

February 17, 2004

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-11088
Conference Calendar

TERRY JAMES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BILL RHEA; JOSEPH B. MORRIS; SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS; NICKI
MATHISON,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:02-CV-2627-N

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, EMILIO M. GARZA, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Terry James appeals from the district court's dismissal of his civil-rights lawsuit for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. He has also filed a motion seeking appointment of counsel on appeal. Because he has failed to show "exceptional circumstances" warranting the appointment of counsel on appeal, that motion is DENIED. See Ulmer v. Chancellor, 691 F.2d 209, 213 (5th Cir. 1982).

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

We review a district court's dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction de novo. See Williams v. Dallas Area Rapid Transit, 242 F.3d 315, 318 (5th Cir. 2001). Because James's complaint is inextricably intertwined with certain state court judgments, federal courts lack jurisdiction to review his complaint. See United States v. Shepherd, 23 F.3d 923, 924 (5th Cir. 1994); see also District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 476, 482 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415 (1923). Accordingly, the district court's judgment of dismissal is AFFIRMED.