
Before McMILLIAN, LOKEN, and MURPHY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In July 1997, the district court¹ granted, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), defendant prison officials' motion to terminate a 1986 consent decree entered into between the Missouri Department of Corrections and a class of prisoners confined in the Missouri Eastern Correctional Center. In September 1997, inmate Billy Mudd, who was not a named plaintiff in the class action suit, filed a Rule 60(b) motion to set aside the order terminating the consent decree, arguing that not a single plaintiff had been served with notice of the motion to terminate. The district court summarily denied Mudd's motion, as well as Mudd's subsequent Rule 59(e) motion. Inmate Donald Moore, who was also not an original named plaintiff, appeals the denials of Mudd's Rule 60(b) and 59(e) motions. He also has moved to substitute another inmate in his place to act as "counsel" for the class.

We conclude that Moore has no standing to appeal the denial of Mudd's motions. *Cf. Croyden Assocs. v. Alleco, Inc.*, 969 F.2d 675, 680 (8th Cir. 1992) (unnamed class member must first move to intervene as condition for standing to appeal final order approving class action settlement or imposing judgment), *cert. denied*, 507 U.S. 908 (1993); *Hamm v. Groose*, 15 F.3d 110, 112 (8th Cir. 1994) (inmate may not bring claim on behalf of other inmate who is able to bring claim). We deny Moore's motion to substitute all class members as appellants and for an inmate to act as counsel for the class.

¹The Honorable Stephen N. Limbaugh, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal.

A true copy.

Attest:

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