

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 10-3102

---

SCOTT LINDENBAUM, Appellant

v.

DAVID ERENIUS, IN HIS INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY;  
WARMINSTER TOWNSHIP

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. Civil Action No. 2-10-cv-00285)  
District Judge: Honorable Joel H. Slomsky

---

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)  
June 23, 2011

---

Before: BARRY, AMBRO, and VAN ANTWERPEN, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: June 23, 2011)

---

OPINION

---

AMBRO, Circuit Judge

Scott Lindenbaum was arrested for making terroristic threats, harassment, and conspiracy to promote or facilitate the crime of terroristic threats. On appeal, he argues that the police officer who arrested him, Defendant David Erenius, did not have probable

cause to believe that he had committed a crime and, therefore, violated his Fourth Amendment right under the United States Constitution to be free from unreasonable seizures. He also contends that Officer Erenius is not entitled to qualified immunity.

The District Court, per Judge Slomsky, dealt thoroughly with Lindenbaum's claims. As we have nothing to add to the Court's analysis, we simply note that, under our applicable plenary standard of review, *see, e.g., In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.*, 618 F.3d 300, 314 (3d Cir. 2010), and because reviewing courts accord significant deference to a magistrate's finding of probable cause to arrest, *see, e.g., Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213, 236 (1983), the facts here amply support the District Court's conclusions.

Accordingly, we affirm.