

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 19-1099

Richard Hoeft

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Nathan Eide; William Nixon; Laura Auron; Russell Conrow; Pat Hondl

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of Minnesota

Submitted: 11/14/2019

Filed: 11/22/2019

[Unpublished]

Before GRUENDER, WOLLMAN, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Richard Hoeft appeals the district court's¹ adverse grant of summary judgment in his pro se action asserting a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim under the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the United States Constitution against Nathan Eide, William Nixon, Laura Auron, Russell Conrow, and Pat Hondl in their individual capacities.² After de novo review, we conclude that summary judgment was proper for the reasons stated by the district court. See Odom v. Kaizer, 864 F.3d 920, 921 (8th Cir. 2017) (grant of summary judgment is reviewed de novo; summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine issue of material fact and party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law; evidence is viewed and all reasonable inferences are drawn in nonmoving party's favor). Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹The Honorable Michael J. Davis, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, adopting the report and recommendation of the Honorable Leo I. Brisbois, United States Magistrate Judge for the District of Minnesota.

²Hoeft does not challenge the adverse grant of summary judgment on his breach of contract, defamation, retaliation, and conspiracy claims. See United States v. Wearing, 837 F.3d 905, 906 n.6 (8th Cir. 2004) (claim is waived on appeal where it is not meaningfully argued in opening brief).