

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 92-9505
Conference Calendar

STEVEN M. ROUNSAVALL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

RICHARD L. STADLER, Secretary,
Department of Corrections, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Louisiana
USDC No. CA-92-938-B-M1
- - - - -

May 7, 1993

Before REAVLEY, KING, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Steven M. Rounsavall is not entitled to relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on his lost property claim because the state of Louisiana provides an adequate post-deprivation remedy. See Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 533-34, 104 S.Ct. 3194, 82 L.Ed.2d 393 (1984); Marshall v. Norwood, 741 F.2d 761, 763-64 (5th Cir. 1984). Rounsavall's allegations that the district court violated his due process rights are meritless. The dismissal of his suit was within the discretion of the district

* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

court. Ancar v. Sara Plasma, Inc., 964 F.2d 465, 468 (5th Cir. 1992). The unexplained charge that the district court "perjured itself" is without factual basis. See Morrison v. City of Baton Rouge, 761 F.2d 242, 244 (5th Cir. 1985).

Rounsavall has requested that this Court issue a certificate of probable cause and appoint counsel. The motion for a certificate of probable cause is DENIED as having no relevance in a § 1983 suit. The motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED because the requisite "exceptional circumstances" do not exist in this case. See Ulmer v. Chancellor, 691 F.2d 209, 212 (5th Cir. 1982).

AFFIRMED.