| Truman v. Moore et | al |
|--------------------|----|
| | |

18

| 1 | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 4 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | | |
| 5 | * * * | | |
| 6 | CURTIS TRUMAN, | Case No. 3:22-cv-00548-MMD-CLB | |
| 7 | Plaintiff, | ORDER | |
| 8 | THURISTON MOORE, <i>et al.</i> , | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | Defendants. | | |
| 11 | Pro se Plaintiff Curtis Truman, who is incarcerated in the custody of the Nevada | | |
| 12 | Department of Corrections ("NDOC"), sued NDOC employees and officials for excessive | | |
| 13 | force and violation of his due process rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 5.) Before | | |
| 14 | the Court is the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of United States Magistrate Judge | | |
| 15 | Carla Baldwin (ECF No. 72), recommending that the Court grant Defendants' motion for | | |
| 16 | summary judgment (ECF No. 60) in part, and deny it in part, along with striking Truman's | | |
| 17 | unauthorized surreply. To date, no objections to the R&R have been filed. Because there | | |
| | | | |

Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is 19 satisfied that Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. See United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 20 21 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) ("De novo review of the magistrate judges' findings and recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both parties file objections to the 22 findings and recommendations." (emphasis in original)). After summarizing the evidence 23 before her, Judge Baldwin first recommends the Court deny Defendants' motion for 24 summary judgment as to Truman's excessive force claim because the pertinent 25 26 allegations in his verified complaint create a genuine dispute of material fact. (ECF No. 72 at 9.) However, Judge Baldwin recommends the Court grant summary judgment to 27 Defendants as to Truman's due process claim because the evidence before her shows 28

is no objection, and as further explained below, the Court will adopt the R&R.

Truman received the process he was due. (Id. at 10-11.) Judge Baldwin finally 1 recommends striking Truman's unauthorized surreply because he did not first obtain 2 leave of Court. (Id. at 11.) Having reviewed the R&R, Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. 3 It is therefore ordered that Judge Baldwin's Report and Recommendation (ECF 4 5 No. 72) is accepted and adopted in full. It is further ordered that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 60) 6 7 is granted in part and denied in part. It is more specifically granted as to Truman's Fourteenth Amendment due process claim and denied as to Truman's Eighth Amendment 8 excessive force claim. Truman is accordingly proceeding on only his Eighth Amendment 9 10 excessive force claim. It is further ordered that the Court strikes Truman's unauthorized surreply (ECF 11 No. 69). 12 13 It is further ordered that the Court finds it appropriate to refer this case for a settlement conference under LR 16-5 before United States Magistrate Judge Carla 14 15 Baldwin. 16 It is further ordered that, if this case does not settle at the settlement conference, 17 the Joint Pretrial Order is due within 30 days of the settlement conference being held. DATED THIS 28th Day of January 2025. 18 19 20 21 MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 22 23 24 25 26 27 28