

PER CURIAM.

Former Missouri inmate Wasim Aziz brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action claiming that prison personnel retaliated against him for filing grievances--thereby chilling his right of free speech and violating due process, the Eighth Amendment, and state law--when they disciplined him for language he had used in the grievances. He also claimed that he was denied adequate medical care. The district court¹ dismissed his complaint, without prejudice, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Aziz appeals.

After de novo review, see Moore v. Sims, 200 F.3d 1170, 1171 (8th Cir. 2000) (per curiam), we agree with the district court that Aziz failed to state a section 1983 claim based on disciplinary action, see Cowans v. Warren, 150 F.3d 910, 912 (8th Cir. 1998) (per curiam) (where inmate breaks prison rule by using abusive and insulting language that is unnecessary to advance his grievance, discipline for use of offensive language does not raise claim of retaliation or other constitutional violation). We also agree that Aziz failed to state a section 1983 claim regarding his medical care, because he did not sufficiently allege defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical need. See Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976); Dulany v. Carnahan, 132 F.3d 1234, 1239 (8th Cir. 1997); Bellecourt v. United States, 994 F.2d 427, 431 (8th Cir. 1993), cert. denied, 510 U.S. 1109 (1994). Finally, we hold that the district court did not err in declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any pendent state law claim. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3).

Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹The Honorable Donald J. Stohr, District Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

A true copy.

Attest:

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