

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-4009

James Frederick Newport,

*

*

Appellant,

*

*

v.

*

*

Deborah L. Babbit; International
United Auto, Aerospace and
Agricultural Implement Workers of
America, Local 249; Ford Motor
Company; Dr. John Amick; Gari
Alumbaugh; Andy Anderson; Don
Breckdon; Chester Carson; Dan
Danner; Shad Dowlatshia; Victor
Dumas; Leslie Elliot; Larry Foreman;
Ron Fue; John Gregory;

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

* Appeal from the United States

* District Court for the Western

* District of Missouri.

*

Appellees,

Marian Geldersma,

*

[UNPUBLISHED]

*

Defendant,

*

*

Edward E. Hales; John Huston;
William Jordon; Jerry Kline; Julee
Murphy; Ronald Mickey; Thomas
Murphy; Tina Matix; Park College;
Kathy Perry; Lou Papalas; Richard
Reynolds; Maria Roath; Thomas
Ronning; Stevens Samual; Francis
Matt Snell; James R. Schaffer; John

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

Smith; Paul Sanberg; Harly John *
Tucking; John Terry; Theresa *
Tamburello; Princie Wallingford; *
James Young, *
Appellees. *

Submitted: December 31, 1997

Filed: January 14, 1998

Before McMILLIAN, BEAM, and MORRIS SHEPPARD ARNOLD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Former military reservist James F. Newport sued Ford Motor Company, the International United Auto, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Local 249, Park College, and several individuals, alleging that defendants participated in a pattern of threatening and harassing activities directed against him in violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c), and that defendants conspired to prevent him from performing his duties as a federal officer in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(1). The district court¹ granted defendants' motions for summary judgment, and Newport appeals. After careful review of the record and the parties' briefs, we conclude that no error of law appears, and that an

¹The Honorable Fernando J. Gaitan, Jr., United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

extended opinion would lack precedential value. Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

A true copy.

Attest:

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