

983 F.2d 1061

This case was not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter.

Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter See Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or after Jan. 1, 2007. See also Fifth Circuit Rules 28.7, 47.5.3, 47.5.4. (Find CTA5 Rule 28 and Find CTA5 Rule 47)

United States Court of Appeals,
Fifth Circuit.

John LELSZ, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees,
Advocacy, Inc., Intervening Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.

John J. KAVANAGH, M.D., et al., Defendants-
Appellees,

v.

Parent Association for the Retarded of Texas,
Intervenor-Appellant.

John Lelsz, et al., Plaintiffs,

John Lelsz, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

Charles L. Meyer, A Member of the Plaintiff Class,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

Advocacy, Inc., Intervening Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

John L. Kavanagh, M.D., etc., et al., Defendants-
Appellees

v.

Parent Association for the Retarded of Texas and
Freda Snyder, By and Through Her Next Friends
and Guardians Fred and Ruth Snyder,
Intervenors-Appellants.

Nos. 91-7033, 92-1087. | Jan. 11, 1993.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (CA 3 85 2462 H).

Before REAVLEY, SMITH, and EMILIO M. GARZA,
Circuit Judges.

Opinion

PER CURIAM.*

* Local Rule 47.5.1 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 Pursuant to that rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

*1 In No. 91-7033, the appeal is DISMISSED, as the appellant has not listed the propriety of the September 4, 1991, order as an issue on appeal, nor does it provide any reasons, in its brief, as to why the order was inappropriate. Accordingly, the issue is waived. See *Atwood v. Union Carbide Corp.*, 847 F.2d 278, 280 (5th Cir.) (per curiam), opinion on rehearing, 850 F.2d 1093 (5th Cir.1988) (per curiam), *cert. denied*, 489 U.S. 1079 (1989).

In No. 92-1087, the judgment is AFFIRMED. We have reviewed the briefs, the record, and the argument of counsel and conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in approving the settlement.