## Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 06-2767

WILLIAM RUPPRECHT,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

CITY OF PITTSFIELD, ET AL.,

Defendants, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Hon. Kenneth P. Neiman, U.S. Magistrate Judge]

Before

Boudin, <u>Chief Judge</u>, Campbell, <u>Senior Circuit Judge</u>, and Lynch, <u>Circuit Judge</u>.

<u>William Rupprecht</u> on brief pro se.

<u>Nancy Frankel Pelletier</u> and <u>Robinson Donovan, P.C.</u> on brief for appellees.

May 31, 2007

<u>Per Curiam</u>. After carefully considering the briefs and record on appeal, we affirm the judgment below. <u>McCord</u> v. <u>Horace</u> <u>Mann Ins. Co.</u>, 390 F.3d 138 (1st Cir. 2004)(*de novo* review).

Among other problems, land-use conflicts rarely support constitutional claims. Extreme circumstances are required to support substantive due process or equal protection claims. Exhaustion of state remedies is a prerequisite for procedural due process and Fifth Amendment takings claims. <u>SFW Arecibo, LTD</u> v. <u>Rodriguez</u>, 415 F.3d 135 (1st Cir. 2005). Appellant made no showing that he satisfied any of these requirements.

Affirmed. See 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c).

-2-