

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 93-7432  
Conference Calendar

---

STEPHEN BONNER WILLIAMS,  
Etc., Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

EDWARD HARGETT ET AL., Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Mississippi  
USDC No. 4:93CV145-D-D  
- - - - -  
(March 23, 1994)

Before KING, DAVIS, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Federal courts must give the same preclusive effect to a state-court judgment as would the courts of the state rendering the judgment. McDonald v. City of West Branch, Mich., 466 U.S. 284, 287, 104 S. Ct. 1799, 80 L. Ed. 2d 302 (1984). "[N]othing in the language or legislative history of [42 U.S.C.] § 1983 provides any congressional intent to deny binding effect to a state-court judgment or decision when the state court, acting within its proper jurisdiction, has given the parties a full and fair opportunity to litigate federal claims, and thereby has shown itself willing and able to protect federal rights." Allen

---

\* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

v. McCurry, 449 U.S. 90, 103-04, 101 S. Ct. 411, 66 L. Ed. 2d 308 (1980).

Mississippi law gives res-judicata effect to all issues tried in a prior lawsuit and all matters that should have been litigated and decided in a prior suit, provided, of course, that the four identities of res judicata are present. Riley v. Moreland, 537 So. 2d 1348, 1354 (Miss. 1989) (citation omitted). Those identities are: (1) identity of the subject matter of the action; (2) identity of the cause of action; (3) identity of the parties of the cause of action; and (4) identity of the quality or character of the persons against whom the claim is made. Id. Williams concedes that he has already filed a suit in state court concerning the same facts, claims, and defendants. The two actions, therefore, are "inextricably intertwined." See Hale v. Harney, 786 F.2d 688, 690-91 (5th Cir. 1986).

Williams was given a full and fair opportunity in state court to litigate the claims he attempts to raise in federal court. The doctrine of res judicata, therefore, precludes him from raising those claims a second time. In effect, Williams is trying to use a § 1983 suit to enforce an "inextricably intertwined" prior state-court judgment. This he cannot do. See Hale v. Harney, 786 F.2d at 690-91; see also Howell v. Supreme Court of Texas, 885 F.2d 308, 311 (5th Cir. 1989) ("Federal district courts have no authority to review the final determinations of a state court."), cert. denied, 496 U.S. 936 (1990). Accordingly, we find that the district court did not err in dismissing Williams's suit, and we AFFIRM the judgment.