

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

No. 10-3598

Jeff Sutherland; *
Tammy Sutherland, *
*
Appellants, *

v. *

Appeal from the United States
District Court for the Western
District of Missouri.

Brian Massa, in his official and *
individual capacity; Lisa McCool, in *
her official and individual capacity; *
Robert Evenson, in his official and *
individual capacity; McDonald County *
911 Center; Don O'Brien, in his *
official and individual capacity; *
Timothy Miller, in his official capacity; *
Ted Huston, in his official capacity; *
Richard Huston, in his official capacity; *
Bill Anderson, in his official capacity; *
Ozzy Amos, in his official capacity; *
Danny Malcom, in his official capacity, *
*
Appellees. *

[UNPUBLISHED]

Submitted: June 29, 2011
Filed: July 8, 2011

Before BYE, ARNOLD, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

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).