

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
For the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 96-30696  
Summary Calendar

---

MARY ANN LOVELL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

GARY HURFORD, President; RAY L. HUNT, Chairman; HUNT OIL COMPANY,

Defendants-Appellees,

---

MARY ANN LOVELL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

MILLS TIMMONS & FLOWERS, Succession of Meaker White,  
Second Judicial District Court in and for  
Claiborne Parish, Louisiana,

Defendant-Appellee,

---

MARY ANN LOVELL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

JAMES HATCH, Attorney, Hatch & Smith,

Defendant-Appellee,

---

MARY ANN LOVELL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

JOHN MONTGOMERY, Attorney, Second Judicial District,  
Defendant-Appellee,

---

MARY ANN LOVELL,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

GARY HURFORD, President; RAY L. HUNT, Chairman,  
Hunt Oil Company,  
Defendants-Appellees,

---

MARY ANN LOVELL,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

WAYNE TIMMONS, Mills Timmons & Flowers,  
Defendant-Appellee,

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
For the Eastern District of Louisiana  
(96-CV-584-G)

---

December 26, 1996  
Before SMITH, DUHÉ, and BARKSDALE, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:<sup>1</sup>

Mary Ann Lovell, proceeding pro se, brought the consolidated actions, and numerous others, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, registering numerous complaints

---

<sup>1</sup>Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

against various defendants having to do with mineral production attributable to the interest of Meaker Glover White in minerals underlying certain lands in Claiborne Parish, Louisiana. Following consolidation of the captioned cases, the district court considered defendants's motions to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12 (b)(6) and granted each motion dismissing plaintiff's claims. We have carefully reviewed the briefs on file and the record and are satisfied that the reasons given by the district court in its Memorandum and Order filed June 14, 1996 in the consolidated matters are correct. We therefore affirm the district court's dismissal of the captioned cases essentially for the reasons given by it in its memorandum and order.

AFFIRMED.