

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Grant Anthony Judish v. City of Eden Prairie, Brett Lindeman, Dan Peterson, Mark Gustad, Rob Johnston, Christopher Wood, and Matthew Sackett

Judish · No. 25-cv-1302 (LMP/DJF) · Decided February 4, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA GRANT ANTHONY JUDISH, Case No. 25-cv-1302 (LMP/DJF) Plaintiff, v. ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND CITY OF EDEN PRAIRIE, BRETT RECOMMENDATION LINDEMAN, DAN PETERSON, MARK GUSTAD, ROB JOHNSTON, CHRISTOPHER WOOD, and MATTHEW SACKETT, Defendants. Plaintiff Grant Anthony Judish initiated this lawsuit asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Minnesota law relating to the alleged mishandling of his personal property in connection with his arrest in April 2021.

See generally ECF No. 1. Judish initially brought claims against the City of Eden Prairie (“City”) and various Eden Prairie Police Department officials¹ (collectively, “Eden Prairie Defendants”), Hennepin County and various Hennepin County institutions and officials, and the Minnesota Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training. See *id.* at 1.

After two previous orders of dismissal, only the claims against the Eden Prairie Defendants remain. ECF Nos. 23, 42. 1 Specifically, the Eden Prairie Police Department officials against whom Judish raises claims are Defendants Brett Lindeman, Dan Peterson, Mark Gustad, Rob Johnston, Christopher Wood, and Matthew Sackett, individually and in their official capacities.

ECF No. 1 at 1. Judish alleges that the Eden Prairie Defendants violated his rights under the Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and various Minnesota criminal statutes. On August 25, 2025, the Eden Prairie Defendants moved to dismiss: (1) the Eight Amendment claim against Defendant Dan Peterson; (2) the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims against Defendants Peterson and Mark Gustad in their official capacities; (3) all claims against the City and Defendants Brett Lindeman, Rob Johnston, Christopher Wood, and Matthew Sackett; and (4) all Minnesota statutory claims against all Eden Prairie Defendants.

See ECF No. 31; ECF No. 33 at 14. The Eden Prairie Defendants did not request dismissal of Judish’s Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims against Defendants Peterson and Gustad. See ECF No. 33 at 14. On November 24, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Dulce J. Foster issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), concluding that the Eden Prairie Defendants’ motion should be granted.

See generally ECF No. 56. No party has filed objections to the R&R, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2), so the Court reviews it for clear error, see *Grinder v. Gammon*, 73 F.3d 793, 795 (8th Cir. 1996) (per curiam). Having completed that review, the Court finds no error and adopts the R&R in full. ORDER Based on the foregoing, and on all the files, records, and proceedings in this matter, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1.

The R&R (ECF No. 56) is ADOPTED; 2. Defendants' Motion for Partial Dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 31) is GRANTED; 3. All claims against Defendants City of Eden Prairie, Brett Lindeman, Rob Johnston, Christopher Wood, and Matthew Sackett are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; 4. All claims against Defendants Mark Gustad and Dan Peterson in their official capacities are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; 5.

The Eighth Amendment claim against Defendant Dan Peterson is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; and 6. All claims arising under Minnesota state criminal statutes against all Defendants are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.² Dated: February 4, 2026 s/Laura M. Provinzino Laura M. Provinzino United States District Judge 2 As noted above, Defendants did not request dismissal of Judith's Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims against Defendants Dan Peterson and Mark Gustad in their individual capacities, so those claims remain and may proceed.