

No. 10-3598

[UNPUBLISHED]

Appellate Case: 10-3598 Page: 1 Date Filed: 07/08/2011 Entry ID: 3805514

Jeff and Tammy Sutherland appeal following the district court's¹ adverse grant of summary judgment in their 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Following careful review, we conclude that the district court (1) properly granted summary judgment for the reasons expressed by the court; (2) did not abuse its discretion in denying the Sutherlands' motion to amend their complaint, which they filed almost a year after the amendment deadline and while dispositive motions were pending; and (3) did not err in denying as moot the Sutherlands' motion for partial summary judgment on the new claim that they sought to add in an amended complaint. See Bell v. Kansas City Police Dep't, 635 F.3d 346, 347 (8th Cir. 2011) (per curiam) (summary judgment standard of review); Deutsche Fin. Servs. Corp. v. BCS Ins. Co., 299 F.3d 692, 700 (8th Cir. 2002) (standard of review of denial of motion to amend complaint).² Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹ The Honorable Richard E. Dorr, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

²We decline to consider those claims that the Sutherlands have abandoned, see Griffith v. City of Des Moines, 387 F.3d 733, 739 (8th Cir. 2004), or the issues they have not meaningfully briefed, see Meyers v. Starke, 420 F.3d 738, 743 (8th Cir. 2005).