

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

---

No. 14-30133  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

July 24, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

ALBERT L. WILLIS; PAULINE WILLIS,

Plaintiffs – Appellants,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; JANET NAPOLITANO, Secretary;  
THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; THE FEDERAL  
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY; LIBBY TURNER; ANN  
CHARLTON; SMITTY BELL; KURTIS MELNICK,

Defendants – Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Louisiana  
No. 3:11-CV-708

---

Before DAVIS, SMITH, and ELROD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Plaintiffs Albert L. Willis and Pauline Willis filed suit under Title VII of the Civil Rights act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, *et seq.* (“Title VII”) alleging claims of race discrimination, gender discrimination, and retaliation

---

\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 14-30133

after Albert Willis was terminated from his position from a Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) Louisiana Transitional Recovery Office.

Plaintiffs argued that Albert Willis was treated less favorably than similarly situated employees outside of his protected class. Defendants responded by noting that all members of Albert Willis’s employment group were terminated at the same time because their positions were no longer needed as the post-Katrina recovery efforts began to wind down. In a well-reasoned and detailed opinion, the district court granted summary judgment to Defendants on Plaintiffs’ claims. The district court explained that Plaintiffs failed to point to evidence to raise a fact issue that any similarly situated individuals were treated differently. The district court further held that Plaintiffs failed to point to evidence of the causal connect necessary to support the retaliation claim. The district court subsequently denied Plaintiffs’ motions to compel discovery after finding that the requested responses had either already been produced, or that the requests were vague, over-broad, and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Plaintiffs appealed, arguing that summary judgment should not have been granted on his claims and requesting further discovery. For the reasons given by the district court, we AFFIRM.