

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

July 7, 2010

TENTH CIRCUIT

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

WALTER RAY REDMOND,

Plaintiff–Appellant,

v.

SALT LAKE CITY POLICE
DEPARTMENT; SALT LAKE
COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT;
CHRIS BURBANK, Chief of Police for
Salt Lake City; SALT LAKE COUNTY;
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION;
SALT LAKE CITY,

Defendants–Appellees.

Nos. 10-4002 & 10-4014

(D. Utah)

(D.C. Nos. 2:07–CV–00722–TS,
2:08–CV–00153–TC)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **KELLY, McKAY**, and **LUCERO**, Circuit Judges.

After examining the briefs and the appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of these consolidated appeals. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). These cases are therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

In these consolidated appeals,¹ Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the dismissal of his claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against various municipal agencies. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges Salt Lake City police officers violated his constitutional rights by falsely arresting him on several occasions. Plaintiff also alleges the police violated his Eighth Amendment rights when they allegedly administered a tuberculosis shot, under threat of force, following one of the alleged arrests.

In both of the underlying cases, the district court dismissed his claims after determining his complaints failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. Despite being given an opportunity to amend his complaints, Plaintiff did not respond with any new facts or allegations which would have allowed his claims to go forward, and they were thus finally dismissed.

After careful review of Plaintiff's briefs and the record on appeal, we conclude the district court correctly dismissed Plaintiff's complaints. Accordingly, for substantially the same reasons as set forth in the district court's orders, we

¹ Because both of these cases involve similar factual allegations made against the same parties, we have consolidated them for purposes of this appeal.

AFFIRM. However, we do **GRANT** Plaintiff's motion to proceed without prepayment of fees.

Entered for the Court

Monroe G. McKay
Circuit Judge