## [NOT FOR PUBLICATION-NOT TO BE CITED AS PRECEDENT]

## **United States Court of Appeals**For the First Circuit

No. 99-1995

A.G. EDWARDS, JR.,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

STEPHEN BROWN; HAROLD F. PEARSON, III; WILLIAM R. GORDON; THOMAS

L. MCKIERNAN; ARTHUR DUNCAN; PRINCE A. HAWKINS; HAWKINS, RHODES

AND SHARP; JOHN G. MCELWEE, OR THE ESTATE OF,

Defendants, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Hon. Douglas P. Woodlock, <u>U.S. District Judge</u>]

Before

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

A.G. Edwards, Jr. on brief pro se.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>John G. Fabiano</u>, <u>G. Perry Wu</u>, and <u>Hale and Dorr LLP</u> on brief for defendants Stephen Brown, William R. Gordon, and the Estate of John G. McElwee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>William C. Saturley</u> and <u>Nelson, Kinder, Mosseau, & Saturley,</u>
<u>PC</u> on brief for defendants Prince A. Hawkins and the Firm of Hawkins, Rhodes & Sharp.

MAY 18, 2000

Per Curiam. We have carefully reviewed the parties' briefs and the record and affirm the judgment of the district court that res judicata bars the current action for essentially the reasons stated in the court's Memorandum and Order, dated July 21, 1999. We only add that we find no merit to appellant's contentions that the district court judge (1) erred by not treating him leniently since he was proceeding pro se, (2) was biased against him because of his pro se status and Native-American ancestry, and (3) delayed in processing his complaint due to the district judge's involvement in planning the new courthouse.

Affirmed. See Local Rule 27(c).