

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 24, 2013

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_

No. 12-20444  
Summary Calendar

\_\_\_\_\_

L.F. by next friend of Mary Ruffin,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT;  
DILLARD, Hearing Officer,

Defendants - Appellees

-----

L.F. by next friend of Mary Ruffin,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

LUECRETIA DILLARD, Hearing Officer,

Defendant - Appellee

-----

L.F. by next friend of Mary Ruffin,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT;  
LUECRETIA DILLARD,

Defendants - Appellees

-----

No. 12-20444

MARY RUFFIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

TONYA LEE; TAIEKA DERRICK,

Defendants-Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:11-CV-903  
USDC No. 4:11-CV-1089  
USDC No. 4:11-CV-1501  
USDC No. 4:11-CV-2395

---

Before WIENER, OWEN, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Plaintiff-Appellant L. F., by next friend of Mary Ruffin, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, appeals the district court's dismissal of her Individuals with Disabilities Education Act complaints that challenged actions by the Houston Independent School District, Tonya Lee, Taieka Derrick, and Lucretia Dillard. On appeal, Ruffin has failed to provide any comprehensible legal arguments that credibly challenge the detailed analyses and conclusions set forth in the district court's decisions. Although we apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding pro se than to those represented by counsel, and we liberally construe briefs of pro se litigants, such parties must still brief the issues substantively and reasonably comply with the requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28. *See Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995).

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 12-20444

As Ruffin has failed to provide any coherent argument demonstrating reversible error by the district court, *see id.*; *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993), we affirm the ruling of the district court.

**AFFIRMED.**