



Brad H. Sidles appeals following the district court's<sup>1</sup> adverse judgment in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Having carefully reviewed the record, we conclude the district court was correct in finding it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over Sidles's complaint, which we agree amounted to a will contest. See Krueger v. Farmers and Merchants Bank of Hannibal, Mo., 721 F.2d 640, 641 (8th Cir. 1983) (per curiam); see also Hagerty v. Succession of Clement, 749 F.2d 217, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1984) (“a plaintiff may not seek a reversal of a state court judgment simply by casting his complaint in the form of a civil rights action”; rejecting claim that state trial court denied plaintiff due process in will-contest action, and upholding dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state claim), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 968 (1985). Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is affirmed. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

A true copy.

Attest:

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

---

<sup>1</sup>The HONORABLE THOMAS M. SHANAHAN, United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.