

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 26, 2009

No. 08-20617

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

DONNA J ARENSDORF

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

MARK EVERSON, in his individual and official capacity as Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service; KEVIN BROWN, In his individual and official capacity as Commissioner of the Small Business/Self Employed, Internal Revenue Service; ELLEN DOLBY, in her individual and official capacity as Director, Collection Area, Internal Revenue Service; MARTIN ARNOLD, In his individual and official capacity as Territory Manager, Internal Revenue Service; JAMES A GIBSON, In his individual and official capacity as Manager, Internal Revenue Service; STEPHANIE CALISTER, In her individual and official capacity as HR Specialist, Employment and Labor Relations, Internal Revenue Service; SUE BURTON, In her individual and official capacity as "On the Job" Instructor, Internal Revenue Service; LINDA M SPRINGER, in her individual and official capacity as Director, United States Office of Personnel Management; JOHN DOES 1-10

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:07-cv-2703

Before REAVLEY, DAVIS, and ELROD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff-Appellant Donna Arensdorf appeals the district court's dismissal pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) and 12(b)(6) of her claims under the Privacy Act of 1974, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1985(3) and 1986, and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S. Ct. 1999 (1971), against numerous Internal Revenue Service and other officials in their individual capacities.¹ Based on our *de novo* review of the record, see *In re Katrina Canal Breaches Litig.*, 495 F.3d 191, 205 (5th Cir. 2007); *Revell v. Lidov*, 317 F.3d 467, 469 (5th Cir. 2002), we conclude that Plaintiff has failed to identify any error in the district court's ruling. Indeed, her brief wholly fails to address the court's reasoned basis for dismissal, which we find fully supported by the governing law. We therefore affirm the judgment of the district court.

AFFIRMED.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

¹ Notwithstanding the style of the case, Plaintiff's original complaint expressly limited her suit to these defendants in their individual capacities.