

[NOT FOR PUBLICATION-NOT TO BE CITED AS PRECEDENT]

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 99-1243

DANIEL R. STANTON,
Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND DURPHY, CUMBERLAND COUNTY
JAIL PROPERTY CORPORAL,

Defendants, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE

[Hon. Gene Carter, U.S. District Judge]

Before

Torruella, Chief Judge,
Selya and Stahl, Circuit Judges.

Daniel R. Stanton on brief pro se.

May 9, 2000

Per Curiam. After a thorough review of the record and of the appellant's submissions, we affirm. Contrary to appellant Daniel R. Stanton's ("Stanton's") contention, the record clearly shows that the district court did dispose of his motions for judgment (docket nos. 55 & 57) by striking them for non-compliance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 5. Stanton has made no showing that the court's decision to award relief pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b) prejudiced him or that the delay adversely affected the proceedings, see Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. Partnership, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993), so we find no abuse of discretion. See Sea-Land Serv., Inc. v. Ceramica Europa II, Inc., 160 F.3d 849, 852 (1st Cir. 1998) (order of relief under Rule 60(b) reviewed for abuse of discretion). Stanton's claim that defendants/appellees failed to comply with a discovery order is unsupported by any explanation as to why the materials in question were important to his case or in what way they could have changed the outcome of the litigation, so the argument is forfeited. See Martinez v. Colon, 54 F.3d 980, 990 (1st Cir. 1995).

Affirmed. 1st Cir. Loc. R. 27(c).