

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 22-60464
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 4, 2023

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JAMEY PAUL BURRAGE,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

LEE COUNTY ADULT JAIL, MEDICAL DEPARTMENT; JAMIE
BURRELL, NP AT LEE COUNTY JAIL,

Defendants—Appellees,

JAMEY PAUL BURRAGE,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

LEE COUNTY ADULT JAIL, ALL; RONNIE PARTLOW, CAPTAIN;
JIM H. JOHNSON, SHERIFF,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Mississippi
USDC No. 1:20-CV-222 c/w 1:21-CV-103

Before JONES, HAYNES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

In this *pro se* suit, Jamey Paul Burrage alleges that his jailers have failed to protect him from inmate-on-inmate violence and deprived him of medical care. The district court granted summary judgment to the defendants. Burrage appealed to this court.

Burrage has been involved in several physical altercations with other inmates, but in each instance the jailers have stepped in, broken up the fight, and separated him from the other inmates. He fails to show how these facts are consonant with the conclusion that “prison officials were deliberately indifferent to his need for protection.” *Newton v. Black*, 133 F.3d 301, 308 (5th Cir. 1998). Likewise, although he complains that he was denied adequate medical care, the record shows that the medical staff have treated him for a variety of ailments during his incarceration. Burrage alleges that they have not adequately treated a brief, intermittent numbness that he experiences when he moves his neck in a certain way. But the medical staff could not reproduce the problem during a range of motion examination, and he has not shown any harm that has arisen due to lack of further treatment. Thus, the medical staff has not “clearly evince[d] a wanton disregard for any serious medical needs.” *Domino v. Texas Dep’t of Crim. Just.*, 239 F.3d 752, 756 (5th Cir. 2001).

We find no reversible error of law or fact and affirm essentially for the reasons stated in the memorandum opinion of the district court. The district court’s judgment is AFFIRMED.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.