

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICKY LAMONT BROWN,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-07-1949 FCD GGH P

vs.

D.K. SISTO, et al.,

Defendants.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is defendants’ motion for summary judgment filed July 24, 2009. On August 4, 2009, defendants served plaintiff with the summary judgment motion to his most current address.

Plaintiff has not filed an opposition to defendants’ motion. In the order directing service filed February 6, 2009, the court stated that “[i]f plaintiff does not serve and file a written opposition to the motion or a request to postpone consideration of defendants’ motion, the court may consider the failure to act as a waiver of opposition to defendant’s motion.” See Local Rule 78-230 (m). Defendants’ notice of motion also directed plaintiff to Local Rule 78-230 for information regarding summary judgment.

\\\\\\

1 A district court may not grant a motion for summary judgment simply because the  
2 nonmoving party does not file opposing material, even if the failure to oppose violates a local  
3 rule. Martinez v. Stanford, 323 F.3d 1178 (9th Cir. 2003); Brydges v. Lewis, 18 F.3d 651, 652  
4 (9th Cir. March 9, 1994), citing Henry v. Gill Industries, Inc., 983 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1993).  
5 However, when the local rule does not require, but merely permits the court to grant a motion for  
6 summary judgment, the district court has discretion to determine whether noncompliance should  
7 be deemed consent to the motion. Id.

8 In the instant case, plaintiff has been warned that his failure to oppose a motion  
9 for summary judgment may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion. Based on  
10 plaintiff's failure to file an opposition, the court concludes that plaintiff has consented to  
11 defendants' motion for summary judgment. In the alternative, the court finds that defendants'  
12 motion has merit.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that defendants' July 24, 2009,  
14 motion for summary judgment be granted.

15 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
16 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty  
17 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
18 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
19 "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any reply to the objections  
20 shall be served and filed within ten days after service of the objections. The parties are advised  
21 that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District  
22 Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

23 DATED: September 15, 2009

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

25 GGH:035  
26 brow1949.46