

official and individual capacity as *
member of the Fort Smith School *
Board; Ann Dawson, in her official and *
individual capacity as member of the *
Fort Smith School Board; Barbara *
Hathcock, in her official and individual *
capacity as member of the Fort Smith *
School Board; Wyman R. Wade, in his *
official and individual capacity as *
member of the Fort Smith School *
Board; Yvonne Keaton-Martin, in her *
official and individual capacity as *
member of the Fort Smith School *
Board; University of Arkansas, at Fort *
Smith; City of Fort Smith, Arkansas; *
Ray Thornton, individually and in his *
official capacity as a Justice of the *
Arkansas Supreme Court; Betty Dickey, *
individually and in her official capacity *
as a Justice for the Arkansas Supreme *
Court; Robert Brown, in his individual *
and official capacity as a Justice of the *
Arkansas Supreme Court; Tom Glaze, *
in his individual and official capacity *
as a Justice of the Arkansas Supreme *
Court; W. H. Arnold, in his individual *
and official capacity as a Justice of the *
Arkansas Supreme Court; Donald L. *
Corbin, in his individual and official *
capacity as a Justice of the Arkansas *
Supreme Court; Annabelle Clinton *
Imber, in her individual and official *
capacity as a Justice of the Arkansas *
Supreme Court; Jim Hannah, in his *
individual and official capacity as a *
Justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court; *
James Mitch Llewellyn, *

Appellees. *

Submitted: April 27, 2006
Filed: May 5, 2006

Before ARNOLD, BYE, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Buck D. Jones (Buck) appeals the district court's¹ dismissal of an action he and his wife Robbie R. Jones, now deceased, brought under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985. Having conducted de novo review of the record, see Gisslen v. City of Crystal, Minn., 345 F.3d 624, 626-27 (8th Cir. 2003) (determination as to subject matter jurisdiction is reviewed de novo), cert. denied, 541 U.S. 960 (2004), we conclude that the Joneses' illegal-exaction claim--the only claim Buck addresses in his brief, and thus the only one before us--was barred under the Rooker-Feldman² doctrine, see Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 125 S. Ct. 1517, 1521-22 (2005) (Rooker-Feldman doctrine applies to cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before federal proceedings were commenced, and inviting federal district courts to review and reject those judgments). Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B. We deny both the University of Arkansas at Fort Smith's motion for sanctions and Buck's request to disqualify the University's counsel.

¹The Honorable G. Thomas Eisele, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, sitting by designation.

²See D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); Rooker v. Fid. Trust, 263 U.S. 413 (1923).