

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 28, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 18-60601

Summary Calendar

PATRICK L. KING,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

JAMES HOOD, State Attorney General; PATRICK BEASLEY, State Assistant Attorney General; LEE MCDIVITT, State Attorney General Investigator; AL FARRISH, JR., HPD Investigator; LAMAR PICKARD, Copiah County Circuit Judge; THERESA LUMLEY, Copiah County Official Court Reporter; CHRISTOPHER EPPS, Former Mississippi Department of Corrections Commissioner; SHERRY ROBINSON, Former Director of Records; EVELYN DIXON, Project Officer III; ELISHA CARMICHAEL; BOBBY MOAK, Former Representative; GEORGE FLAGGS, Former State Representative; WILLIE BAILEY, Representative,

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Mississippi
USDC No. 3:17-CV-859

Before SMITH, DENNIS, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-60601

Proceeding *pro se*, Patrick L. King sued state officials in October 2017 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968, seeking redress for alleged wrongs arising out of his 2012–13 arrests, conviction, and sentencing for pirating DVDs and CDs under state law. The district court granted the defendants’ motions to dismiss on various grounds, including that his suit was untimely under the applicable three-year Mississippi statute of limitations and the four-year statute of limitations for civil RICO claims. *See Cuvillier v. Taylor*, 503 F.3d 397, 401 (5th Cir. 2007); *Corwin v. Marney, Orton Invs.*, 843 F.2d 194, 199 (5th Cir. 1999). King timely appealed.

We review dismissals under Rule 12(b)(6) *de novo*. *Smith v. Hood*, 900 F.3d 180, 184 (5th Cir. 2018). We may affirm on any ground supported by the record. *R2 Invs. LDC v. Phillips*, 401 F.3d 638, 642 (5th Cir. 2005). Review of the record and King’s briefs filed in this appeal show no error in the district court’s conclusion that his suit was time-barred. Insofar as King argues that limitations should be tolled due to fraudulent concealment, *see Ross v. Citifinancial, Inc.*, 344 F.3d 458, 463-64 (5th Cir. 2003), this argument fails because King fails to allege any particular acts of concealment on the part of the defendants. The district court’s judgment is **AFFIRMED**, and all outstanding motions are **DENIED**.