



Board of Architects; Jeff Shannon, \*  
in his official capacity as a member of \*  
the Arkansas State Board of Architects; \*  
Larry Jegley, in his official capacity as \*  
prosecuting attorney for Pulaski \*  
County, Arkansas and the Sixth \*  
Judicial District on behalf of himself \*  
and other similarly situated persons; \*  
Mike Beebe, in his official capacity \*  
as Attorney General for the state of \*  
Arkansas, \*  
\*  
Appellees. \*

---

Submitted: July 7, 2004  
Filed: July 27, 2004

---

Before MELLOY, HANSEN, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Robert D. Holloway appeals the district court's<sup>1</sup> dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action as barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. See Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923); Dist. of Columbia Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983). After *de novo* review, see Charchenko v. City of Stillwater, 47 F.3d 981, 982-83 (8th Cir. 1995), we agree with the district court that it lacked jurisdiction, because Holloway's federal complaint raised constitutional challenges already decided by the Arkansas Supreme Court, albeit in a non-section 1983 action. See Bechtold v. City of Rosemount, 104 F.3d 1062, 1065 (8th Cir. 1997) (litigant cannot

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Susan Webber Wright, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

circumvent Rooker-Feldman by recasting lawsuit as § 1983 action). Holloway's claims for declaratory and injunctive relief were also barred, because any grant of relief would require the district court to make conclusions directly contrary to the decision of the state supreme court. See Lemonds v. St. Louis County, 222 F.3d 488, 492 (8th Cir. 2000) (Rooker-Feldman bars indirect attempts to undermine state-court judgments); Keene Corp. v. Cass, 908 F.2d 293, 297 (8th Cir. 1990) (Rooker-Feldman doctrine applies to claims for declaratory and injunctive relief).

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

---