UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
TIMOTHY WATTS,	No. 2:13-cv-1749 TLN AC P
Plaintiff,	
v. <u>(</u>	DRDER
M. RUGGIERO, et al.,	
Defendants.	
Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief	
8 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to	
28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
On March 10, 2016, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein	
which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to	
the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Defendant Ruggiero,	
the only party not dismissed from this action, has filed objections to the findings and	
recommendations.	
Defendant Ruggiero argues he would have taken the same actions in the absence of	
Plaintiff's protected conduct. See Allen v. Iranon, 283 F.3d 1070, 1074 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal	
alterations omitted) (discussing that at trial "defendants could escape liability only by sustaining	
	evidence that they would have reached the same
	FOR THE EASTERN DIST TIMOTHY WATTS, Plaintiff, v. M. RUGGIERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On March 10, 2016, the magistrate judge f which were served on all parties and which contait the findings and recommendations were to be filed the only party not dismissed from this action, has recommendations. Defendant Ruggiero argues he would have Plaintiff <sup>*</sup> s protected conduct. <i>See Allen v. Iranon.</i>

1 decision ... even in the absence of the plaintiff's protected conduct"). However, Plaintiff alleges 2 Ruggiero possessed implementing authority for the search of his cell and recovery of source 3 items. At this stage the inferences must be drawn in Plaintiff's favor; it is not a concluded fact 4 that Defendant would have implemented the same investigation in the absence of Plaintiff's 5 protected conduct.

6 Defendant Ruggiero argues Plaintiff must prove Ruggiero lacked legitimate penological 7 goals for taking the steps leading to Plaintiff's gang validation. See Pratt v. Rowland, 65 F.3d 8 802, 806 (9th Cir. 1995). Under a summary judgment standard, Plaintiff has adequately claimed 9 that Ruggiero initiated the investigation because of Plaintiff's protected activity and without a 10 legitimate interest in Plaintiff's gang affiliation. Defendant also argues he is entitled to qualified 11 immunity. "[T]he prohibition against retaliatory punishment is 'clearly established law' in the 12 Ninth Circuit, for qualified immunity purposes." Id. (citing Schroeder v. McDonald, 55 F.3d 454, 13 461 (9th Cir. 1995)). Under a summary judgment standard, Plaintiff has adequately claimed that 14 Ruggerio retaliated against him for engaging in protected activity. In resolving the question of 15 qualified immunity on defendant's motion for summary judgment, the court must view the facts 16 in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, Schwenk v. Hartford, 204 F.3d 1187, 1198 (9th Cir. 17 2009), and can only grant the motion if defendant presents evidence that would entitle him to a 18 "directed verdict if the evidence went uncontroverted at trial." Houghton v. South, 965 F.2d 1532, 19 1536 (9th Cir. 1992). Defendant does not meet this standard.

20 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this 21 Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the 22 Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper 23 analysis. The Court overrules Defendant's objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

25 1. The findings and recommendations filed March 10, 2016, are adopted in full; 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is granted on Plaintiff's Eighth and 26 27 Fourteenth Amendment claims, and on Plaintiff's First Amendment claims against Defendants 28 Campbell and Audette;

2

2 claim against Defendant Ruggiero; and	st Amendment	
<ul> <li>4. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further proceedings.</li> <li>Dated: April 4, 2016</li> <li>Troy L. Nunley United States District Junited States Distr</li></ul>	2 claim against Defendant Ruggiero; and	
<ul> <li>4 proceedings.</li> <li>5</li> <li>6 Dated: April 4, 2016</li> <li>7</li> <li>8</li> <li>9</li> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> </ul>	3 4. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial	
<ul> <li>6 Dated: April 4, 2016</li> <li>7</li> <li>8</li> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> </ul>		
7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11		
8 9 Troy L. Nunley United States District J 11	^	
9 Troy L. Nunley 10 11		
10 11	kay	
10 11		
	udge	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		