

PER CURIAM.

Charles Armstrong appeals following the district court's¹ dismissal of his pro se civil rights action against numerous defendants, and the court's subsequent denial of leave to amend. After careful review of the record, we conclude Mr. Armstrong's complaint was frivolous and failed to state a claim for the reasons given by the district court. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii) (action subject to dismissal if it is frivolous or fails to state claim upon which relief may be granted). We also conclude the court, having twice accepted Armstrong's amended complaints, did not abuse its discretion in denying him further leave to amend, subsequent to dismissal of his action. See Humphreys v. Roche Biomedical Labs., Inc., 990 F.2d 1078, 1081-82 (8th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47A(a).

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

¹The Honorable Jean C. Hamilton, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.