

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

March 2, 2012

---

No. 11-30894  
Summary Calendar

---

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

PATRICK PRICE; BETHANY PRICE; AARON PRICE; KELDA PRICE;  
KELVIN WELLS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants

v.

DONNA WALLETTTE; JEAN HARTLEY; WAYNE MESSINA; JOHN  
DILWOTH; EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,

Defendants - Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 3:10-CV-323

---

Before REAVLEY, SMITH, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Over the past four years these plaintiffs have had difficulties with the school to which their children attend. Twice they have attempted to resolve their difficulties by bringing suit in federal court. Unfortunately for them this is not where their problems can be solved. Federal courts are given only limited authority. They cannot investigate complaints by citizens who think they have

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 11-30894

been mistreated. Only where federal law permits it and the complaining party follows federal procedure can the federal court act to help the parties. Most personal injuries that justify court action have to go to state courts which have much broader authority to act upon what we call tort claims.

The entire record of the present case has been read and nothing that has been said presents a legal claim for federal court. Even if the children have been unfairly treated and even if the school authorities have not satisfied the parents about the problem, there is no specific act of racial discrimination set forth here. The plaintiffs may have concluded that racial animosity existed but that does not activate the federal court. Specific conduct must be stated that, if true, would establish that racial discrimination motivated the adverse treatment. And there is no legal action of this nature authorized by some of the laws named by the pleadings. Judge Brady has explained this to the plaintiffs and they should need no further attention. This judgment was correct and it is affirmed.

**AFFIRMED.**