

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 02-30458  
Conference Calendar

---

ROBERT KALTENBACH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL NEUSTROM; RAY BROUSSARD; FELIX ZAUNBRECHER;  
LOUIS J. PERRET; PAULA BERNARD; DANIEL C. HUGHES, INC.;  
PATRICK L. MICHOT; JOSEPH VALEX GUIDRY; ETTA GUIDRY  
BROUSSARD; ANDRE WILLIAM BROUSSARD; PERCY JOSEPH BROUSSARD;  
JOE FORESTIER; JOHN DOE, 1 through 10; JANE DOE, 1 through 10;  
STATE OF LOUISIANA; PARISH OF LAFAYETTE; CONSOLIDATED  
GOVERNMENT OF LAFAYETTE,

Defendants-Appellees.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 01-CV-2464  
-----

February 19, 2003

Before WIENER, EMILIO M. GARZA, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Robert Kaltenbach appeals from the order of the district court denying him authorization to file his complaint, pursuant to a 1992 sanction order requiring prior authorization.

Kaltenbach contends that the sanction order deprived him of his right of access to the courts and his right to equal protection

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

of the law. He also contends that his Fourth Amendment and due process rights were violated when his home was searched and property was seized pursuant to an allegedly invalid eviction warrant.

Kaltenbach did not appeal from the order imposing sanctions. His current challenge to that order amounts to an untimely appeal over which we lack jurisdiction. *See United States v. Carr*, 979 F.2d 51, 55 (5th Cir. 1992).

Kaltenbach does not contend that the district court erred by determining that his substantive claims would have been barred by *Dist. of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 476, 482 (1983), and *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923), had he been authorized to file his complaint. He has not shown that the district court should have allowed him to file his complaint.

APPEAL DISMISSED AS FRIVOLOUS. 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.