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

\_\_\_\_

No. 02-30219 Conference Calendar

DREW DAVID ARNOLD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

INMATE ACCOUNTS AT LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY,

Defendant-Appellee.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DAVIS, and PARKER, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:\*

Drew David Arnold, Louisiana prisoner number 96979, appeals the district court's dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit as frivolous and for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii). Arnold maintains that the defendant improperly lost his savings bonds. Arnold has not shown that the district court erred in determining that, to the extent that Arnold sought an order compelling the defendant to perform

 $<sup>^{*}</sup>$  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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

certain acts, the district court lacked jurisdiction to do so. 28 U.S.C. § 1361.

Arnold also has not shown that the district court erred in determining that he had failed to raise a cognizable 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim. To successfully raise a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim, the plaintiff must allege a violation of a constitutional right.

See Johnson v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist., 38 F.3d 198, 200 (5th Cir. 1994). Arnold's allegation of wrongful deprivation of property does not implicate a constitutional right because Louisiana provides an adequate postdeprivation remedy for property loss claims. Marshall v. Norwood, 741 F.2d 761, 763-64 (5th Cir. 1984). Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.