

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 96-3730

---

Mary V. Meckel,	*	
	*	
Appellant,	*	
	*	
v.	*	
	*	
University of Arkansas, at	*	
Monticello,	*	
	*	Appeal from the United States
Appellees,	*	District Court for the
	*	Eastern District of Arkansas.
Jack Lassiter, Executive	*	
Vice Chancellor,	*	[UNPUBLISHED]
	*	
Appellees,	*	
	*	
John N. Short, Chairman,	*	
Division of Social Sciences	*	
	*	
Appellees.	*	

---

Submitted: May 2, 1997

Filed: May 20, 1997

---

Before McMILLIAN, FAGG, and LOKEN, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Mary V. Meckel appeals from the final order entered in the District Court<sup>1</sup> for the Eastern District of Arkansas denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(2) motion for relief from judgment. The

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable James Maxwell Moody, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

district court found that Meckel's proffered expert testimony did not constitute newly discovered evidence which could not have been timely discovered by due diligence. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion. See Mitchell v. Shalala, 48 F.3d 1039, 1041 (8th Cir. 1995) (standard of review; movant must show due diligence, among other things). Accordingly, we affirm.

A true copy.

Attest:

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