United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 08-1457

_____

Kendrick Harris,	*
	*
Appellant,	*
	*
	* Appeal from the United States
v.	* District Court for the
	* Eastern District of Missouri.
Forest Park Hospital; Forest Park	*
Hospital Security John Does 1-6;	* [UNPUBLISHED]
St. Louis Police Department/Sublett	*
Station,	*
	*
Defendants,	*
	*
John Doe, Sergeant; John Doe, Police	*
Officer; Jane Doe, Police Officer,	*
	*
Appellees,	*
	*
St. Louis City Justice Center	*
Processing,	*
	*
Defendant,	*
	*
Unknown Collins, Nurse; Unknown	*
Sims, Nurse; Unknown Hill, Nurse,	*
	*
Appellees,	*

```
                                           *
St. Louis City Justice Center Medical      *
Department; Unknown Smith, St. Louis       *
City Justice Center Social Worker,         *
                                           *
            Defendants.                    *
```

_____

Submitted: June 5, 2009
Filed: June 24, 2009

_____

Before BYE, COLLOTON, and GRUENDER, Circuit Judges.

_____

PER CURIAM.

Kendrick Harris appeals the district court's[1] dismissal without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion because Harris failed to comply with the court's order directing him to provide the names and addresses for defendants, even after being granted two extensions of time to do so. See Smith v. Gold Dust Casino, 526 F.3d 402, 404-05 (8th Cir. 2008) (standard of review); Farnsworth v. Kansas City, Mo., 863 F.2d 33, 34 (8th Cir. 1988) (per curiam) (pro se litigants are not excused from complying with court orders); Schooley v. Kennedy, 712 F.2d 372, 374 (8th Cir. 1983) (per curiam) (fact that Rule 41(b) dismissal is without prejudice mitigates against finding abuse of discretion). We further conclude the court did not abuse its discretion in denying appointment of counsel. See Stevens

---

[1]The Honorable Carol E. Jackson, then Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

v. Redwing, 146 F.3d 538, 546 (8th Cir. 1998) (standard of review; relevant factors include complexity of case, ability of plaintiff to investigate facts and present claims, and existence of conflicting testimony).

Accordingly, we affirm.

_____