

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

CHADERICK A. INGRAM,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-2547 LKK EFB PS

vs.

SACRAMENTO POLICE DEPARTMENT,
K-9 Unit, OFFICER G. DAHL #672,
DOES 1 to 50;

ORDER

Defendants.

Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* in this action, which was referred to the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 72-302(c)(21). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

On August 28, 2009, plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment. Dckt. No. 47. In light of the district judge’s September 30, 2009 order adopting the September 4, 2009 findings and recommendations in full, the motion is denied as moot.¹ Dckt. Nos. 48, 51.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 2, 2009.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Additionally, the summary judgment motion does not comply with Local Rule 56-260(a), which provides that “[e]ach motion for summary judgment . . . shall be accompanied by a ‘Statement of Undisputed Facts’ that shall enumerate discretely each of the specific material facts relied upon in support of the motion and cite the particular portions of any pleading, affidavit, deposition, interrogatory answer, admission or other document relied upon to establish that fact.”