

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,
OFFICER GARY DAHL #672,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On November 23, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. Plaintiff filed objections on November 30, 2009, and they were considered by the undersigned.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are

1 reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.
2 1983).


3 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
4 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.

5 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

6 1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed November 23, 2009, are
7 ADOPTED; and

8 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, Dckt. No. 53, is denied.

9 DATED: February 23, 2010.

10
11
12 
13 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
14 SENIOR JUDGE
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26