

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

January 28, 2010

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 09-50576  
Summary Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

CONNRY B HATCH, III,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

FIRST TRANSIT, INC.; SCOTT LANSING; ANDREW CHAVIRA; M.D.  
CHARLES HINNMAN; MARY DIGGS; JIM WRIGHT,

Defendants - Appellees

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 1:08-CV-475  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before REAVLEY, DAVIS, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

This is an appeal from a series of orders by the district court granting summary judgment to all Defendants/Appellees.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 09-50576

Plaintiff/Appellant was terminated from his employment as a bus driver for failing to consult with a psychiatric doctor after a year of medical leave.<sup>1</sup> Appellant, proceeding pro se, brought a host of ever-shifting claims against his former employer and the doctor. By the time Appellant's case had reached the summary judgment stage, Appellant's pleadings contained claims that Appellees had violated the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Texas Labor Code, and various provisions of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code. Appellant also claimed that Appellees had slandered him and invaded his privacy.

In its orders dismissing Appellant's claims, the district court held that all of Appellant's claims were either legally barred because they did not contain private rights of action, or the claims lacked any evidence to support them. Appellant now argues that the district court erred because Appellees allegedly breached a collective bargaining agreement with the union to which Appellant belonged.<sup>2</sup> Appellant also argues that the evidence is sufficient for a claim of hostile work environment under the ADA. Finally, Appellant argues that Appellees "possessed an evil intent and gross disregard for [Appellant's] civil rights."

Because we find no error in the district court's orders, and because we find no proof of Appellant's claims on the record, we AFFIRM.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant/Appellee First Transit Inc. first referred Appellant to the company doctor after Appellant brought allegations against his co-workers that they were involved in a vast conspiracy run by the Roman Catholic Church to monitor and perhaps murder Appellant.

<sup>2</sup> Appellant also now argues the union breached this agreement.