

Before RICHARD S. ARNOLD, BOWMAN, and BEAM

PER CURIAM.

Michael Schneider, an Arkansas inmate, appeals from the district court's¹ order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action following an evidentiary hearing. After reviewing the record and the parties' briefs, see Choate v. Lockhart, 7 F.3d 1370, 1373 & n.1 (8th Cir. 1993) (standard of review), we conclude the district court did not err in dismissing Schneider's First Amendment claim, because the grooming policy at issue was reasonable under the four factors enumerated in Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 89-91 (1987). See Dunavent v. Moore, 907 F.2d 77, 79 (8th Cir. 1990). In addition, we conclude the district court did not err in dismissing Schneider's equal protection claim, see Rouse v. Benson, 193 F.3d 936, 942-43 (8th Cir. 1999), or his Eighth Amendment claim, see Berryhill v. Schriro, 137 F.3d 1073, 1076 (8th Cir. 1998). Accordingly, we affirm.

A true copy.

Attest:

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

¹The Honorable William R. Wilson, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable Jerry Cavaneau, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.