 1915\(d\)](#).³ This immunity does not extend,
however, to Bryant's claim for equitable relief.⁴

That Stripling is not absolutely immune in the injunction
phase does not resolve whether that request is frivolous.
To the contrary, in order to state a cogent claim for
equitable relief Bryant must demonstrate the absence of
adequate legal remedies and irreparable harm.⁵ As noted,
Bryant does not claim to have filed a writ application
which complied with Rule 121. Unless and until such a
filing is made, Bryant has not availed himself of an
obvious, adequate legal remedy and, accordingly, no
injunction may issue. His claim for equitable relief is
patently frivolous.

The judgment of the district court is **AFFIRMED**.

Parallel Citations

1993 WL 347037 (C.A.5 (Tex.))

3 *Nietzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989) (1915(d) dismissal appropriate where the defendant clearly is entitled to immunity).

4 *Pulliam v. Allen*, 466 U.S. 522 (1984).

5 *Id.*

End of Document

© 2010 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.