

PER CURIAM.

William Simpson Edwards appeals the district court's¹ judgment granting defendants summary judgment, and denying Edwards's motions for leave to amend his complaint and for an injunction, in his pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action.

Following careful de novo review, see Mason v. Corr. Med. Servs., Inc., 559 F.3d 880, 884 (8th Cir. 2009) (summary judgment standard of review), we find no basis for reversal. We also find that the court did not abuse its discretion in denying leave to amend the complaint, see Popp Telcom v. Am. Sharecom, Inc., 210 F.3d 928, 943 (8th Cir. 2000) (where amendment would likely result in burdens of additional discovery and delay to proceedings, court usually does not abuse its discretion in denying leave to amend); or in denying Edwards's request for an injunction, see Hinz v. Neuroscience, Inc., 538 F.3d 979, 986 (8th Cir. 2008) (standard of review); Bank One, Utah v. Guttau, 190 F.3d 844, 847 (8th Cir. 1999) (factors considered in ruling on request for permanent injunction). Accordingly, the judgment is affirmed.

¹The Honorable John A. Jarvey, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.