
No. 95-4012

Vincent X. Lee,

Appellant,

v.

Dora Schriro; Bill Armontrout;
Steve Long; Lisa Jones; Michael
Groose; Dave Dormire; Gerald
Bommel; Jack Kirk; Vivian Watts; *
Harriet Swinger; Larry Woods;
Davis; Michael L. Plemmons;
Malone; Steve Gilpin; Corum;
Lucretia Bright; Gore; Oxford;
Weaver; Ruppels; Farm and Home
Insurance Company; State Farm
Insurance; All State Insurance,

Appellees.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
* Appeal from the United States
* District Court for the
* Western District of Missouri.
*
* [UNPUBLISHED]
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Submitted: June 7, 1996

Filed: June 11, 1996

Before McMILLIAN, WOLLMAN, and MURPHY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Vincent X. Lee appeals the district court's¹ dismissal of his complaint. Lee alleged twenty-four different defendants violated his state and federal constitutional rights, and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, by placing him in administrative

¹The Honorable Scott O. Wright, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable William A. Knox, United States Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

segregation, by interfering with his practice of religion, and by confiscating and destroying his personal property. On two occasions, the district court ordered Lee to submit a shorter, more readable, and more definite statement of his claims, and to provide facts showing how each defendant violated his constitutional rights; the court indicated failure to comply would result in dismissal. Lee did not comply. The district court dismissed Lee's property claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), and dismissed Lee's remaining claims without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) for failure to comply with court orders. We conclude the district court did not err in dismissing Lee's claims. See Edgington v. Missouri Dep't of Corrections, 52 F.3d 777, 779 (8th Cir. 1995) (no abuse of discretion to dismiss complaint for failure to comply with court order where pro se plaintiff failed to specifically plead how each defendant violated his rights); Orebaugh v. Caspari, 910 F.2d 526, 527 (8th Cir. 1990) (per curiam) (inmate's due process rights were not violated by destruction of property seized from cell because Missouri provided adequate post-deprivation remedy).

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

A true copy.

Attest:

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