

[NOT FOR PUBLICATION-NOT TO BE CITED AS PRECEDENT]

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 01-1160

RICHARD PACHECO,
Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

MASSACHUSETTS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, NEW BEDFORD EDUCATORS
ASSOCIATION, JEAN DUVAL, MATTHEW D. JONES,
ARTHUR J. CARON, NEW BEDFORD SCHOOL COMMITTEE,
JOSEPH S. SILVA, CYNTHIA BARBOZA, KEVIN J. FINNERTY,
JOAQUIM NOBREGA, CARLOS PACHECO, J. MARK TREADUP,
RONALD J. WALSH, AND FREDERICK J. KALISZ, JR.,

Defendants, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Hon. Mark L. Wolf, U.S. District Judge]

Before

Boudin, Chief Judge,
Selya and Lynch, Circuit Judges.

Richard Pacheco on brief pro se.
Donald J. Siegel, Elizabeth A. Sloane and Segal, Roitman &

Coleman on brief for appellees Massachusetts Teachers Association, New Bedford Educators Association, Matthew D. Jones and Jean Duval.

Jonathan M. Silverstein and Kopelman and Paige, P.C. on brief for appellees Arthur J. Caron, New Bedford School Committee, Joseph S. Silva, Cynthia Barboza, Kevin J. Finnerty, Jaquim Nobrega, Carlos Pacheco, J. Mark Treadup, Ronald J. Walsh, and Frederick M. Kalisz, Jr.

SEPTEMBER 21, 2001

Per Curiam. Richard Pacheco appeals from an adverse judgment in his civil rights suit against various defendants. In pertinent part, Pacheco, who is a public school employee subject to a collective bargaining agreement between the school committee defendant and the union defendant, claimed that he had been suspended without pay for five days in violation of his federal due process rights after he failed to pay the service fee required by the collective bargaining agreement. The district judge granted certain defendants' motion to dismiss when Pacheco did not file a timely opposition,¹ and he granted the remaining defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings in a Memorandum and Order dated September 29, 2000. We affirm, essentially for the reasons given by the district judge in his Memorandum and Order and for the reasons given by the defendants in their appellate briefs.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed.

See Loc. R. 27(c).

¹In response to defendants' motion, the judge later struck a belated opposition. On appeal, Pacheco has not contended that the judge abused his discretion, or otherwise erred, in striking his opposition.