



Inmate Harold Hobbs appeals following the district court's<sup>1</sup> adverse grant of summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Having carefully reviewed the record, we agree with the reasons the district court gave for granting summary judgment to all defendants but Dr. Jack Stewart, see Mason v. Corr. Med. Servs., Inc., 559 F. 880, 884-85 (8th Cir. 2009) (de novo review), and with the reasons the court gave for dismissing the claims against Dr. Stewart following an evidentiary hearing.<sup>2</sup> We also conclude that the procedures employed by the magistrate judge and the district court were consistent with the Seventh Amendment and our precedent. See Johnson v. Bi-State Justice Center, 12 F.3d 133, 135-36 (8th Cir. 1993). The district court is affirmed. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

---

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Brian S. Miller, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable H. David Young, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

<sup>2</sup>We consider only the Eighth Amendment claims arising from the alleged delay in treating Hobbs's tooth, as he addresses only these claims in his opening brief. See W3i Mobile, LLC v. Westchester Fire Ins. Co., 632 F.3d 432, 437-38 (8th Cir. 2011).