

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-13419
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 4:15-cv-00622-RH-CAS

RONALD DAVID JONES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

GARBAGE TRUCK OPERATORS,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Florida

(October 25, 2016)

Before HULL, WILSON and WILLIAM PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald David Jones appeals *pro se* the dismissal of his amended complaint about the violation of his civil rights by the “Garbage Truck Operators for the City of Quincy,” Florida. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court dismissed Jones’s complaint for failure to state a claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). We affirm.

The district court did not err by dismissing Jones’s complaint. Jones alleged that truck operators dumped garbage in front of his house, scratched his car, loitered nearby at night, and sprayed poison into his house through his window air conditioning unit, and he alleged that the truck operators retaliated against him because of his race, his religion, and his attempt to run for President of the United States. But Jones failed to allege any facts that would support a plausible inference that the truck operators acted with a discriminatory animus. That is, Jones failed to allege any facts to suggest that the truck operators were motivated to discriminate against him based on his race, retaliated against him after he engaged in a religious practice, or intended to deprive him of any other right under federal law. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Jones argues, for the first time, that his neighbors colluded with the truck operators to violate his rights under the Florida Civil Rights Act of 1992, Title VII of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, but we will not consider arguments that Jones failed to present to the district court. *See Access Now, Inc. v. Sw. Airlines Co.*, 385 F.3d 1324, 1331 (11th Cir. 2004).

We **AFFIRM** the dismissal of Jones's amended complaint.