[NOT FOR PUBLICATION–NOT TO BE CITED AS PRECEDENT]

United States Court of Appeals
For the First Circuit

No. 00-2095

DANNY M. KELLY,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

TOWN OF CHELMSFORD, ET AL.,

Defendants, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Hon. Rya W. Zobel, U.S. District Judge]

Before

Selya, Circuit Judge,
Campbell and Stahl, Senior Circuit Judges.

Danny M. Kelly on brief pro se.
Leonard H. Kesten, Deidre Brennan Regan and Brody, Hardoon, Perkins & Kesten on brief for appellee Town of Chelmsford.

June 14, 2001

Per Curiam. After affording plaintiff an opportunity to file an amended complaint which "clearly and concisely" set forth his claims, and after two hearings on the matter, the district court granted defendants' motions to dismiss. Reviewing the dismissal de novo in light of the briefs and the record, we see no error. The complaint failed to understandably state a cognizable claim for relief and some of the relief demanded was not within the court's jurisdiction. Plaintiff's memorandum response to the court's order to clarify suggested that plaintiff was unable or unwilling to cure the deficiencies.

Affirmed.