

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 4, 2008

---

No. 08-20001  
Summary Calendar

---

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

ALI WARIS

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

HARRIS COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES;  
HERMINIA PALACIO, Harris County Public Health and Environmental  
Services, in Personal and Official Capacity; CHARLES CUNNINGHAM, Harris  
County Public Health and Environmental Services, in Personal and Official  
Capacity; UMAIR SHAH, Medical Doctor, Harris County Public Health and  
Environmental Services, in Personal and Official Capacity; HARRIS COUNTY

Defendants - Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas, Houston  
USDC No. 4:06-CV-1331

---

Before STEWART, OWEN, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Ali Waris's employment was terminated seven weeks after he was hired  
as a clinic manager for Harris County. The decision to terminate Waris'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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not  
be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

employment was based on numerous complaints about his attitude, verbal attacks, and unprofessional conduct after previous reprimands, including sending an improper email to his subordinates and supervisors about a member of the United States Congress who sponsored a public immunization event through the clinic.

Waris, acting pro se, filed suit alleging discrimination based on race and national origin and violation of constitutional rights. The district court adopted the findings and recommendation of a magistrate judge and granted summary judgment for the Defendants. We agree with the district court that Waris failed to demonstrate a prima facie case of race or national origin discrimination in that no evidence of disparate treatment was advanced. Waris also failed to adequately state any claim for violation of constitutional rights. Finding that there was no jurisdiction once the Defendants were granted summary judgment, the district court properly refused to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3).

For the reasons adopted by the district court, the judgment is **AFFIRMED**.