(PC) Landau v. Voss et al		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IINITED STATI	ES DISTRICT COURT
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	LASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8	SID LANDAU,	1:07-CV-00815-AWI-DLB PC
9	Plaintiff,	AMENDED ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
10	v.	
11	W. T. VOSS, et al.,	
12	Defendants.	(DOCS. <u>48</u> , <u>72</u> )
13		
14		
15	Plaintiff Sid Landau is a civil detainee proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant	
16	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's complaint, filed June 4, 2007, against	
17	Defendants Weinstein, Bresler, Kaur, Winchel, Forrest, and Adcock. The matter was referred to a	
18	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
19	On July 14, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein which	
20	recommended Defendants' motion for summary judgement be denied in part and granted in part.	
21	The Findings and Recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice to the parties	
22	that any objection to the Findings and Recommendations was to be filed within thirty days. Neither	
23	party filed a timely Objection to the Findings and Recommendations.	
24	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court has conducted a de	
25	<u>novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and	
26	Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.	
27	///	
28	///	
		1

Doc. 76

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: The Findings and Recommendations, filed July 14, 2010, is adopted in full; 1. 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment, filed September 18, 2009, GRANTED in favor of Defendants Weinstein, Bresler, and Kaur for the failure to protect claim, and in favor of Defendants Winchell, Kaur, Adcock, and Forrest for the retaliation claim; 3. Defendants' motion is DENIED for the excessive force claim against Defendants Adcock and Forrest; and 4. This action is REFERRED to the Magistrate Judge for further scheduling and proceedings. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: September 1, 2010 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE