

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 15, 2012

No. 11-20373

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

KAREN McPETERS, individually, and on behalf of those individuals, persons and entities who are similarly situated,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

THE HONORABLE FREDERICK E. EDWARDS, Individually and in His Capacity as the District Judge of the 9th District Court Montgomery County, Texas; BARBARA GLADDEN ADAMICK, Individually and as The District Court Clerk of Montgomery County, Texas; MONTGOMERY COUNTY, TEXAS; and REED ELSEVIER, INC. d/b/a LexisNexis

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:10-cv-01103

Before BENAVIDES, STEWART, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

BENAVIDES, Circuit Judge:*

Plaintiff-Appellant Karen McPeters appeals the district court's dismissal of her suit against Defendants-Appellees the Honorable Frederick Edwards, Barbara Adamick, Montgomery County, and Reed Elsevier, doing business as

* Pursuant to FIFTH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in FIFTH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 11-20373

LexisNexis. Judge Edwards designated an employment discrimination suit filed by McPeters as an electronic filing (“e-file”) case, thereby requiring that she pay certain fees imposed by LexisNexis in order to file pleadings and other court documents electronically. In the district court, McPeters sought to have the e-filing fees declared unconstitutional as denying her access to the courts, as well as in violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO”), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-68. She also brought various state and common-law claims, over which the district court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction once it had dismissed her constitutional and federal claims.

After considering the record, the parties’ briefs and the arguments contained therein, as well as entertaining oral argument, this Court is of the firm commitment that no reversible error has been shown. The ruling of the district court is therefore **AFFIRMED**.