

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 96-4228EA

---

Perry Galloway, Jr.,

\*

\*

Appellant,

\*

\*

v.

\*

\*

Johnny Harris, Rural Economic and

\*

Community Development Services,

\*

United States Department of

\*

Agriculture, August, Arkansas; George

\*

Irwin, Sr., State Director, Rural

\*

Economic and Community Development

\*

Services, United States Department of

\*

Agriculture, Jackson, Mississippi;

\*

Freddy E. Robertson, Rural Economic

\*

and Community Development Services,

\*

United States Department of

\*

Agriculture, Jackson, Mississippi;

\*

Michael L. Dunaway, State Director,

\*

Rural Economic and Community

\*

Development Services, United States

\*

Department of Agriculture, Little Rock,

\*

Arkansas; Marvin Sutterfield, Rural

\*

Economic and Community Development

\*

Services, United States Department of

\*

Agriculture, Little Rock, Arkansas; A.

\*

Rodney Johnson, AgCredit Manager,

\*

Yazoo County, Mississippi FSA Office;

\*

S. D. Reagan, FSA District Director 3;

\*

Billy R. Manning, Inventory Property

\*

Specialist, Farm Service Agency,

\*

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

[UNPUBLISHED]

USDA; Norris Faust, State Executive \*  
Director, Farm Service Agency, USDA, \*  
\*  
Appellees. \*

---

Submitted: October 28, 1997  
Filed: November 3, 1997

---

Before FAGG, BOWMAN, and MURPHY, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Perry Galloway, Jr. appeals the district court's adverse grant of summary judgment in Galloway's mandamus action against Johnny Harris and other United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) officials. Galloway sought to exercise an option to purchase land formerly owned by his father, see 7 U.S.C. § 1985(e)(1)(A)(iv) (1994) (repealed 1996), claiming he qualified for the option because he held an oral sublease to the land from the USDA. Having carefully reviewed the record, we agree with the district court that Galloway failed to establish the existence of an oral sublease. Because an extended opinion would serve no useful purpose in this fact-based dispute, we affirm without further discussion. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

A true copy.

Attest:

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