1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7		FEG DISTRICT COUDT	
8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9		TRICI OF CALIFORNIA	
10	NORMAN GERALD DANIELS III,	) Case No.: 1:13-cv-00202-AWI-SAB (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	) Case 1(0., 1.15 eV 00202 11(V1 51AB (1 e))	
12	V.	) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND ) RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S	
13	STU SHERMAN,	) MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND ) GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR	
15	Defendant.	<ul> <li>SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DIRECTING</li> <li>CLERK OF COURT TO ENTER JUDGMENT</li> </ul>	
16		) ) [ECF Nos. 76, 87, 127, 134]	
17	Plaintiff Norman Gerald Daniels III is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil		
18	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.		
19	The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §		
20	636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On August 3, 2017, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and		
21	Recommendations recommending that Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment be denied and		
22	Defendant's motion for summary judgment be granted. The Finding and Recommendations were		
23	served on the parties and contained notice that objections were to be filed within thirty days. Plaintiff		
24	filed objections on October 6, 2017, and Defendant filed a response on October 20, 2017.		
25	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a <i>de</i>		
26	novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and		
27	Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. In light of that conclusion,		
28	Defendant's motion to strike Plaintiff's sur-reply will be denied as moot.		

1	

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
1.	The Findings and Recommendations, filed on August 3, 2017, are adopted in full;	
2.	Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (ECF NO 76 is DENIED;	
3.	Defendant's motion for summary judgment is GRANTED;	
4.	Defendant's motion to strike (ECF. No. 134) is DENIED as moot; and	
4.	The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of Defendant Stu Sherman.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
Dated: <u>November 16, 2017</u>		
	SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE	
	2	
	1. 2. 3. 4. 4. 4. IT IS SO OR	