

alleging claims under both 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state law. The defendants removed the action to federal court and then moved to dismiss the complaint under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The district court granted their motion, concluding that the release barred Petersen's § 1983 claim. It then declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his state-law claims. Petersen argues on appeal, as he did below, that the release is unenforceable because it lacks consideration and that he did not voluntarily execute the release due to economic duress.

After carefully considering the record, the briefs of the parties, and the applicable law, we agree with the judgment of the district court. Because the reasoning that supports the dismissal of Petersen's claims has been clearly articulated by the district court in a thorough and comprehensive opinion, the issuance of a detailed written opinion by this court would be unduly duplicative. Accordingly, the judgment rendered by the Honorable Janet T. Neff, United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, is **AFFIRMED** on the basis of the reasoning detailed in her Opinion and Order dated August 10, 2010.