1		
2		
3	E-FILED 6/9/14	
4	CLOSED	
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	NORWOOD PRICE,	Case No. CV-13-3390 PSG (EMX)
12	Plaintiff,	IDDODOSEDI HIDOMENT IN FAVOD
13		[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT AKAL SECURITY
14	VS.	INC., WILLIAM WALLACE, POTE PIGULSAWAS, AND STEVEN
15	MICHAEL PEERSON, AKAL SECURITY,	MCGRATH
16	INC., WILLIAM WALLACE, POTE PIGULSAWAS, STEVEN MCGRATH	
17	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
18	Defendants.	
19		
20	On April 1, 2014, Defendants Akal Security, Inc. ("Akal"), William Wallace, Pote	
21	Pigulsawas, and Steven McGrath (the "Defendant CSOs") (and collectively referred to	
22	herein, "Defendants") brought a motion for summary judgment, or in the alternative for	
23	summary adjudication against Plaintiff Norwood Price ("Plaintiff") on Plaintiff's claims	
24	for First and Fourth Amendment violations under Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents, 403	
25	U.S. 388, 91 S. Ct. 1999 (1971), and the Bane Act, and for respondeat superior liability.	
26	The evidence and arguments in support and against the motion has been fully	
27	considered by this Court, and a decision having been duly rendered,	
28	The Court rules that Defendants are entitled to judgment on the grounds that:	
	Case No. CV-13-3390 PSG (EMX)1[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT AKAL SECURITY INC., WILLIAM WALLACE, POTE PIGULSAWAS, AND STEVEN MCGRATH	

Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment *Bivens* claims fail. Plaintiff has failed to 1. establish he was "seized" within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. Moreover, Defendants established that there was reasonable suspicion to conduct a *Terry* stop of 4 Plaintiff.

Plaintiff's First Amendment *Bivens* claims fail. Plaintiff has failed to 2. establish that Defendants acted with the impermissible motive of curbing protected speech or that that Defendants were motivated by retaliatory intent to silence Plaintiff.

3. Plaintiff's claims under the Bane Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 52.1, and for respondeat superior liability also fail. Plaintiff has failed to establish a constitutional violation under the First Amendment and Fourth Amendment, or for respondeat superior liability.

Judgment is entered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

6/9/14

15 Dated:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

27

28

PHILIP S. GUTIERREZ

THE HON. PHILIP S. GUTIERREZ UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Submitted by: 20

FRANKEL GOLDWARE FERBER LLP

s/Michelle R. Ferber 24 Michelle R. Ferber 25 Attorneys for Defendants AKAL SECURITY, INC., WILLIAM WALLACE, 26 POTE PIGULSAWAS, and STEVEN MCGRATH

> Case No. CV-13-3390 PSG (EMX) [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT AKAL SECURITY INC., WILLIAM WALLACE, POTE PIGULSAWAS, AND STEVEN MCGRATH