

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-14883

D.C. Docket No. 0:11-cv-61607-JIC

DONALD SPADARO,
as Limited Guardian for Anthony Caravella,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

CITY OF MIRAMAR,
a municipality,
GEORGE PIERSON,
WILLIAM MANTESTA,
individually and in his official capacity as former police
officer for the City of Miramar,
WILLIAM GUESS,
BROWARD COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE,
Scott J. Israel, Sheriff, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 13-14884

D.C. Docket No. 0:11-cv-61607-JIC

DONALD SPADARO,
as Limited Guardian for Anthony Caravella,

Plaintiff-Appellee
Cross Appellant,

versus

CITY OF MIRAMAR,
a municipality, et al,

Defendants,

GEORGE PIERSON,
WILLIAM MANTESTA,
individually and in his official capacity as former police
officer for the City of Miramar,

Defendants - Appellants
Cross Appellees,

WILLIAM GUESS,

Defendant
Cross Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida

(January 22, 2015)

Before HULL and JULIE CARNES, Circuit Judges, and ROTHSTEIN,^{*} District
Judge.

^{*}Honorable Barbara J. Rothstein, United States District Judge for the Western District of
Washington, sitting by designation.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiff Donald Spadaro, acting as limited guardian for Anthony Caravella, brought suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and various state law causes of action against defendant City of Miramar, Florida, and several defendant police officers. The suit alleged violation of Caravella's constitutional rights and Florida law in connection with Caravella's 1984 wrongful conviction and incarceration. Relevant to these appeals, the district court granted summary judgment in favor of defendant City of Miramar as to plaintiff Spadaro's § 1983 claim, but denied summary judgment to defendants George Pierson, William Mantesta, and William Guess as to plaintiff Spadaro's § 1983 claim. The case proceeded to trial. Ultimately, the jury returned a verdict in favor of plaintiff Spadaro against defendants Pierson and Mantesta on plaintiff's § 1983 claim, but returned a verdict in favor of defendant Guess on plaintiff's § 1983 claim.

These appeals followed. In case 13-14483, plaintiff Spadaro challenges: (1) the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of defendant City of Miramar on plaintiff Spadaro's § 1983 claim and (2) the district court's grant of judgment as a matter of law (at the close of the plaintiff's evidence at trial) in favor of defendant City of Miramar on plaintiff Spadaro's state law claim of negligent retention and supervision. In case 13-14484, defendants Pierson and Mantesta challenge: (1) the district court's denial of their defense of qualified immunity to

plaintiff Spadaro's § 1983 claim; (2) the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the jury's verdict against them; (3) whether the district court improperly admitted certain evidence during the trial; and (4) whether the district court erred in denying defendants' motion for new trial based on the introduction of that evidence.

Plaintiff Spadaro cross-appealed, challenging the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of the defendants on his state law RICO claim.

After review, and with the benefit of oral argument, we find no reversible error in the rulings of the district court here being appealed. Accordingly, in both case 13-14483 and case 13-14484, we affirm the final judgments.

AFFIRMED.