

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

September 26, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 24-20114
Summary Calendar

CATRELL BAKARI,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

FILAMAR TRANSPORT, L.L.C.,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:23-CV-2265

Before JOLLY, JONES, and WILLETT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Catrell Bakari, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's dismissal of his case alleging that Filamar Transport, L.L.C. did not hire him, and, by failing to hire him, subjected him to a hostile work environment because of his race. The district court dismissed Bakari's original complaint—which only alleged race discrimination—for failure adequately to plead that

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 24-20114

Bakari’s race was the but-for cause of Filamar’s decision not to hire him.¹ The district court then gave Bakari an opportunity to amend his complaint. Bakari filed an amended complaint reasserting his race discrimination claim and—even though he was never hired—newly asserting a hostile work environment claim. The district court dismissed Bakari’s amended complaint for failure to state claims upon which relief can be granted. Bakari has appealed.

On appeal, Bakari seemingly challenges the district court’s holding that he failed adequately to plead his race discrimination and hostile work environment claims. His arguments are characterized, however, by various ramblings, including that Filamar, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States Postal Service, the district court judge, the district court, and a “mystery hacker” are involved in a white supremacist organization that is responsible for the hardships in his life.

Because Bakari’s appeal lacks an arguable basis in law upon which we can grant him relief, it is frivolous. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. Accordingly, Bakari’s appeal is, in all respects,

DISMISSED.

¹ Bakari’s company, Bakari Logistics, was also a *pro se* plaintiff in the original complaint. The district court dismissed Bakari Logistics’ claims on the grounds that it could not proceed *pro se*. Bakari Logistics did not join Bakari’s amended complaint and has not appealed the district court’s order dismissing its claims.