

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 95-60181  
Conference Calendar

---

BILLY RAY FORD,  
versus  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

BILLY MCGEE and FORREST  
COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEP'T,  
Defendants-Appellees.

\* \* \* \* \*

BILLY RAY FORD,  
versus  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

RICHARD MCKENZIE, Judge,  
and FORREST COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,  
Defendants-Appellees.

\* \* \* \* \*

BILLY RAY FORD,  
versus  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS and RAY HINTON,  
Defendants-Appellees.

\* \* \* \* \*

BILLY RAY FORD,  
versus  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

GLEN WHITE,  
Defendant-Appellee.

\* \* \* \* \*

BILLY RAY FORD,  
versus  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

ROBIN WHITE,  
Defendant-Appellee.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Mississippi  
USDC No. 2:94-cv-332-PS; 2:94-cv-333-PS;  
2:94-cv-334-PS; 2:94-cv-335-PS; 2:93-cv-336-PS  
- - - - -

June 30, 1995

Before JONES, WIENER, and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Bill Ray Ford filed five civil rights complaints, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, against various defendants alleging violations of his civil rights arising from the revocation of his probation. The district court consolidated the complaints and dismissed them as frivolous. The district court dismissed the claims against two defendants, Judge Richard McKenzie and Forrest County district attorney Glenn White, based on absolute immunity, and the remaining defendants as premature under Heck v. Humphrey, 114 S. Ct. 2364 (1994). On appeal Ford argues the merits of his underlying claim, but fails to challenge the basis of the dismissal. Issues not raised or briefed are considered abandoned. Evans v. City of Marlin, Tex., 986 F.2d 104, 106 n.1 (5th Cir. 1993).

The appeal is without arguable merit and thus frivolous. Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983). Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. 5th Cir. R. 42.2.

---

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.