

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 1, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 11-30591  
\_\_\_\_\_

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

LESTER L. WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH SCHOOL SYSTEM; EAST BATON ROUGE  
PARISH SCHOOL SYSTEM BOARD OF DIRECTORS; CHARLOTTE  
PLACIDE; ANNETTE MIRE; DIANE HELIRE; PEGGY LEDE; MILLIE  
WILLIAMS; DEMOINE RUTLEDGE; ELIZABETH DURAN SWINFORD,  
also known as Liz; HOWARD DAVIS; N. DECUIR, Mr.,

Defendants-Appellees

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Louisiana  
(3:09-CV-662)  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before STEWART, ELROD, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Plaintiff-Appellant Lester L. Washington, pro se, appeals the district court's dismissal of his complaint, alleging discrimination in violation of Title VI

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.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. 11-30591

and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

We hold pro se complaints to a lower standard than formal pleadings drafted by attorneys. *See Miller v. Stanmore*, 636 F.2d 986, 988 (5th Cir. 1981). Nevertheless, such complaints “must set forth facts giving rise to a claim on which relief may be granted.” *Johnson v. Atkins*, 999 F.2d 99, 100 (5th Cir. 1993).

We have considered the briefs of the parties and the record on appeal. The district court carefully considered Washington’s claims prior to dismissal. While we read pro se complaints liberally, pro se litigants must still comply with the law and procedural rules. As we conclude that Washington’s complaint fails to state a cognizable cause of action, we AFFIRM the district court’s judgment.