## **United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_

		<del></del>
	No. 11-2:	558
Curtis James Neeley, Jr., MFA,	*	
Appellant,	*	
V.	*	
NameMedia, Inc.,	*	
Appellee,	*	Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Network Solutions,	*	Western District of Arkansas.
Defendant,	*	[UNPUBLISHED]
Google, Inc.,	*	
Appellee.	*	
	*	
NameMedia, Inc.,	* *	
Counter Claimant,	*	
V.	* *	
Curtis James Neeley, Jr., MFA,	*	
Counter Defendant.	*	

Submitted: February 3, 2012 Filed: February 15, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_

Before BYE, COLLOTON, and GRUENDER, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM.

Following the adverse resolution of his civil action, Curtis Neeley appeals the district court's dismissal of certain claims, and the court's refusal to allow amendment of his complaint. Upon careful review, we conclude that dismissal of his 17 U.S.C. § 106A claims was proper for the reasons stated by the district court in its June 7, 2011 order denying Neeley's motion for reconsideration. We also conclude that the court did not abuse its discretion in denying Neeley further leave to amend after he filed a second amended complaint, as the proposed amendments he highlights on appeal would have been futile. See Dennis v. Dillard Dep't Stores, Inc., 207 F.3d 523, 525 (8th Cir. 2000). Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas.