

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

---

February 7, 2017

Elisabeth A. Shumaker  
Clerk of Court

EDMOND WALKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PETER CRUM, M.D.\*; CAROL  
RODGERS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 16-1375  
(D.C. No. 1:15-CV-01915-RBJ-MEH)  
(D. Colo.)

---

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\*\***

---

Before **HARTZ, HOLMES, and BACHARACH**, Circuit Judges.

---

Plaintiff Edmond Walker sued Dr. Peter Crum under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging a violation of the Eighth Amendment while he was a pretrial detainee in the Denver County Jail. His claim is that after he suffered a hip injury, he was subjected to unnecessary pain

---

\* The district-court caption spells the doctor's last name as "Crumb." But his brief on appeal consistently spells the name without a "b." We have corrected the caption here.

\*\* After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, *res judicata*, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

because of Dr. Crum’s deliberate indifference in providing him medical care. *See Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994).

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado granted summary judgment to Dr. Crum. The court’s opinion thoroughly reviews the facts and the law. We see nothing to add. On appeal, Plaintiff does not point to any factual errors in that opinion and his “legal” argument is too brief and conclusory to be helpful.

We **AFFIRM** the judgment below. Mr. Walker’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED**.

Entered for the Court

Harris L Hartz  
Circuit Judge