

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-10508

(Summary Calendar)

MARTI ADDAMS-MORE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NINA RUTH MOORE, Et Al,

Defendants,

DAVID CAVE, Honorable Judge,

Defendant, Appellee

No. 97-10898

MARTI ADDAMS-MORE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NINA RUTH MOORE, Et Al,

Defendants,

STATE OF TEXAS,

Defendant - Appellee

No. 97-11257

MARTI ADDAMS-MORE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NINA RUTH MOORE, Et Al,

Defendants,

COUNTY OF DALLAS,

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Northern District of Texas
(3:96-CV-2254-D)

June 24, 1998

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

PER CURIAM:*

Marti Addams-More appeals from the judgments dismissing her claims against state-court judge David Cave, the State of Texas, and Dallas County for failure to state a claim. We consolidate Addams-More's appeals, FED. R. APP. P. 3(b), and we dispose of all

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

three appeals with this opinion. Addams-More's motions for leave to correct her briefs are DENIED.

This court must examine the basis of its jurisdiction on its own motion if necessary. See *Mosley v. Cozby*, 813 F.2d 659, 660 (5th Cir. 1987). Federal courts lack jurisdiction to engage in appellate review of the final determinations of state courts. See *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 476-82, 103 S. Ct. 1303, 1311-15, 75 L. Ed. 2d 206 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415, 44 S. Ct. 149, 150, 68 L. Ed. 362 (1923).

Addams-More repeats the civil-rights claims and the claims under the Americans With Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12131-12165, that she raised in the district court. Addams-More attempts to use federal civil rights law and the ADA to review the state-court judgments adverse to her and to review actions inextricably intertwined with those judgments. We lack jurisdiction to consider Addams-More's appeals. Addams-More's appeals are frivolous. We warn Addams-More that future frivolous appeals may result in sanctions against her. Addams-More should review any pending appeals and withdraw any appeals that are frivolous.

APPEALS DISMISSED. 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. SANCTIONS WARNING IMPOSED.