Docket #0159 Date Filed: 10/10/2023
Southern District of Texas
FILED
OCT 10 2023
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON

ANANT KUMAR TRIPATHY VS. SARA TIRSCHWELL ET AL	23-03072 (CML) Reply to ECF 15

① EVEN THOUGH FEDERAL Judges have found Daniel STRUCK BLATANTLY lies to FEDERAL Judges [ECF 392 PP 21 - Page 19 TO 25 Page 5]

Daniel STRUCK Does it Again by saying BANKRUPTCY RULES DO NOT ALLOW Replies to A MOTION to AMEND

② IN WOPSOCK V NATCHEZ 2008 US APP. LEXIS 11206 [10th Cir

1/ THIS is JUST ONE PORTION of A TRANSCRIPT. There are NUMEROUS Examples

23900862310120000000000004

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

ECF 3921 — CW 12-0601 - RWS
US DIST COURT ATTACHED
FEDERAL JUDGE FILES
Daniel STORCK FILED
TO NINTH CIRCUIT AND
DISTRICT JUDGES — AND
CAME UP WITH
FRIVOLOUS POST HOC
RATIONALIZATIONS

ECF 203 — CW 19-04038 PHO RWS
FEDERAL JUDGE
FILES QUESTIONING FRIED
FOR CORIZON — LIED THAT
NO EMAILS EXISTED AND
IN FN 3 ADDRESSED
SANCTIONS SEPARATELY

THIS FORCED CORIZON
TO SETTLE

ECF 47 — CW 21-00678 RWS - FN 9
FEDERAL JUDGE FINDS
& BOLDLY OBSP —
CONTINUED CHANGING WHAT
THE DECLARATION STATED

EXHIBITS Cont'd

Receipts By Prison officials showing I have been Reviewing evidence since 1/20/23 - with spoliation - the Defendants Conceals

2008) Plaintiff Filed his Reply As of Right to Motion for leave to amend and attached A Copy of the Complaint Curing the defects Pointed by DEFENDANTS in their Response

(3) In my Reply to Motion for leave to amend [ECF-96] I DID Just that I showed how Judicial Estoppel Applies — how DEFENDANTS are lying about the screening.

I have also shown that As A MATTER OF LAW DEFENDANTS are incorrect [2]

(4) IN ECF - MOTION TO ABATE

2/ See also Attached Reply to ECF 138 showing that As A MATTER OF LAW All Objections Fail.

-2-

TIME — I CLEARLY SET FORTH Viable Reasons — why I should be Granted Relief — AND — I have SINCE FILED My Reply

Conclusion

(5) FEDERAL Judges State AFTER, Daniel STUART Gets Caught[3] lying — he — comes up with frivolous — post hoc RATIONALIZATIONS — [ECF 392 PP 27 LINE 21-28]

(6) — entirety — WETFORD — Corizon —

[3] QUINTANILLA PRIOR DEFENDANTS got Caught lying about inmates ECF 203 PP 2 LINE 2-3 FOR CORIZON AND WERE SANCTIONED ECF 208 EX 2 — FORCED SETTLEMENT

Renown COOK DEFENDANTS got Caught lying before

WEBER Gallagher — Arizona
DEFENDANTS — Jones Skelton Hockulr
AND others - JOINED STINCK

(7) ALL these lies have TWO
Common Lines!

- Daniel STINCK is
NEEDED FOR these
LAWYERS / DEFENDANT
to PROFIT — BECAUSE
— DANIEL STINCK
— is the GATEKEEPER
OF Evidence that is
NEEDED / HAS BEEN
NEEDED — in ALL
those CASES — DAN

3 Cont'd / Judge Cynthia Jorgensen
and the Judge ACCEPTED
Evidence for Cause

Breaching Oberg Defendants
got Caught lying for Centurion
and DARKTRACKER EOF 47
FOR 5

— 4 —

ABSENT SANCTIONS — WHO WITH THE HELP OF JUDGE SCOTT HOCHULI — CONTINUED TO JOIN PRACTICE [4] — THEIR CLIENTS — WESTERN — CENTENNIAL — LONGVIEW — ADLER — WOULD NOT PREVAIL

AND

ALL THESE DEFENDANTS EXCEPT MAKING CONCLUSORY ARGUMENTS — HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO SHOW WHERE THE THIRD CIRCUIT — DISTRICT COURTS FOUND THE CLAIMS VEXATIOUS — MALICIOUS — AND WHERE THEY OR ANY OTHER DISTRICT COURTS — DECIDED

[4] SEE PENDING MOTIONS FOR SANCTIONS — AND REPLIES TO ANY MOTIONS/RESPONSES — TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS

THESE CLAIMS — POST JUDGMENT — AFTER 2020 — AND — ON 1/20/23, 4/12/23, 5/22/23, 6/14/23, 6/15/23 FROM ATTORNEYS AROUND the COUNTRY — WITH EVIDENCE AGAINST DEFENDANTS — OR SPOLIATION — [SEE Reply to ECF 138]

(8) The MOTION to abate + me should be granted

(9) As SET FORTH in the PENDING MOTION TO STRIKE — STRUCK — A MEMBER OF the BAR — HAS A HISTORY OF trying to RECUSE JUDGES — Am should not be allowed

(10) The Replies by ME — ADDRESS ISSUES — SHOWING DEFENDANTS arguments FRIVOLOUS

5) I incorporate Reply to ECF 138 As An integral Part of Pending motions — b —

Defendants have waived
all objections

(1) As sophisticated lawyers
Defendants should have
addressed the issues - they
not removed stuck.

Respectfully submitted

10/2/23

Expert testimony like
existing system

PM	Location	January 2021	February 2021	March 2021	April 2021
98	Eyman	80%	82%	94%	82%
98	Lewis	90%	89%	78%	89%
98	Winslow	75%	100%	100%	100%
Total Noncompliant		29	25	33	32

This plainly establishes that despite the emergence from the pandemic, Defendants remain noncompliant with some of the most fundamental and critical aspects of medical and mental health care delivery.

RESCISSION

A. Defendants Know Rescission Was Always Possible

After concluding the Stipulation represented an appropriate resolution, the Court closed this case "subject to the Court maintaining jurisdiction to supervise the enforcement of the settlement as provided in the parties' Stipulation." (Doc. 1458). On November 15, 2018, the Court warned Defendants their "actions raise the distinct miserable possibility that the Stipulation will have to be set aside and the parties instructed to litigate again." (Doc. 3057 at 9). Defendants acknowledged as much when arguing before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in September 2019. At oral argument, defense counsel told the Ninth Circuit this Court lacked contempt authority under the Stipulation and argued, instead, that the Court could vacate the settlement and set the case for trial. Defense counsel made this clear in response to Judge Callahan questioning Defendants' position that the Court lacked the authority to enforce the stipulation through its contempt powers.

> **Judge Callahan:** So the stipulation then just basically means nothing? I mean it's just this is what we agree to and if it doesn't work out then that's it. The court can't do anything?
>
> **Defendants' Counsel:** No. The court definitely has enforcement ability. First of all, if the court concludes that the parties aren't dealing with the . . . complying with the stipulation, it can vacate the stipulation and we can go back and litigate the case.

Defendants later attempted to graft a post-hoc rationalization for their oral argument statement, saying they meant only that "state law contractual remedies . . . are available to

enforce noncompliance, including initiating an action in state court for breach of contract." (Doc. 3411 at 1). But that is far from what they said. Rather, Defendants represented that if the Court "concludes that the parties aren't . . . complying with the stipulation, it can vacate the stipulation" and resume litigation. Defendants were very aware their failures could result in the resumption of litigation.

Further, as Defendants were told in October 2019, after reviewing Dr. Stern's expert report, the Court identified rescission of the Stipulation as one of the three remaining options. The other two—renewed settlement negotiations and further contempt sanctions—have now since been repeatedly attempted but proven unsuccessful in provoking compliance. And the Court recognized in February 2020 that the "record supports a finding of rescission," but elected to give Defendants "one more, but final, attempt at coercive sanctions." (Doc. 3495 at 1). As detailed above, that attempt obviously failed again to bring about compliance.

B. Legal Basis for Undoing Settlement

In 1994, the Supreme Court addressed federal courts' power to enforce settlement agreements. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 511 U.S. 375 (1994). In distinguishing between a district court enforcing a settlement agreement and reopening a dismissed action because of a parties' repudiation of a settlement agreement, the Supreme Court recognized that "some Courts of Appeals have held the latter can be obtained under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(6)." *Id.* at 377 (internal footnote omitted). The Supreme Court cited the Ninth Circuit as one such circuit. *Id.* at 378 (citing *Keeling v. Sheet Metal Workers Int'l Assn.*, 937 F.2d 408, 410 (9th Cir. 1991)). The Ninth Circuit is not alone as the First, Fourth, and Sixth Circuits have also so held. *See, e.g., Delay v. Gordon*, 475 F.3d 1039, 1044-45 & n.11 (9th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Baus*, 834 F.2d 1114, 1124 (1st Cir. 1987); *Fairfax Countywide Citizens Assn. v. Fairfax County*, 571 F.2d 1299, 1302-1303 (4th Cir. 1978); *Hinsdale v. Farmers Natl. Bank & Trust Co.*, 823 F.2d 993, 996 (6th Cir. 1987); *Aro Corp. v. Allied Witan Co.*, 531 F.2d 1368, 1371 (6th Cir. 1975). Thus, it is well-established that a party's behavior after entering into a settlement

ADM 3/0

intentional misconduct in this case that would establish such extreme circumstances. At best, the record has shown that counsel presented a declaration (that there were no relevant emails) that turned out to be incorrect. He proffers nothing to show counsel knew it to be so at the time it was presented. Plaintiff presents smoke, not fire. The only fire shown (the presentation of a declaration that turned out wrong) is not an extreme circumstance but an unfortunately common byproduct of counsel's dependence upon his client and others to assist in developing discovery responses.

Moreover, even if Plaintiff could produce evidence of the claimed fire, it would not call for disqualification (although perhaps other sanctions). Rather, disqualification is not normally justified as a punitive measure, but rather only to protect the ongoing fairness of the litigation. For example, where the attorney's misconduct affects his ability to vigorously represent his client (e.g. because of a conflict of interest, etc.), or where the attorney may use privileged information to the disadvantage of his opponent. *See Bd. of Ed. of City of New York v. Nyquist*, 590 F.2d 1241, 1246 (2d Cir. 1979). Here, any purported misconduct is in the past, and has already been rectified by the eventual disclosure of the error and the existence of the emails.

Other sanctions against counsel (if any were shown to be appropriate) should not be applied by the Court in this proceeding. Local Rule of Civil Procedure 83.1 governs the appearance and conduct of counsel in this Court. That Rule provides:

> (4) Scope; Enforcement. Nothing in this Local Rule is intended to modify, or take the place of, the Court's inherent powers, contempt powers or the sanctions provisions contained in any applicable federal rule or statute. **Further, nothing in this Local Rule is intended to confer upon any attorney or party the right to file a motion to enforce the provisions of this Local Rule.** The initiation of enforcement proceedings under this Local Rule is within the sole discretion of the Court.

LRCiv 83.1(f)(4) (emphasis added). This Rule comports with the principle, applicable in Arizona and in the federal courts eschewing the use of ethical violations as a sword by litigants. *See Alexander v. Superior Ct. In & For Maricopa Cty.*, 141 Ariz. 157, 161, 685 P.2d 1309, 1313 (1984) ("Only in extreme circumstances should a party to a lawsuit be

205).[3] The Court will grant in part and deny in part Corizon Defendant's Motion, deny Centurion and Shinn's Motion, and grant Shank's Motion to Supplement.

I. Background

In his Complaint, Shank alleged that for years, he has been denied adequate treatment for serious medical needs related to his prostate, bladder, sphincter, and shoulder. (Doc. 1 at 3–11.) Shank alleged that he had to undergo prostate surgery, but there were complications, he was denied the recommended post-surgery follow up, and specialist consults have been delayed. He further alleged that he has suffered extreme pain and damage from medical staff's inability to competently treat him and to properly insert catheters. Shank also alleged that Defendants refused to provide a sphincter implant and medication ordered by a specialist, and they have delayed and denied shoulder surgery ordered by a specialist. Shank stated that he has suffered pain, repeated and ongoing infections, and lost 50% use of his left arm. (*Id.*) For relief, Shank requests damages and injunctive relief. (*Id.* at 18.)

Corizon Defendants move for summary judgment on the grounds that (1) Shank's urinary claims are time-barred, (2) neither Corizon nor any individual Corizon Defendant acted with deliberate indifference to Shank's serious medical needs, (3) Shank suffered no injury attributable to Defendants, and (4) punitive damages are not warranted. (Doc. 136.)

Centurion and Shinn move for summary judgment on the grounds that (1) Shank has not demonstrated deliberate indifference on the part of Centurion or Shinn, (2) Shank suffered no injury attributable to Centurion or Shinn, (3) Shank received the requested surgery and is scheduled for a second surgery, and (4) Shank has not demonstrated a policy or custom that caused an alleged constitutional violation. (Doc. 124).

On October 29, 2021, Shank filed his Motion to Supplement the Record, which seeks to submit additional evidence in the form of a grievance and grievance responses related to his medical care. (Doc. 205.)

---

[3] Also before the Court is Shank's Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 160), which will be addressed separately.

amount to deliberate indifference to [a plaintiff's] serious medical needs." *Sanchez v. Vild*, 891 F.2d 240, 242 (9th Cir. 1989). The action must rise to a level of "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain." *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 105.

Plaintiff has demonstrated a strong likelihood of success on his Eighth Amendment medical claim. Plaintiff previously required surgical repair of a recurrent hernia and has been seeking treatment for a shrunken testicle as well as groin and abdominal pain for approximately six months. While Defendants claim Plaintiff has been provided care consistent with his "current medical diagnosis," it is not clear what "diagnosis" Defendants are referencing. The only diagnosis Plaintiff has received since 2019 was a diagnosis of "other chronic pain" made sixteen months before he reported a decrease in testicle size and eighteen months before his ultrasound was performed. (Doc. 31-2 at 183-84.) In addition, Defendants' own records show that Plaintiff was denied access to two different diagnostic tools initially recommended by Karanja-Adams: a pelvic/lower abdominal ultrasound and a urology consultation. Although Defendants attempt to portray these reversals as reasoned determinations regarding a lack of medical necessity based on Karanja-Adams reevaluating Plaintiff's condition, their characterization is not supported by the record.

Defendants' explanation for Karanja-Adams's reconsideration of the pelvic/lower abdominal ultrasound is baseless. Defendants assert "[i]t was later determined"—by whom they do not say—"that based on the presentation and exam that [sic] only the testicular ultrasound needed to take place."[9] (Doc. 31 at 4.) Their failure to attribute this determination is telling, as the evidence cited does not reflect *any* basis for the cancelation of Plaintiff's pelvic ultrasound. (Doc. 31-2 at 41-51.) The only relevant evidence, a March 3, 2021 "Consultation Request Action" (Doc. 31-2 at 40), is too ambiguous to conclude Karanja-Adams was even responsible for this decision, much less that she made this decision based on further presentation and examination. That document merely indicates Karanja-Adams canceled the consultation request on March 3, 2021, noting, "No clinical

[9] At the evidentiary hearing, defense counsel appeared to backtrack from this position by arguing the pelvic ultrasound *did* occur. Defense counsel's constantly shifting positions makes it difficult to determine what, in fact, they are arguing.

Arizona Department of Corrections
Rehabilitation & Reentry

Inmate Property/Contraband/Disposition Tracking

INSTITUTION/UNIT	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)	TIME
ASPC-Yuma/Cibola	01/20/23	1833
INMATE NAME (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	ADCRR NUMBER	PROPERTY SEIZED BY (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)
Tripathi, Amant Kumar	102081	CO Escobedo R #1027

SEIZED PROPERTY RECEIPT

#	Description	Reason
1	USB	Inside of legal mail envelope
		flashdrive was sent out to attorney on June 15 2023 was given to CO Mercado by Lieutenant Lugo

The above described contraband was seized from the suspect/inmate when he/she knowingly took said contraband into a correctional facility, or was found in possession of said contraband in violation of A.R.S. 13-2505.

CONTRABAND CONTROL/CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Evidence Control Number:

From	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Time	To	Initials

PROPERTY RELEASE

INMATE SIGNATURE	DATE OF NOTIFICATION (mm/dd/yyyy)
CONTRABAND CONTROL NUMBER	NOTIFIED BY (Staff Signature and Badge Number)

- ☐ I wish to donate the property listed above to the Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR)
- ☐ I wish to have the property listed above destroyed by the ADCRR
- ☐ **HOLD FOR:** Appeal (*This option applies only for publications excluded under Department Order 914, Inmate Mail*). Inmate must timely submit Inmate Letter, Form 916-1 to initiate appeal process per Department Order 914, Inmate Mail.
- ☐ **SEND TO:**
  Name _____
  Address _____
- ☐ **HOLD FOR:**
  Name _____
  Address _____

SIGNATURE OF PERSON PICKING UP PROPERTY	DATE PROPERTY PICKED UP

CONTRABAND CONTROL OFFICER (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER (Last, First M.I.) (If Inmate unavailable)	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)

Original – Property Officer
Copy – Inmate
Copy – CIU/Disciplinary (as needed)

909-6
9/7/21

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Inmate Property/Contraband/Disposition Tracking

LOCATION/UNIT	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)	TIME
Asec. Yma / Cibola	4/12/23	1530
INMATE NAME (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	**ADC NUMBER**	**PROPERTY SEIZED BY** (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)
Tripati, A	102081	COTE Cruz, A #10986

SEIZED PROPERTY RECEIPT

#	Description	Reason
1	USB	Legal Mail

The above described contraband was seized from the suspect/inmate when he/she knowingly took said contraband into a correctional facility, or was found in possession of said contraband in violation of A.R.S. 13-2505.

CONTRABAND CONTROL/CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Evidence Control Number:

From	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Time	To	Initials

PROPERTY RELEASE

INMATE SIGNATURE	DATE OF NOTIFICATION (mm/dd/yyyy)
CONTRABAND CONTROL NUMBER	NOTIFIED BY (Staff Signature and Badge Number)

☐ I wish to donate the property listed above to the Department of Corrections
☐ I wish to have the property listed above destroyed by the Department of Corrections
☐ **HOLD FOR:** Appeal (*This option applies only for publications excluded under Department Order 914, Inmate Mail*). Inmate must timely submit Inmate Letter, Form 916-1 to initiate appeal process per Department Order 914, Inmate Mail.

☐ **SEND TO:**
Name _____
Address _____

☐ **HOLD FOR:**
Name _____
Address _____

SIGNATURE OF PERSON PICKING UP PROPERTY	DATE PROPERTY PICKED UP
[signature]	4.13.23

CONTRABAND CONTROL OFFICER (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER (Last, First M.I.) (If Inmate unavailable)	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)

Distribution: Original – Property Officer
Copy – Inmate
Copy – CIU/Disciplinary (as needed)

Arizona Department of Corrections
Rehabilitation and Reentry

Inmate Property/Contraband/Disposition Tracking

LOCATION/UNIT	DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	TIME
YUMA-CIBOLA	5-22-2023	1822
INMATE NAME *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	**ADCRR NUMBER**	**PROPERTY SEIZED BY** *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*
TRIPATI, ANANT KUMAR	102081	RIVERA, J. GOII 3880

SEIZED PROPERTY RECEIPT

#	Description	Reason
1	USB CSANDISK 32GB	

The above described contraband was seized from the suspect/inmate when he/she knowingly took said contraband into a correctional facility, or was found in possession of said contraband in violation of A.R.S. 13-2505.

CONTRABAND CONTROL/CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Evidence Control Number:

From	Date *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	Time	To	Initials
			2 of 2	

PROPERTY RELEASE

INMATE SIGNATURE	DATE OF NOTIFICATION *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
CONTRABAND CONTROL NUMBER	NOTIFIED BY *(Staff Signature and Badge Number)*

☐ I wish to donate the property listed above to the Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR)
☐ I wish to have the property listed above destroyed by the ADCRR
☐ **HOLD FOR:** Appeal *(This option applies only for publications excluded under Department Order 914, Inmate Mail)*. Inmate must timely submit Inmate Letter, Form 916-1 to initiate appeal process per Department Order 914, Inmate Mail.

☐ **SEND TO:**
Name _____
Address _____
_____
_____

☐ **HOLD FOR:**
Name _____
Address _____
_____
_____

SIGNATURE OF PERSON PICKING UP PROPERTY	DATE PROPERTY PICKED UP

CONTRABAND CONTROL OFFICER *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER *(Last, First M.I.) (If Inmate unavailable)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*

Distribution: Original – Property Officer
Copy – Inmate
Copy – CIU/Disciplinary *(as needed)*

Arizona Department of Corrections Rehabilitation and Reentry

Inmate Property/Contraband/Disposition Tracking

LOCATION/UNIT	DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	TIME
ASPC Yuma Cocopa	06/14/2023	1550
INMATE NAME *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	**ADCRR NUMBER**	**PROPERTY SEIZED BY** *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*
Tripathi, Anant	102081	Ramirez, E COII 11999

SEIZED PROPERTY RECEIPT

#	Description	Reason
1	USB flash drive	USB confiscated for library usage

The above described contraband was seized from the suspect/inmate when he/she knowingly took said contraband into a correctional facility, or was found in possession of said contraband in violation of A.R.S. 13-2505.

CONTRABAND CONTROL/CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Evidence Control Number:

From	Date *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	Time	To	Initials

PROPERTY RELEASE

INMATE SIGNATURE	DATE OF NOTIFICATION *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
CONTRABAND CONTROL NUMBER	NOTIFIED BY *(Staff Signature and Badge Number)*

- ☐ I wish to donate the property listed above to the Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR)
- ☐ I wish to have the property listed above destroyed by the ADCRR
- ☐ **HOLD FOR:** Appeal *(This option applies only for publications excluded under Department Order 914, Inmate Mail)*. Inmate must timely submit Inmate Letter, Form 916-1 to initiate appeal process per Department Order 914, Inmate Mail.
- ☐ **SEND TO:**
  Name _____
  Address _____
- ☐ **HOLD FOR:**
  Name _____
  Address _____

SIGNATURE OF PERSON PICKING UP PROPERTY	DATE PROPERTY PICKED UP

CONTRABAND CONTROL OFFICER *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
DESTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEMBER *(Last, First M.I.) (If Inmate unavailable)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*

Distribution: Original – Property Officer
Copy – Inmate
Copy – CIU/Disciplinary *(as needed)*

Received on 7/10/2023

Arizona Department of Corrections Rehabilitation and Reentry

Inmate Property/Contraband/Disposition Tracking

LOCATION/UNIT	DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	TIME
ASPC-Yuma/Cibola	06-15-2023	1525
INMATE NAME *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	**ADCRR NUMBER**	**PROPERTY SEIZED BY** *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*
Tripati	102081	COII Nolasco, M

SEIZED PROPERTY RECEIPT

#	Description	Reason
1	USB	Contraband

The above described contraband was seized from the suspect/inmate when he/she knowingly took said contraband into a correctional facility, or was found in possession of said contraband in violation of A.R.S. 13-2505.

CONTRABAND CONTROL/CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Evidence Control Number:

From	Date *(mm/dd/yyyy)*	Time	To	Initials

PROPERTY RELEASE

INMATE SIGNATURE	DATE OF NOTIFICATION *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
CONTRABAND CONTROL NUMBER	NOTIFIED BY *(Staff Signature and Badge Number)*

- ☐ I wish to donate the property listed above to the Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR)
- ☐ I wish to have the property listed above destroyed by the ADCRR
- ☐ **HOLD FOR:** Appeal *(This option applies only for publications excluded under Department Order 914, Inmate Mail)*. Inmate must timely submit Inmate Letter, Form 916-1 to initiate appeal process per Department Order 914, Inmate Mail.
- ☐ **SEND TO:**
  Name _____
  Address _____
- ☐ **HOLD FOR:**
  Name _____
  Address _____

ATURE OF PERSON PICKING UP PROPERTY	DATE PROPERTY PICKED UP

ND CONTROL OFFICER *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
COMMITTEE MEMBER *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
MMITTEE MEMBER *(Last, First M.I.) (If Inmate unavailable)*	BADGE NUMBER	DISPOSAL DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*

Distrib

Officer

linary *(as needed)*