

December 6, 2011

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Elisabeth A. Shumaker  
Clerk of Court

## TENTH CIRCUIT

EBRAHIM ADKINS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

RICK ARMSTRONG, Chief of Police,  
Kansas City, Kansas Police Department,  
in his dual capacity; GREG LAWSON,  
Internal Affairs, Kansas City, Kansas  
Police Department, in his dual capacity;  
MIKE MCLIN, Vehicles Administrator,  
Kansas Department of Revenue, in his  
dual capacity; JOHN SMITH, Vehicles  
Administrator, Kansas Department of  
Revenue, in his dual capacity; AARON  
ROBERTS, Municipal Court Judge,  
Wyandotte County Courthouse, in his dual  
capacity; JEROME GORMAN, District  
Attorney, Wyandotte County Courthouse,  
in his dual capacity,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 11-3225  
(D.C. No. 5:11-CV-03053-SAC)  
(D. Kansas)

---

ORDER AND JUDGMENT\*

---

Before **O'BRIEN**, **McKAY**, and **TYMKOVICH**, Circuit Judges.

---

---

\* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

After examining Plaintiff's brief and the appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). This case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

Plaintiff Ebrahim Adkins appeals from the district court's dismissal of his § 1983 complaint against various state officials. In his complaint, Plaintiff alleged that his constitutional rights were violated by the Kansas City Municipal Court's refusal to file motions he submitted in four cases. The district court concluded that Plaintiff's complaint lacked sufficient factual support to state any plausible claim against any defendant, and the court also noted that some of the damages sought in the complaint were barred by various immunities. The district court granted Plaintiff an opportunity to file an amended complaint addressing these deficiencies. Although Plaintiff filed an amended complaint, it was again devoid of specific factual allegations, containing only conclusory claims and citations to legal authorities. The district court accordingly dismissed the complaint for the same reasons stated in its earlier order.

After thoroughly reviewing Plaintiff's brief and the record on appeal, we see no error in the district court's rulings. We therefore **AFFIRM** the dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint for substantially the same reasons stated by the district court. We **DENY** Petitioner's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal and instruct him to

immediately pay the remaining unpaid balance of his appellate filing fee.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

Monroe G. McKay  
Circuit Judge