Docket #0162 Date Filed: 10/16/2023

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HOUSTON DIVISION

United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED
OCT 16 2023
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

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

MOTION FOR INHERENT POWER AND RULE 11 SANCTIONS AGAINST HOLLY M. WHALEN, ESQ; DIBELLA WEINHEIMER; JONES SKELTON HOCHULI PC; MICHAEL P. RIDULFO, ESQ; KANE RUSSELL COLEMAN PC; GREGORY C. MICHAELS; DICKEY MCCAMEY & CHILCOTE; WEXFORD HEALTH SOURCES

This motion seeks an order that may adversely affect you. If you oppose the motion, you should immediately contact the moving party to resolve the dispute. If you and the moving party cannot agree, you must file a response and send a copy to the moving party. You must file and serve your response within 21 days of the date this was served on you. Your response must state why the motion should not be granted. If you do not file a timely response, the relief may be granted without further notice to you. If you oppose the motion and have not reached an agreement, you must attend the hearing. Unless the parties agree otherwise, the court may consider evidence at the hearing and may decide the motion at the hearing. Represented parties should act through counsel.

2390086231017000000000003

Plaintiff asks this court for an order imposing inherent power and Rule 11 Sanctions against counsel and Defendants. In support thereof he submits.

PROOF OF COMPLIANCE

¶ I served this motion on counsel, waited 30 days and then filed it. *In re Rollings 2008 Bankr. Lexis 993 (Bankr. SD Tx March 31, 2008)*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROOF OF COMPLIANCE 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

CASES 2

THE SANCTIONABLE CONDUCT 3

THESE LAWYERS AND DEFENDANTS MUST BE SANCTIONED 4

CONCLUSION 5

CASES

Armstrong v Davis, 2012 USD 135389 (ED Tex 2012) 5

In re French Gardens Ltd, 1986 Bankr. Lexis 6894 (SD Tex 1986) 6

In re French, 162 BR 541(Bankr. D.SD. 1994) 5

In re Legrand, 2022 Bankr. Lexis 894 (Bank. EDCA 2022) 6

In re Midwest Donut Inc 1998 Bankr. Lexis 1333 (Bankr. ND Tex 1988) 5

In re Phillips, 2008 Bankr.Lexis 412 (SD Tx 2008) 6

In re R0gers 2002 Bankr. Lexis 1963 (ND Tx 2002) 6

In re Rollings 2008 Bankr. Lexis 993 (Bankr. SD Tx March 31, 2008) 3

Leeds Building Products v Moore-Handley Inc (In re Leeds Building Products) 18 BR 1006 (Bankr. ND Ga 1995).....5

MEET AND CONFER

¶ I sent counsel this motion and asked them to withdraw their pleadings. I gave them through October 25, 2023 to take corrective action and they failed to.

THE SANCTIONABLE CONDUCT

¶ In ECF 121 pp 4 Wexford through Michael P. Ridulfo, Esq; Kane Russell Coleman Pc; Gregory C. Michaels; Dickey McCamey & Chilcote; Wexford Health Sources concealing the material fact that before the Third Circuit there was pending a motion to recall the mandate Filed February 16, 2023 and that neither the Third Circuit nor the District Court decided the spoliation issue before the court. Counsel also omit the fact that the Third Circuit declined to rule on the motion as to all Defendants, because of this bankruptcy, and that the United states Supreme Court did not docket the matter, due to this bankruptcy. (See attached log and order)

¶ Wexford through Michael P. Ridulfo, Esq; Kane Russell Coleman Pc; Gregory C. Michaels; Dickey McCamey & Chilcote; Wexford Health Sources falsely argued that Plaintiff did not pay the filing fees though the record shows Plaintiff paid the filing fees (see attached) and that 28 USC 1915(a)(3) which applies to appeals in forma pauperis, mandate this court review this complaint.

¶ Jones Skelton Hochuli through counsel Holly M. Whalen, Esq; Dibella Weinheimer; informed this court in their reply that the spoliation claims were fully litigated (pp 7) concealing the material fact that before the Third Circuit there was pending a motion to

recall the mandate Filed February 16, 203 and that neither the Third Circuit nor the District Court decided the spoliation issue before the court. Counsel also omit the fact that the Third Circuit declined to rule on the motion as to all Defendants, because of this bankruptcy, and that the United states Supreme Court did not docket the matter, due to this bankruptcy.

THESE LAWYERS AND DEFENDANTS MUST BE SANCTIONED

¶Bankruptcy courts have the inherent power to impose sanctions for bad faith conduct. *Cadle Co. v Pratt (In re Pratt) 2008 Bankr. Lexis 2103 (Bankr. N.D.Tex. July 30, 2008)*

¶ In this case joint liability is appropriate as Defendants and counsel are sophisticated, acted in bad faith. *In re Midwest Donut Inc 1998 Bankr. Lexis 1333 (Bankr. ND Tex 1988)*

¶ The motions they filed:

- Wexford falsely argued that Plaintiff did not pay the filing fees and that 28 USC 1915(a)(3) which applies to appeals in forma pauperis, mandate this court review this complaint. This is not an appeal, and not in forma pauperis.
- Defendants concealed the material fact that before the Third Circuit there was pending a motion to recall the mandate Filed February 16, 203 and that neither the Third Circuit nor the District Court decided the spoliation issue before the court. Counsel also omit the fact that the Third Circuit declined to rule on the motion as to all Defendants, because of this bankruptcy, and that the United states Supreme Court did not docket the matter, due to this bankruptcy.

- Were filed to manipulate the bankruptcy process and asssit in the perpetration of the biggest fraud in United States Bankruptcy history. *Armstrong v Davis, 2012 USD 135389 (ED Tex 2012)*
- They are not well grounded in fact and law. *In re French Gardens Ltd, 1986 Bankr. Lexis 6894 (SD Tex 1986)*
- They were filed without counsel performing their duty to investigate. *In re Phillips, 2008 Bankr.Lexis 412 (SD Tx 2008)*
- These were filed to harass and delay these proceedings. *In re R0gers 2002 Bankr. Lexis 1963 (ND Tx 2002)*
- The pleadings, arguments, all contain falsehoods and are not privileged. In re Legrand, 2022 Bankr. Lexis 894 (Bank. EDCA 2022) In re French, 162 BR 541(Bankr. D.SD. 1994)

CONCLUSION

¶ These lawyers and Defendants should be sanctioned for misleading this court, as to the issue, core to this case and their defenses. Their conduct was intentional.

Respectfully submitted,

Anant Kumar Tripati

The Plaintiff hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by the Court's CM/ECF system on all parties requesting notice/ all parties who have entered appearance.

Inmate Account Summary

Transactions from 05/01/2023 to 06/30/2023

Case 23-03072 Document 162 Filed in TXSB on 10/16/23 Page 7 of 18

Inmate

Name:	TRIPATI, ANANT K
ADC #:	102081
ADC #:	102081
DOB:	1/16/1954
Status:	Active
Admitted:	12/20/1993
Released:	N/A

Funds

Account

Spendable:

INMATE DEBT:

DDA:

Wages:

Retention:

DDA L:

Classifications

Religious Affiliation : Buddhist

Religious Diet : none

Phase : Phase 3

Security Level : 3

Loss of Privilege : N

Transactions

Inmate Account Summary

Transactions from 05/01/2023 to 06/30/2023

5/26/2023 1:37:38 AM	94 XFR WAGES TO SPND L2	Deduct: from 'Wages' into 'Spendable'	Wages	($7.84)
5/26/2023 1:37:38 AM	54 TRANSITION FEE LT2	Deduct: from 'Wages' into 'Common Checks - Deductions and Fees'	Wages	($0.56)
5/26/2023 1:37:38 AM	13 DDA XFR G	Deduct: from 'Wages' into 'DDA'	DDA	$2.80
5/26/2023 1:37:38 AM	13 DDA XFR G	Deduct: from 'Wages' into 'DDA'	Wages	($2.80)
5/26/2023 1:37:37 AM	15 PYRL WI L2 TR	WIPP Payroll LT $2 Transition	Wages	$11.20
5/23/2023 1:15:32 PM	46 COPY NON LGL	Y09 354 NON-LEGAL COPIES 05/23/23	Spendable	($3.80)
5/22/2023 10:17:50 AM	22 CHECK DISBURSEMENT	YUMA Y09 601 U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT/FEE	Spendable	($350.00)
5/20/2023 12:39:50 AM	36 PMT UTILITY FEE	Pay: 5/20/2023 12:39:50 AM - 36 UTILITY FEE - Charge for Utilities	Spendable	($2.00)
5/20/2023 12:39:50 AM	36 PMT UTILITY FEE	Pay: 5/20/2023 12:39:50 AM - 36 UTILITY FEE - Charge for Utilities	INMATE DEBT	($2.00)
5/20/2023 12:39:50 AM	36 UTILITY FEE	Charge for Utilities	INMATE DEBT	$2.00
5/19/2023 7:46:42 AM	39 PMT POST LGL	Pay: 5/19/2023 9:46:42 AM - 39 LEGAL POSTAGE - Y09 345 Legal Postage 5/19/23	Spendable	($1.74)
5/19/2023 7:46:42 AM	39 PMT POST LGL	Pay: 5/19/2023 9:46:42 AM - 39 LEGAL POSTAGE - Y09 345 Legal Postage 5/19/23	INMATE DEBT	($1.74)
5/19/2023 7:46:42 AM	39 LEGAL POSTAGE	Y09 345 Legal Postage 5/19/23	INMATE DEBT	$1.74
5/17/2023 1:52:14 PM	22 CHECK DISBURSEMENT	VOID: STOP PAYMENT CK#500345543 REQUEST BY INMATE WRONG AMOUNT	Spendable	$300.00
5/16/2023 8:37:59 AM	38 PMT COPY LGL	Pay: 5/16/2023 8:37:59 AM - 38 LEGAL COPIES - Y09 333 LEGAL COPIES 05/15/23	Spendable	($1.75)
5/16/2023 8:37:59 AM	38 PMT COPY LGL	Pay: 5/16/2023 8:37:59 AM - 38 LEGAL COPIES - Y09 333 LEGAL COPIES 05/15/23	INMATE DEBT	($1.75)

Case 23-03072 Document 162 Filed in TXSB on 10/16/23 Page 8 of 18

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

Arizona Department of Corrections
Rehabilitation 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

etal and other contraband have been removed prior to issuing to inmate.*

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

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

COMMANDER NAME *(Last, First M.I.) (Please print)*	SIGNATURE	DATE *(mm/dd/yyyy)*
pl. U. Sergenti	Cpl. U. [illegible] 1289	2-16-23

2-16-23

Case 23-03072 Document 162 Filed in TXSB on 10/16/23 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, 95.62 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, 670.56 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, 891.57 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)
TRUETT, Arnold	102081	409	9/9/23

TO: Mail Room

LOCATION:

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 for me from Meyer Unkovic & Scott Pittsburgh.

During 2/1/23 and 2/28/23.

09/09/2023

In response to your inmate letter, I call Mvela, D #10288 reviewed the incoming legal mail Log.

There is no incoming Legal mail from Meyer Unkovic & Scott Pittsburgh during the period of 2/1/23 TO 2/28/23.

Thankyou! D. Mvela #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 803, Inmate Disciplinary Procedure.

Distribution: Original – Master File
Copy - Inmate