

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 19-1618

R. Stark Ligon, Jr., as Executive Director of the Supreme Court Committee on
Professional Conduct

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Teresa Lynette Bloodman, Attorney at Law, ABN 2005055

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Arkansas - Little Rock

Submitted: December 16, 2019

Filed: December 18, 2019

[Unpublished]

Before STRAS, WOLLMAN, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Teresa Bloodman appeals the district court's¹ order remanding her disbarment proceeding to Arkansas state court. We have jurisdiction to review the remand order because it involves a removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1443 (civil action commenced in state court can be removed to federal court when action is against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in state court any law providing for equal rights of United States citizens). See 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (order remanding case to state court is not reviewable unless case was removed pursuant to, inter alia, § 1443).

We conclude that remand was proper because Bloodman failed to show that she met the requirements for removal under § 1443, as she did not show that, due to state law or an equivalent basis, she will be denied, or cannot enforce, her federal rights in state court. See Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., v. Ganon, 913 F.3d 704, 707 (8th Cir. 2019) (grant of motion to remand is reviewed de novo); Neal v. Wilson, 112 F.3d 351, 355 (8th Cir. 1997) (removal under § 1443 is warranted only if, inter alia, it can be predicted by reference to law of general application that party will be denied, or cannot enforce, federal rights in state court; in unusual case, equivalent basis could be shown for “equally firm prediction” that party will be denied, or cannot enforce, federal rights in state court). Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹The Honorable Kristine G. Baker, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.