

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Fifth Circuit

No. 94-30521
Summary Calendar

CARL JERRY ROUBIQUE, CONNIE ROUBIQUE, and
JOSEPH FRANK SEARCY,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

VERSUS

EDWARD ROZELL, individually, and in his capacity as,
deputies of the WBR Sheriff's Department ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Middle District of Louisiana
(No. CA-92-664-B)

December 28, 1995

Before REAVLEY, GARWOOD and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Carl Jerry Roubique, Connie Roubique, and Joseph Frank Searcy appeal from a judgment awarding damages in their favor in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit. The plaintiffs argue that the district court abused its discretion in limiting their closing argument to

*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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

one hour. Because the record fails to reflect that the plaintiffs objected to the purported time limitation in the district court, the issue is considered raised for the first time on appeal, and this Court declines to address it. Varanado v. Lynaugh, 920 F.2d 320, 321 (5th Cir. 1991).

The plaintiffs also contest the damages award as inadequate. The amount of compensatory damages awarded is not "clearly erroneous or so gross or inadequate as to be contrary to right reason." Sockwell v. Phelps, 20 F.3d 187, 192 (5th Cir. 1994). Further, the amount of the punitive damages award does not constitute an abuse of discretion. See id.

AFFIRMED.