

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-50429

Summary Calendar

GLEN C. JAMES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

WAYNE SCOTT ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Western District of Texas
USDC No. SA-96-CV-325

September 12, 1996

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, WIENER, and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Glen C. James, Texas inmate #660410, appeals the dismissal as frivolous of his civil rights complaint. James does not challenge the denial of his request for a preliminary injunction or the imposition of court costs. Therefore, these issues are abandoned on appeal. See Eason v. Thaler, 14 F.3d 8, 9 n.1 (5th Cir. 1994).

James argues that the district court abused its discretion by dismissing the complaint because he has the constitutional right to receive information and ideas through the medium of free

*Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

television. Our review of the record and James' argument detects no abuse of discretion by the district court. See Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). James' sparse allegations do not implicate the denial of a constitutional right. See Mann v. Smith, 796 F.2d 79, 82-83 (5th Cir. 1986); Montana v. Commissioners Court, 659 F.2d 19, 23 (5th Cir. Unit A 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 1026 (1982).

James' remaining argument, that the magistrate judge and district court were biased against him through their rulings, is without merit. See Liteky v. United States, 114 S. Ct. 1147, 1155 (1994).

This appeal is without arguable merit and thus frivolous. See 5th Cir. R. 42.2. The appeal is DISMISSED. This opinion does not lessen the sanction imposed upon James in James v. Scott, No. 96-50406 (5th Cir. 1996).

DISMISSED.