



PER CURIAM.

Nebraska inmate Gary Brunzo brought this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, claiming that his continued placement in administrative confinement violated his Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. The district court<sup>1</sup> granted defendants summary judgment, and denied Brunzo's motion for reconsideration. Brunzo appeals. After careful review of the record, we affirm.

Under our cases, the alleged conditions of Brunzo's confinement simply do not amount to an atypical and significant hardship relative to the ordinary incidents of prison life. See Portley-El v. Brill, 288 F.3d 1063, 1065 (8th Cir. 2002); Kennedy v. Blankenship, 100 F.3d 640, 642-43 & n.2 (8th Cir. 1996). As a result, summary judgment was appropriate, and the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying reconsideration, see Smith v. Chem. Leaman Tank Lines, Inc., 285 F.3d 750, 752 (8th Cir. 2002) (standard of review for motion for reconsideration).

Accordingly, we affirm.

A true copy.

Attest:

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

---

<sup>1</sup>The HONORABLE RICHARD G. KOPF, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.