

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 11-3472

---

Elsie M. Mayard,

Appellant,

v.

Adam P. Siegfried,

Appellee.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\* Appeal from the United States  
\* District Court for the  
\* District of Minnesota.  
\*  
\* [UNPUBLISHED]  
\*

---

Submitted: June 18, 2012

Filed: June 21, 2012

---

Before WOLLMAN, MELLOY, and SMITH, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

In this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, Elsie Mayard appeals from the district court's<sup>1</sup> judgment based upon an adverse jury verdict, and from the district court's denial of her motion for a new trial. She argues that the district court committed errors at trial, such as improperly excluding evidence, and that the jury verdict was against the weight of the evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable John R. Tunheim, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Because Mayard has not provided a trial transcript, this court cannot rule on the issues she has raised on appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 10(b); Schmid v. United Bhd. of Carpenters and Joiners of Am., 827 F.2d 384, 386 (8th Cir. 1987) (per curiam) (where pro se appellant did not order transcript of trial proceedings as required by Rule 10(b), court could not rule on issues concerning judge's alleged bias, exclusion and admission of evidence, and argument that jury verdict was against weight of evidence).<sup>2</sup>

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

---

---

<sup>2</sup>We note, however, that the available information in the record--including the district court's order denying Mayard's motion for a new trial--strongly suggests that there is no merit to Mayard's arguments on appeal.