
No. 95-3368EM

Robert Goerger, *

Appellant,

v.

St. Charles County, MO; Edward
J. Uebinger, former Sheriff,
St. Charles County Sheriff's
Department; R. Neupert; Evelyn
M. Cruz; Karen A. Mattson; City
of St. Charles, MO; Mark
Ehrhard; Michele A. Cork,

Appellees.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Appeal from the United States
District Court for the Eastern
District of Missouri.

[UNPUBLISHED]

Submitted: April 5, 1996

Filed: April 22, 1996

Before FAGG, BOWMAN, and HANSEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Robert Goerger appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of appellees in Goerger's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Goerger contends he was arrested and prosecuted without probable cause for inflicting damage on his former wife's car and leaving the scene of an accident, various appellees conspired to deprive him of his civil rights incidental to his arrest and prosecution, and municipal and supervisory appellees failed to supervise the arresting officers. Goerger also asserted state law claims.

Following our de novo review of the record, we conclude the district court correctly resolved each of Goerger's claims, and an

opinion by this court would have no precedential value. We agree with the district court's conclusion that the police acted with probable cause, and appellees did not conspire or otherwise violate Goerger's civil rights. The arresting officers were entitled to rely on the information supplied by the victim of the crime, supported by another witness, absent some indication the information was not reasonably trustworthy or reliable. See Clay v. Conlee, 815 F.2d 1164, 1168 (8th Cir. 1987) (concerning standard of probable cause to arrest); White v. Walsh, 649 F.2d 560, 561-62 (8th Cir. 1981) (concerning requirements of conspiracy claim). Summary judgment was properly entered on the supervisory-liability claims because the allegations were conclusory and predicated on Goerger's unlawful-arrest theory. See Moody v. St. Charles Co., 23 F.3d 1410, 1412 (8th Cir. 1994). Finally, the district court correctly declined to exercise jurisdiction over Goerger's pendent state law claims.

We thus affirm the judgment of the district court.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.