

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 8, 2016

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 15-10556  
\_\_\_\_\_

C.C., Individually, by and through his next friends, Charles Cripps and  
Kristie Cripps,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Defendant - Appellee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:14-CV-1042  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before DAVIS, JONES, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

C.C. is a student with a disability. The Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District (“HEBISD”) placed C.C. in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (“DAEP”) after C.C. photographed another

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 15-10556

student sitting on the toilet in the restroom at school without that student's consent.<sup>1</sup>

C.C. claims that HEBISD violated the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and other constitutional and statutory provisions when it failed to reevaluate his DAEP placement after the Tarrant County Juvenile Authority declined to prosecute him for the felony of invasive visual recording. The district court entered judgment in HEBISD's favor, and C.C. now appeals.

After carefully reviewing the district court's order, the parties' arguments, the relevant case law, and all of the evidence in the record, we conclude that the district court committed no reversible error. We therefore affirm the judgment essentially for the reasons given by the district court.<sup>2</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

<sup>1</sup> HEBISD determined that C.C.'s acts of illicit photography were not a manifestation of his disability, and C.C. does not challenge that determination on appeal.

<sup>2</sup> We also affirm the district court's order denying C.C.'s motion to conduct discovery, as well as the court's order denying C.C.'s motion to remand the case to the Texas Education Agency for a rehearing.