

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 94-10459
Conference Calendar

STEPHEN C. TASSIO,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

WILLARD SOPER ET AL.,

Defendants,

WILLARD SOPER ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:93-CV-1687-H

- - - - -
(September 21, 1994)

Before KING, SMITH, and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Stephen C. Tassio states that "[t]his case is a challenge to the unlawful foreclosure granted and upheld in Courts with no Lawfully Constituted Authority to do so."

In District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482, 103 S. Ct. 1303, 75 L. Ed. 2d 206 (1983), the Supreme Court stated that federal district courts have no

* 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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

authority to review final state court judgments. This principle is not limited to actions in which such review is openly sought; it extends to actions in which "the constitutional claims presented [in federal court] are inextricably intertwined with the state court's grant or denial of relief." Hale v. Harney, 786 F.2d 688, 691 (5th Cir. 1986) (internal quotation and citation omitted). Thus, "a plaintiff may not seek a reversal in federal court of a state court judgment simply by casting his complaint in the form of a civil rights action." Reed v. Terrell, 759 F.2d 472, 473 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 946 (1985).

Tassio contends that the district court "has by error of untruths and omissions created a fictional portrayal of the matter," and he denies that he is seeking reversal of the county court judgment against him. However, a review of his pleadings and arguments reveals that Tassio's suit is "inextricably intertwined" with that state-court judgment. See Chrissy F. by Medley v. Mississippi Dept. of Public Welfare, 995 F.2d 595, 597, 599 (5th Cir. 1993) (complaint alleging "various violations of a vast array of constitutional and statutory rights and privileges" nothing more than a "patent[] attempt to collaterally attack the validity" of the state court judgment), cert. denied, 114 S. Ct. 1336 (1994). Moreover, beyond his general allegations of bias, Tassio offers no reason why he could not seek relief through appeals in the Texas state courts and then through appeal or petition of writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme

Court. Thus, the district court properly dismissed Tassio's suit for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

AFFIRMED.