Docket #0158 Date Filed: 10/10/2023

United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED
OCT 10 2023
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

In Re: Tehum Care Services, Inc Debtor.	Case No: 23-90086 (CML) CHAPTER 11
Anant Kumar Tripati Plaintiff, vs. Sarah Tirschwell, et al., Defendant.	Adv. Pro. No. 23-03072 (CML)

REPLY TO ECF 138

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pertinent Facts 2
Summary Of ECF 138 3
Defendants Give No Argument, No Explanation How The Decision Of The Third Circuiit And Arizona Is Being Collaterally Attacked By Evidence Discovered After The Arizona Decision 4
Conclusion 5
Certificate Of Service 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Fin. Acquisition Partners L.P. v. Blackwell, 440 F.3d 278, 284 (5th Cir. 2006) 5

Grogan v. Garner, 498 U.S. 279, 288-91 (1991). 5

23900862310120000000000003

Neely v. Johnson (In re Knezek), 370 F. App'x 449, 453 (5th Cir. 2010). 5

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

A. ECF 2 in District Court showing court described m claims to be spoliation.
B. Decision by the Third Circuit declining to decide claims due to this bankruptcy.

Plaintiff submits the following reply and states:

PERTINENT FACTS

¶ The United States District Court Western District of Pennsylvania stated in ECF 2 [1] in pertinent part: "Distilled to its essence, the complaint alleges that the various healthcare providers, and their attorneys and ADOC policymakers, have engaged in a vast conspiracy "in advance of litigation . . . [and] have deployed their prefabricated defense against me and other pro per (sic) prisoner plaintiffs. They used the Permissible Procedural Devices in bad faith . . . They [] rigged the game from the very beginning. Seeking truthful, accurate, non-tainted evidence has never been their objective. Not mischaracterizing but creating alternative facts." Complaint at ¶¶ 9 and 9A. For example, Plaintiff alleges that "Wexford, Zwick, Forman, Weber Gallagher assembled template and stock pleadings discovery and motions documents for use by local counsel in proper prisoner litigation, that contained false or misleading information about the practices of Wexford. Specifically, concealed all emails, reports and complaints about the practices of Wexford . . .They concealed these to frustrate

[1] Tripati v. Wexford Health Servs. Civil Action No. 2: 20-cv-0427 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 8,
2020)

prisoner litigation. Then they submitted false sworn and unsworn representations including false affidavits, false and incorrect expert reports and discovery response verifications by Wexford employees, offices, consultants, and experts. ((EX A)

¶These claims were not decided by the District or Circuit Courts. They were pending in the FRAP 41 motion which the Third Circuit declined to decide because of this bankruptcy. (EX B)

SUMMARY OF ECF 138

¶ Counsel states at ECF 138 para 4 that the United States District Court Western District of Pennsylvania dismissed these claims and this statement is patently false, [2]because the court screened these claims,[3] and did not address it after the screening.

¶ The claims were screened by the court and not decided. [4]These claims were pending before the Third Circuit.(EX A Order Dated March 13, 2023) [5]

---

[2] Counsel does not refer this court to that portion of the court where the court resolved
the claim, because the court did not. Tripati v. Wexford Health Servs. Civil Action
No. 2: 20-cv-0427 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 8, 2020)

[3] The court ordered me to pay the filing fees and once I paid the fees, the court ordered service.

[4] Counsel does not refer to where the court decided these claims in the Third Circuit.

5 As Defendants, and each of them, have incorporated each other's argument as an integral part of their argument, Plaintiff incorporates this argument in

¶ At 5 counsel argues that I am a vexatious litigant. However, counsel omits the fact that neither the Magistrate Judge, the District Court or the Third Circuit found that these claims were precluded though counsel argued before those courts, I was a vexatious litigant forcefully,. The courts declined to find the claims barred by the vexatious argument.

DEFENDANTS GIVE NO ARGUMENT, NO EXPLANATION HOW THE DECISION OF THE THIRD CIRCUIIT AND ARIZONA IS BEING COLLATERALLY ATTACKED BY EVIDENCE DISCOVERED AFTER THE ARIZONA DECISION

¶ The argument that this action is a collateral attack on prior decisions by the Arizona Courts, is frivolous at best. It is not.

¶When initiating an issue preclusion analysis, it is necessary to first determine in which court the underlying judgment originated to establish the specific elements needed to satisfy the rule. While federal common law—as well as the majority of states—generally rely on the Restatement (Second)'s interpretation of issue preclusion, a body of common law has since developed based on unique jurisdictional interpretations of the general rule. In addition to common law interpretations, some states have codified their rendition of the issue preclusion doctrine. It is imperative to adhere strictly to the preclusion rule adopted by the state that issued the underlying judgment when conducting an issue preclusion analysis. The occasional misstatement of an applicable preclusion rule creates conflicting case law and misleads the court.

---

this reply as an integral part of the reply to each and every Defendants argument, heac verba.

¶In addition to a "valid and final" judgment, that was "actually litigated" in a prior hearing, the underlying facts and legal standard used to assess those facts must be the same in both proceedings for an issue to be afforded preclusive effect.494 Thus, while the underlying factual setting in both matters may be the same, if the legal standard to be applied is different in each, the issues are not identical and issue preclusion should not apply.Fin. Acquisition Partners L.P. v. Blackwell, 440 F.3d 278, 284 (5th Cir. 2006); see also Grogan v. Garner, 498 U.S. 279, 288-91 (1991).

¶ When requesting that a court apply claim preclusion, the party should provide the court with a copy of the pleadings and the final judgment in the prior case and affirmatively explain why the prior judgment should have preclusive effect, lest that party run the risk of waiving his or her claim preclusion argument. See, e.g., Neely v. Johnson (In re Knezek), 370 F. App'x 449, 453 (5th Cir. 2010).

¶ Defendants do not show: (a) where the Third Circuit resolved these spoliation claims; (b) where Arizona Courts resolved these spoliation claims; and (c) they do not provide any evidence that they did provide the documents/evidence subject to spoliation, in prior litigation.

CONCLUSION

¶ For these reasons the motion should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Anant Kumar Tripati

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of the foregoing document have been served by the Electronic Case Filing System for the United States Bankruptcy Court SD Texas.

EXHIBIT A

Civil Action No. 2: 20-cv-0427

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Tripati v. Wexford Health Servs.

Decided Apr 8, 2020

ANANT KUMAR TRIPATI, Plaintiff, v. WEXFORD HEALTH SERVICES, INC., et al Defendants.

Cynthia Reed Eddy Chief United States Magistrate Judge

*2 28 U.S.C.§1915(g). Plaintiff, Anant Kumar Tripati, is a very litigious state prisoner currently confined in the Arizona State Prison Complex, East Unit, in Florence, Arizona. At least three of his prior actions or appeals qualify as strikes under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g):

Therefore, Plaintiff may not bring a civil action without complete prepayment of the $350.00 filing fee and $50.00 administrative fee unless he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

William S. Stickman, IV United States District Judge REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

I. Recommendation

For the following reasons, it is respectfully recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1) be denied in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that this action be dismissed without prejudice to Plaintiff reopening it by paying the full statutory filing fee in the amount of $350.00, plus an administrative filing fee in the amount of $50.00, for a total of $400.00.

II. Report

a. Dismissal Pursuant to 28 U .S.C. § 1915(g)

A prisoner may not bring a civil action or appeal a civil judgment in forma pauperis ("IFP") if: the prisoner has, on 3 or more occasions,

while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

(1) Tripati v. Schriro, No. CV 97-0021-PHX-ROS (D. Ariz. May 22, 1997) (dismissed for failure to state a claim); (2) Tripati v. Felix, No. CV 05-0762-PHX-DGC (D. Ariz. Oct. 14, 2005) (same); and (3) Tripati v. Thompson, No. CV 03-1122-PHX-DGC (D. Ariz. Dec. 28, 2005) (same).3

Abdul-Akbar, 239 F.3d at 315 (internal citation omitted). Imminent danger requires a showing of serious physical injury at the time the complaint is filed. Id. at 312. The imminent danger exception is available only for genuine emergencies where time is pressing and a threat is real and proximate. Long v. Lanigan, et al., CA No. 10-0798, 2010 WL 703181, *2 (D.N.J., Feb. 23, 2010).

1 An attachment to the Complaint reflects that on November 30, 1993, Plaintiff was convicted in Maricopa County, Arizona, and sentenced to 28 years of imprisonment for fraudulent schemes, 20 years for attempted fraudulent schemes, and 4-1/2 years for false swearing, resulting in an aggregate prison sentence of 52-1/2 years without the possibility of parole. Complaint, Exh. 1 (ECF No. 1-4 at 5).

3 In Tripati v. Schriro, 541 U.S. 1039 (2004), the Supreme Court ordered, "As petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matter from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and petition submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1." Id. at 1039.

Additionally, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a pre-filing Order on October 14, 1993, which remains in effect. In re Tripati, No. 93-80317 (9th Cir. Oct. 14, 1993).

b. Imminent Danger

To satisfy the imminent danger element, Plaintiff must allege facts in his complaint showing that he was in imminent danger at the time the complaint was filed; allegations that the prisoner has faced imminent danger in the past are insufficient to trigger the exception to section *3 1915(g). See Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie, 239 F.3d 307 (3d Cir. 2001) (overruling Gibbs v. Roman, 116 F.3d 83, 86 (3d Cir. 1997)). In making this determination, the court should construe all allegations in a complaint in favor of the plaintiff. Gibbs v. Cross, 160 F.3d 962,965 (3d Cir. 1998); Gibbs v. Roman, 116 F.3d at 86. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has instructed that:

"[i]mminent" dangers are those dangers which are about to occur at any moment or are impending. By using the term "imminent," Congress indicated that it wanted to include a safety valve for the "three strikes" rule to prevent impending harms, not those harms that had already occurred. The imminent danger exception allows the district court to permit an otherwise barred prisoner to file a complaint I.F.P. if the prisoner could be subject to serious physical injury and does not then have the requisite filing fee.

c. Discussion

On March 27, 2020, Plaintiff initiated this case by the filing of a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and attached to the motion a thirty-two page handwritten pro se civil rights complaint. (ECF No. 1). In his complaint, Plaintiff names approximately 42 defendants including, inter alia, various former and current prison healthcare contractors (including Wexford Health Sources, Inc.; Corizon, Inc.; Centurion of Arizona) and what appears to be current or former employees of those healthcare contractors; six law firms (Broening Oberg Woods & Wilson PC; Jones Skelton Hochuli PLC; Quintairos Prieto Wood & Boyer PA; Renaud Cook Drury Mesaros PA; Struck Wieneke & Love, PLC; and Weber Gallagher Simpson *4 Stapleton Fires & Newby LLP) and multiple attorneys within each of those firms, as well as a number of attorneys with the Arizona Office of Attorney General; and various Arizona Department of Corrections ("ADOC") policymakers.

Complaint, at ¶ 14. Plaintiff further contends that this "misconduct . . . occurred in and out of courtrooms in Pitts, Tenn., Ill., Fl., Az., Mo." Id. at ¶ 20. Similar allegations are made in the complaint against each of the named law firms and the Arizona Attorney General's office. Complaint, at ¶ 8 (emphasis in original). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that, Id. at ¶¶ 46, 47.

Plaintiff alleges four counts in his verified complaint: Count 1 - violations of the Eighth Amendment; Count II -fraudulent concealment, fraud, deceit; Count III - violations of Customary International Law; and Count VI -conspiracy. He asserts that venue is proper in this district because "events have been directed from this district." Complaint at ¶ 6. Distilled to its essence, the complaint alleges that the various healthcare providers, and their attorneys and ADOC policymakers, have engaged in a vast conspiracy "in advance of litigation . . . [and] have deployed their prefabricated defense against me and other pro per (sic) prisoner plaintiffs. They used the Permissible Procedural Devices in bad faith . . . They [] rigged the game from the very beginning. Seeking truthful, accurate, non-tainted evidence has never been their objective. Not mischaracterizing but creating alternative facts." Complaint at ¶¶ 9 and 9A. For example, Plaintiff alleges that "Wexford, Zwick, Forman, Weber Gallagher":

4 Plaintiff contends that he is "an alien within the meaning of [the Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. 1350] and the conduct [of Defendants] violates Customary International Law as well as Articles I, II, III, X, XI, XXVI, [illegible] of the American Declaration and the Law of Nations." Complaint, at ¶53. -------- assembled template and stock pleadings discovery and motions documents for use by local counsel in proper prisoner litigation, that contained false or misleading information about the practices of Wexford. Specifically, concealed all emails, reports and complaints about the practices of Wexford . . .They concealed these to frustrate prisoner litigation. Then they submitted false sworn and unsworn representations including false affidavits, false and incorrect expert reports and discovery

response verifications by Wexford employees, offices, consultants, and experts.

As to his Eighth Amendment claim, Plaintiff asserts that he has, high blood pressure, shakes, tremors, chronic pain, constipation, prostate issues, allergies. I am suppose to have a nephroblast done to my kidneys to see if there is blockage. If there is no blockage found, then something else shall have to be done. Centurion is procrastinating and not sending me to be treated. They are going through the motions to treat me, but their delays show nothing they are doing helps. They have continued with the practice that Wexford began, Corizon continued, and Centurion, like Wexford and Corizon, have refused to prescribe the course of treatment that did manage my condition. As a result of my being denied treatment for my blood pressure, pain, prostrate and other issues, I have been told that I have to have a nephroplast to see if my kidney is blocked and this may cause me serious injury. Had Wexford, Corizon, Centurion continued with the treatment that I received in March 2012 - . . . - continued with the diet - I would not have been in imminent danger. I am 66 years of age and it is very likely that my injury shall be permanent.

Applying the above legal principles, and taking the complaint as a whole, the Court finds that Plaintiff's allegations are insufficient to satisfy the imminent danger requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). While he alleges that he is being denied medical care, identical allegations are currently at issue in a pending case filed by Plaintiff in the United States District Court for District of Arizona. In that case, Plaintiff is alleging that he is receiving inadequate healthcare for high blood pressure, unbearable pain, a lung condition, shakes, tremors, and 6 the denial of a proper medical diet. See Tripati v. Corizon, Inc., 4:18-cv-00066 (D. Ariz.). *6

The remaining allegations of the complaint in which he alleges fraudulent concealment, fraud, deceit, violations of customary international law, and conspiracy, do not show that Plaintiff is in imminent danger of serious physical injury.

III. Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, it is respectfully recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1) be denied in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that this action be dismissed without prejudice to Plaintiff reopening it by paying the full statutory and administrative filing fees, totaling $400.00.

Plaintiff is permitted to file Objections to this Report and Recommendation to the assigned United States District Judge. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(d) and 72(b)(2), and LCvR 72.D.2, Plaintiff, because he is a non-electronically registered party, may file objections to this Report and Recommendation by April 27, 2020. Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file Objections within this timeframe "will waive the right to appeal." Brightwell v. Lehman, 637 F.3d 187, 193 n. 7 (3d Cir. 2011).

Dated: April 8, 2020

/s Cynthia Reed Eddy
Cynthia Reed Eddy
Chief United States Magistrate Judge

EXHIBIT B

'zona Department of Corrections
...habilitation and Reentry

Legal Mail Log

Legal correspondence shall be opened and inspr for contraband only in the presence of the Inmate (As outlined in A Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR,, partment Order 914, Inmate Mail). If the Inmate is not in the unit return the unopened Legal Mail to Complex Mail Room.

	DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
	02/16/2023

metal and other contraband have been removed prior to Issuing to Inmate.*

Inmate Name *(Print name)*	ADCRR Number	Housing	Date *(mm/dd/yy)*	Signature	Received From / Mail To	Tracking Number	Contents	Outgoing Postage	Officer/Badge Number
ATH, A	102081	4D15L	02/16/23		U.S Court of Appeals 601 Maricet St #21400 Philadelphia, CA 19106				

E: Shift Commander shall sign and date upon completion of all Legal/Certified Mail distribution.

T COMMANDER NAME *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	SIGNATURE	DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
Cpl. V. Servantie	Cpl. [signature] 1289	2-16-23

2-16-23

914-1

Case 23-03072 Document 158 Filed in XSB on 10/10/23 Page 5 of 18

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 22-1861

Tripati v. Wexford Health Sources Inc.

To: Clerk

1) Suggestion of Bankruptcy received from Appellee Corizon Inc.

2) Motion by Appellant titled FRAP 41(d)(1) Application and Request for Other Relief

---

In light of the suggestion of bankruptcy filed by Appellee Corizon Inc., indicating the defendant in the lower court filed a petition for relief under the Bankruptcy Code, no action will be taken on Appellant's motion. See 11 U.S.C. § 362 (actions against the debtor may not proceed during the pendency of the bankruptcy).

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit
Clerk

Dated: March 13, 2023
CJG/cc: Anant Kumar Tripati
Christopher J. Watson, Esq.
Joseph J. Bosick, Esq.
Holly M. Whalen, Esq.
Jason M. Yarbrough, Esq.
Rita Bustos, Esq.
Alyssa R. Illsley, Esq.
Kevin L. Nguyen, Esq.
Cassidy L. Neal, Esq.

10/18/2022	☐ 61 90 pg, 2.61 MB	PRO SE REPLY BRIEF on behalf of Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati. Certificate of Service dated 10/12/2022 by US mail. (IDR) [Entered: 10/18/2022 10:45 AM]
10/31/2022	☐ 63 1 pg, 92.04 KB	ORDER (Clerk) The motion for leave to file overlength reply brief is referred to the merits panel. (CJG) [Entered: 10/31/2022 04:42 PM]
11/28/2022	☐ 64 1 pg, 124.36 KB	CALENDARED for Monday, 12/12/2022. (AR) [Entered: 11/28/2022 05:07 PM]
12/12/2022	☐ 65 1 pg, 50.33 KB	SUBMITTED (Pro Se) on Monday, December 12, 2022. Panel: AMBRO, KRAUSE and SCIRICA, Circuit Judges. (AR) [Entered: 12/12/2022 08:07 AM]
12/15/2022	☐ 66 6 pg, 206.1 KB	NOT PRECEDENTIAL PER CURIAM OPINION Coram: AMBRO, KRAUSE and SCIRICA, Circuit Judges. Total Pages: 6. Tripati's motion for permission to file his overlength reply brief is granted. (SLC) [Entered: 12/15/2022 07:19 AM]
12/15/2022	☐ 67 5 pg, 188.43 KB	JUDGMENT, Affirmed. Costs taxed against Appellant. (SLC) [Entered: 12/15/2022 07:25 AM]
12/28/2022	☐ 68 2 pg, 172.96 KB	ECF FILER: BILL OF COSTS filed on behalf of Appellee Kelly Joan Morrissey. Certificate of Service dated 12/28/2022. Service made by US mail, ECF. [22-1861] (KLN) [Entered: 12/28/2022 02:12 PM]
12/29/2022	☐ 69 1 pg, 87.65 KB	REVIEWED & ADJUSTED Bill of Costs filed. After review, costs will be taxed in the amount of $39.33. (CJG) [Entered: 12/29/2022 08:41 AM]
01/03/2023	☐ 70 3 pg, 372.59 KB	MOTION filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati for Extension of Time to File Petition for Rehearing. Response due on 01/17/2023. Certificate of Service dated 01/04/2023. Service made by ECF. (SLC) [Entered: 01/04/2023 11:04 AM]
01/05/2023	☐ 71 1 pg, 96.62 KB	ORDER (AMBRO, Circuit Judge) granting motion for extension of time to file petition for rehearing filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati to file a petition for rehearing until February 15, 2023. (SLC) [Entered: 01/05/2023 10:56 AM]
01/09/2023	☐ 72 35 pg, 8.84 MB	PETITION filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati for Rehearing En Banc and before Original Panel. Clerk's Office ensured service on 01/11/2023. (SLC) [Entered: 01/11/2023 08:18 AM]
02/01/2023	☐ 73 2 pg, 100.26 KB	ORDER (CHAGARES, Chief Judge, AMBRO, JORDAN, HARDIMAN, GREENAWAY JR., SHWARTZ, KRAUSE, RESTREPO, BIBAS, PORTER, MATEY, PHIPPS, FREEMAN and SCIRICA*, Circuit Judges) denying Petition for panel and for en banc rehearing filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati. Ambro, Authoring Judge. (*Judge Scirica's vote is limited to panel rehearing only.) (CJG) [Entered: 02/01/2023 01:43 PM]
02/09/2023	☐ 74 10 pg, 354.67 KB	MANDATE ISSUED. (SLC) [Entered: 02/09/2023 08:34 AM]
02/13/2023	☐ 75 4 pg, 670.66 KB	MOTION filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati to Abate Time to File for Certiorari. (SLC) [Entered: 02/14/2023 08:48 AM]
02/13/2023	☐ 76 6 pg, 691.57 KB	MOTION filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati for a Procedural Order as to Certiorari. (SLC) [Entered: 02/14/2023 08:49 AM]
02/17/2023	☐ 77 1 pg, 63.98 KB	ORDER (Clerk) No action will be taken on Appellant's motions as it noted that the case is closed. As to the motion for Procedural order Ordinarily, the Court does not intervene in the day-to-day operations of a prison. Appellantshould contact prison administrators with your concerns and for information on prison grievance procedures. Any inquiry regarding a writ for certiorari should be directed to the United States Supreme Court at the following address: Public Information Center, One First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20543-001 (SB) [Entered: 02/17/2023 10:01 AM]
02/17/2023	☐ 78 4 pg, 254.92 KB	ECF FILER: SUGGESTION OF BANKRUPTCY received from Appellee Corizon Inc. Certificate of Service dated 02/17/2023. Service made by US mail, ECF. [22-1861] (JMY) [Entered: 02/17/2023 02:24 PM]
02/21/2023	☐ 79 110 pg, 2.16 MB	MOTION filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati titled FRAP 41(d)(1) Application and Request for Other Relief. Response due on 03/06/2023. Clerk's Office made service on 02/23/2023. Service made by ECF.--[Edited 03/13/2023 by CJG] (SLC) [Entered: 02/23/2023 10:38 AM]
03/13/2023	☐ 80 1 pg, 64.82 KB	ORDER (Clerk) In light of the suggestion of bankruptcy filed by Appellee Corizon Inc., indicating the defendant in the lower court filed a petition for relief under the Bankruptcy Code, no action will be taken on Appellant's motion titled FRAP 41(d)(1) application and request for other relief . See 11 U.S.C. Section: 362 (actions against the debtor may not proceed during the pendency of the bankruptcy). (CJG) [Entered: 03/13/2023 02:02 PM]
03/13/2023	☐ 81 54 pg, 2.72 MB	MOTION filed by Appellant Anant Kumar Tripati for Leave to File Completed Petition in Support of Pending Motion to Stay and Recall. (CJG) [Entered: 03/17/2023 10:18 AM]
03/21/2023	☐ 82 1 pg, 63.64 KB	ORDER (Clerk) The motion for leave to file completed petition in support of motion to stay and recall was received by the Court on March 13, 2023, after a Clerk Order taking no action on Appellant's motion to

Arizona Department of Corrections
Rehabilitation and Reentry

Inmate Letter

Requests are limited to one page and one issue. NO ATTACHMENTS PERMITTED. Please print all information.

INMATE NAME (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	ADC NUMBER	INSTITUTION/UNIT	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)
TRUPTI Anant	102081	909	9/9/23

TO	LOCATION
Mail Room	

State briefly but completely the problem on which you desire assistance. Provide as many details as possible.

Can You Please Confirm You Did Not Receive Any Mail From Me From Meyer Unkovic & Scott Pittsburgh.

During 2/17/23 and 2/28/23.

09109/2023

In response to your inmate letter, I Cpl Mueller #10288 reviewed the incoming legal mail Log.

There is no incoming Legal mail from Meyer Unkovic & Scott Pittsburgh during the period of 2/17/23 to 2/28/23.

Thankyou! D. Mueller #10288

INMATE SIGNATURE	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)
	9/9/23

Have you addressed this with Department staff? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, give the staff member's name and the date you addressed with them:

(Staff Member's Name) (Please print) _____ (Date addressed) _____

Note: Using profanity, insulting, obscene, or abusive language and/or addressing staff with inappropriate names or making inappropriate remarks in this written correspondence (or verbal communication to staff concerning this correspondence), will not be tolerated and may result in no response to the correspondence and/or discipline pursuant to Department Order 303, Inmate Disciplinary Procedure.

Distribution: Original – Master File
Copy - Inmate

916-1
7/26/19