

March 28, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Fifth Circuit

No. 05-10379
Summary Calendar

LAURANCE KRIEGEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

VERSUS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE; FARM SERVICE AGENCY

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Northern District of Texas
5:04-CV-132

Before JOLLY, DAVIS, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Appellant, Kriegel, has had a long standing dispute (since 1986) with the United States Department of Agriculture, the Small Business Administration and related agencies of the United States. This is the second suit he filed seeking relief. These disputes are related inter alia to denied loan applications from Farmer's

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 R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Home Administration and the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service along with perceived failures to properly service his loans. Kriegel also challenged the Small Business Administration's offset of Kriegel's farm program payments against sums owed the Small Business Administration. Kriegel sued in tort and contract and also pursued an administrative claim against some or all of these agencies. The district court found that Kriegel's request for declaratory judgment, relief for breach of contract, violation of his constitutional rights, civil conspiracy and tort claims were all barred by statutory limitation. Because Kriegel did not bring his action timely as required by the relevant statute waving sovereign immunity, the court concluded it had no jurisdiction over his claims.

As to the review of the administrative determination rejecting Kriegel's §741 discrimination claims, the district court determined that Kriegel alleged no facts to show any basis for the alleged discrimination and therefore his complaint failed to state an actionable §741 claim.

Appellant's brief addresses the merits of his long standing controversy with the governmental agencies he sued. He fails to address in any coherent way the reasons the district court dismissed his claims.

Essentially for the reasons stated by the district court in its comprehensive order of January 26, 2005 we affirm the district court judgment.

AFFIRMED.