

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK x

LEROY PEOPLES,

Plaintiff,

- against -

BRIAN FISCHER, et al.,

Defendant. x

Amended Complaint

under

Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1983
(Prisoner Complaint)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

11 Civ. 2694 (SAS)

Leave Granted To Amend Complaint And Waiver

Plaintiff, Leroy Peoples, was granted leave to amend complaint, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15(a), in a Opinion and Order by this Court on May 2, 2012. This amended complaint reflects this change as follows:

1. The plaintiff in his original complaint made claims against Fischer, Leclaire, Lee, O'Connor, Malave, Bellamy, D.O.C.S. Office of Counsel, Crusco, Brown and Rosenbaum. Due to their lack of personal involvement, the claims against these defendants was dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend and this is reflective in this instant amendment. Defendant Malave was dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Fed. R. Civ. Proc..

Further reflected in this amended complaint is compliance to Rule 8 of the Fed. R. Civ. Proc..

2. In order to proceed with the Fourteenth Amendment due process claim, plaintiff amends and waives his challenge to any and all sanctions affecting the length of his confinement, including the loss of good time credit claim, that was raised in original complaint. see, Jackson Jenkins v. Haubert, 179 F.3d 19, 27 (2d Cir. 1999).

Jurisdiction And Venue

1. Pursuant to Rule 8(A)(1) of the Fed. R. Civ. Proc. and 28 U.S.C. §§ 112(B) and 1331, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York has full jurisdiction to hear and adjudge this matter.

(a) The plaintiffs basis of venue is that of legal doctrine of "Federal Questions Jurisdiction." As such, this action is based upon U.S. Constitutional rights violations that took place in the State of New York Correctional Facility of Green Haven Correctional Facility, located in Stormville, New York (Dutchess County).

Parties

1. The plaintiff, LeRoy Peoples, Dn No.: OSA2620 current institution: Attica Corr. Fac., P.O. Box 149-639 Exchange Street, Attica, New York 14011-0149, was incarcerated at Green Haven Corr. Fac. ("Green Haven") during the events described in this complaint.

2. Defendant Curtis Drown, Commissioner Hearing Officer (now deceased), was employed at: N.Y.S. D.O.C.S., 1220 Washington Ave., Albany, New York 12226. He is being sued in his individual and official capacity.

3. Defendant David Rock, Superintendent of Upstate Correctional Facility, employed at: Upstate Corr. Fac. P.O. Box 2001-309 Bare Hill Road, Malone, New York 12953. He is being sued in his individual capacity.

4. Defendant Norman Bezio, Director of Special Housing Unit, employed at: N.Y.S. D.O.C.S., 1220 Washington Ave., Albany, New York 12226. He is being sued in his individual capacity.

5. Defendant Richard Ward, Lieutenant Correctional Officer, employed at: Green Haven Corr. Fac., P.O. Box 4000 - 594 Route 216, Schenectady, New York 12302. He is being sued in his individual capacity.

6. All defendants herein are persons, personally involved, acting under color of state law and have deprived the plaintiff of federal rights, at all times relevant to this complaint.

Exhaustion Of Administrative Remedies

1. The plaintiff has exhausted all his administrative remedies with to all claims and all defendants, pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), 42 U.S.C. § 1997e (a).

Statement Of Facts

1. On October 5, 2009, at approximately 11:45 am/12 pm while at my industry work program, Sgt. K. O'Connor and C.O. Malave approached my work area in which O'Connor ordered Malave to put risk plaintiff and to search my work station, in which he complied. From there, I was escorted by O'Connor and Malave to my cell-block living quarters (F-Block 150-Cell), in which upon arrival there, my cell was thoroughly searched and papers, confiscated, with my personal mail, legal mail, family photos, clothing and other miscellaneous property was scattered all over my cell.

I was placed in this cell for about 5 minutes in which O'Connor and Malave departed and the stu staff came to escort plaintiff to the stu. The next day (10/6/09) I was served with misbehavior report while in 12 cell of stu. (see, Exh. A - Misbehavior Report) Defendant Richard Ward, Lt. Corr. Off., authorized the placement of plaintiff in stu 12 cell (see, Exh. A - Misbehavior Report for Ward's signature). This cell search and placement of plaintiff in stu, stimulated from documents plaintiff sent to the Queens County District Attorney Office, and in turn, they forwarded to William Lee Supt. of Green Haven Corr. Fac. Those former defendants of the Queens County District Attorney Office were dismissed in this Court's December 1, 2011, Opinion and Order.

2. On October 13, 2009, my misbehavior report hearing disposition was conducted by defendant Curtis Brown, Comm. Hear. Officer. Plaintiff was walked through the normal formalities of a hearing, to end hearing with the disposition and punishment of 3 yrs. stu confinement, 3 yrs. loss of packages, phone and commissary privileges. (see, Exh. A - Pgs. 182 of Hearing Disposition) prior to defendant Brown rendering this disposition, off the record, plaintiff was prejudiced in that defendant Brown referenced surprise that plaintiff was capable of composing such articulated documents (that was confiscated), being that he was a sex-offender.

3. In November 2009, the plaintiff appealed the hearing disposition of defendant Brown to defendant Norman Bezie - who affirmed and confirmed the sanctions of 3 yrs. stu, 3 yrs. loss of packages, phone and commissary privileges, by denying his appeal leaving plaintiff confined to the stu. Plaintiff had a fist fight with fellow inmate Larry Allen, which was dismissed, as defendant Rock

could not have foreseen this incident transpiring. This fight took place in November 2009 as well.

4. On March 7, 2011, plaintiff submitted a inmate grievance challenging the hearing disposition sanctions of 3 yrs. SHU confinement, 3 yrs. loss of phone, packages and commissary privileges. (see, Exh. A - Inmate Grievance) On March 9, 2011, the Inmate Grievance Resolution Committee ("IGRC") denied plaintiff's grievance and he simultaneously appealed to defendant David Rock, as Supt. of Upstate Corr. Fac. (a SHU facility), and, on March 15, 2011, defendant Rock denied plaintiff's appeal, affirming his confinement and revoked privileges of 3 yrs., and plaintiff appealed two days later on March 17, 2011. (see, Exh. A - Response of IGRC; Defendant Rock's denial of appeal which plaintiff appeal 2 days later.) On April 18, 2011, plaintiff commenced this instant civil rights action. Corc responded to plaintiff's grievance appeal on June 8, 2011, only to deny said. (see Corc's 6/8/11 response to appeal, Exh. B to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss, at 1.) Plaintiff attempted to, in April 2010, to submit a drafted Article 78 motion raising issues herein, however, upon plaintiff's return from court corrections officers confiscated this motion, acting under order's of defendant Rock.

5. On July 24, 2009, Lucien Leclair Jr., Deputy Commissioner of DOCS issued a memorandum, upon the orders of his superior Brian Fischer as Commissioner of DOCS, which prohibited U.C.C. documents and materials related thereto, by the enactment of rules #107.21 and #113.30 that was sent to all DOCS superintendents. (see, Exh. A - July 24, 2009, Memorandum) These rules were enacted by DOCS Office of Counsel at the discretion of the Commissioner of DOCS, pursuant to Corrections Law §§ 112 and 138. Despite these rules being legally and

lawfully enacted, defendants insufficient process of October 5, 2009, which confined plaintiff to the SHU and the disposition sanctions of October 13, 2009, violated federally protected rights, as the law was clearly defined and established.

Cause of Actions

1. Defendant Richard Ward exercised deliberate indifference to plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment liberty interest and due process rights by authorizing his confinement to SHU, prior to a 'sufficient process. His participation was direct, and the law was clearly established, which would constitute his actions cruel and unusual punishment.

2. Defendant Curtis Brown exercised deliberate indifference to plaintiff's due process rights of the Fourteenth Amendment, as he has a protected liberty interest, and as a result of a insufficient process, there is no evidence to support the sanction of three years SHU confinement, or 3 yrs. loss of phone, packages or commissary privileges, which is a cruel and unusual punishment when taking the nature of the rule violations into perspective. This punishment pose a substantial risk of harm which satisfies the atypical and significant hardship standards. Plaintiff is entitled to a impartial hearing officer and his participation was direct and in direct contrast to clear established Federal law.

3. Defendants Norman Bezio and David Rock exercised deliberate indifference to plaintiff's Fourteenth and Eighth Amendment rights, as Bezio affirmed and confirmed plaintiffs disciplinary sanctions of 3 yrs. SHU, 3 yrs. loss of phone, packages and commissary privileges. Defendant Rock continued to confine plaintiff to the SHU and revoke his privileges. Although plaintiff was 'released' from the SHU with

privileges restored on November 28, 2011, for plaintiffs satisfactory adjustment to situ, plaintiff still remained confined with said privileges revoked from October 5, 2009, to November 28, 2011, approximately 2 yrs. and 54 days. These defendants participation was direct and the law was clearly established.

Relief Sought

1. Pursuant to rule 8(A)(2) of the Fed. R. of Civ. Proc. and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1997e(e)(2), 1983, based upon the foregoing tortious actions of the defendants, plaintiff herein seek the relief of:

(a) Compensatory damages for violations of plaintiffs constitutional rights by the injuries of mental and emotional stress, fear, depression and other psychological impacts, and, for physical injuries in the amount of: \$150,000, dollars from each individual defendant. The meaning of 'physical injury' is defined by 18 U.S.C. § 242, a federal statute that makes it a crime for someone acting under color of state law to deprive another person of federal civil rights, and requires a showing of 'bodily injury'. Although 'bodily injury' is not defined by the statute, several other federal criminal statutes define that term as meaning, among other things, but 'specifically': ~~impair~~ impairment of "mental faculty", no matter how temporary. see, 18 U.S.C. § 831 (f)(5); 18 U.S.C. § 1365 (h)(4); 18 U.S.C. § 1515 (a)(5); 18 U.S.C. § 1864 (d)(2). Several circuits have adopted that definition for purposes of § 242 as well, see, U.S. v. Bailey, 405 F.3d 102, 111 (1st Cir. 2005), and there is no apparent reason why it should not be applied under § 1997e(e)(2). Mental and emotional stress, fear, depression are psychological impacts that 'impair mental faculties', as there is no difference between 'bodily' injury and 'physical' injury; and

(b) compensatory damages for lost wages at .16 cents per hour (lowest DCSS stipend) from October 5, 2009, to November 28, 2011, total amount being approximately \$7,516.80, dollars, and, for confinement to 5th in amount of: \$175 dollars per day or \$25,000 for each month of segregation. see, Maurer v. Patterson, 197 F.R.D. 244, 249 (SDNY 2000); and

(c) punitive damages for intent and motive, and, conduct that was reckless and callously indifferent to my federal rights, in the amount of: \$1,000,000. dollars, from each individual defendant; and

(d) injunctive relief in that plaintiff is entitled to a

hearing before a impartial fact-finder. see, Patterson v. Coughlin, 905 F.2d 564, 570 (2d. Cir. 1990). The mental, emotional, and psychological impacts plaintiff suffered do to lack of a impartial fact-finder, while in 5th,

plaintiff suffered a substantial risk of harm and 'bodily/physical injury to his 'mental facility' while in 5th. Plaintiff's placement in protective custody would be in the public interest, as he would be in a safer environment,

with more heightened protection to his federal rights. Injunctive relief, to the extent of ordering plaintiff's placement in protective custody is

appropriate for mental and emotional injuries. see, Thompson v. Carter, 284 F.3d 411, 418 (2d. Cir. 2002) Moreover, if a judgment herein would be

favorable to plaintiff, this to would prevent harassment.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Lekey Peoples, prays for judgment and relief in his favor against all named Defendants, in their individual and official capacity, for there deliberate indifference to plaintiff's federal rights;

that all defendants be ordered to answer the complaint and for, such other and further relief the Court deems just and proper.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct,
and that I am delivering this amended complaint to prison authorities
to be mailed to the Pro Se Office of the United States District
Court for the Southern District of New York, this day of
May 28TH, 2012.

/s/ LeRoy Peoples
Pro Se Plaintiff
LeRoy Peoples # 05A2620
Attica Corr. Fac.
P.O. Box 149
639 Exchange Street
Attica, New York 14011-0149

cc: filed
Jeb Harben, AAG.

Exhibit - A

Greenhaven

Correctional Facility

INMATE MISBEHAVIOR REPORT ♦ INFORME DE MAL COMPORTAMIENTO DEL RECLUSO

1. NAME OF INMATE (Last, First) ♦ NOMBRE DEL RECLUSO (Apellido, Nombre) <u>Peoples, Leroy</u>	NO. ♦ NÚM. <u>05A2620</u>	HOUSING LOCATION ♦ CELDA <u>F150</u>
2. LOCATION OF INCIDENT ♦ LUGAR DEL INCIDENTE <u>F-block 150 cell</u>	INCIDENT DATE ♦ FECHA <u>10/5/09</u>	INCIDENT TIME ♦ HORA <u>11:20 AM</u> <u>Apron</u>
3. RULE VIOLATION(S) ♦ VIOLACIÓN/ES <u>107:21 An inmate shall not file or record any document to create a lien or a security interest against any person of the dept. the state or the United States 113:30 An inmate shall not possess any U.C.C. Article 9 form 180.11 Correspondence Procedures</u>		
4. DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT ♦ DESCRIPCIÓN DEL INCIDENTE <u>On the above date I was given a packet of papers sent to Dept. Leo from the District Attorney's office of Queens County New York. A cover letter states these materials were U.C.C. & other Financial claims that are bogus & without legal basis. A subsequent search of the inmate's cell (F-150) produced approx. 148 documents which all also appear to violate the above referenced charges. C.O. Malave who conducted the search turned over all documents to me & I intern placed them in the contraband locker End of report.</u>		
REPORT DATE ♦ FECHA <u>10/5/09</u>		
REPORTED BY ♦ NOMBRE DE LA PERSONA QUE HACE EL INFORME <u>H. O'Connor</u>		SIGNATURE ♦ FIRMA <u>H. O'Connor</u>
TITLE ♦ TÍTULO <u>Sgt</u>		
5. ENDORSEMENTS OF OTHER EMPLOYEE WITNESSES (if any) SIGNATURES: ENDOSOS DE OTROS EMPLEADOS TESTIGOS (si hay) FIRMAS		
1. _____		
2. _____		
3. _____		

NOTE: Fold back Page 2 on dotted line before completing below.

6. WERE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED?	YES ☐	NO ☒	IF YES, GIVE NAME & #
7. AT THE TIME OF THIS INCIDENT, WAS INMATE UNDER PRIOR CONFINEMENT/RESTRICTION?			
YES ☐ NO ☒ OR			
AS A RESULT OF THIS INCIDENT, WAS INMATE CONFINED/RESTRICTED?			
YES ☒ NO ☐			
8. WAS INMATE MOVED TO ANOTHER HOUSING UNIT?			
YES ☒ NO ☐			
IF YES, (a) CURRENT HOUSING UNIT <u>APU 12</u>		(b) AUTHORIZED BY <u>LT Ward</u>	
9. WAS PHYSICAL FORCE USED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (IF YES, FILE FORM 2104)			
AREA SUPERVISOR ENDORSEMENT <u>Sgt H. O'Connor</u>			

GRN HAVN GEN

TAPE NUMBER B 09-0363

JIN: 05A2620 NAME: PEOPLES, LEROY

LOCATION: SH-UU-012

INCIDENT DATE & TIME: 10/05/09 11:30 AM TIER 3

REVIEW DATE: 10/05/09 BY: LT S. HANN

DELIVERY DATE & TIME: 10/06/09 10:05 AM BY: CD P RABIDEAU

HEARING START DATE & TIME: 10, 13, 9 1:27 pm BY: [Signature]HEARING END DATE & TIME: 10, 13, 9 2:34 pm BY: [Signature]WAS THERE NEED FOR A FORMAL MENTAL HEALTH/INTELLECTUAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT? Y (N)

CHARGE NUM	DESCRIPTION OF CHARGES	REPORTED BY	DISPOSITION
13.30	POSSESS UNAUTH UCC MAT.	SGT K. O'CONNOR	<u>g</u>
07.21	UNAUTHORIZED LIEN		<u>g</u>
80.11	FACILITY CORRESPONDENCE VIOL		<u>g</u>

JOURNAL ENTRY COMPLETED

(RK) 10/14/09

A.R. ENTRY COMPLETED

NY GUILTY DISPOSITION WILL RESULT IN A MANDATORY DISCIPLINARY SURCHARGE IN THE AMOUNT OF FIVE(\$5.00) DOLLARS BEING ASSESSED AUTOMATICALLY AGAINST THE INMATE.

ENALTY CODE	DESCRIPTION	PENALTY MO DAYS	START DATE	RELEASE DATE	SUSPEND MO DAYS	DEFERRED MO DAYS	RESTITUTION \$\$\$\$
1000	SHU	30	10/05/09	10/05/12			
000	packages	↓	↓	↓			
000	Commissary	↓	↓	↓			
000	phone	↓	↓	↓			

rec'd loss of good time of 2 months

DCP004

SUPERINTENDENT HEARING DISPOSITION RENDERED

DIN: 05A2620 NAME: PEOPLES, LEROY

HEARING DATE: _____

A. STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE RELIED UPON:

The misbehavior report, attached documents, testimony of CO Malave, CO Engstrom & Capt. Burnett were considered. There is substantial evidence that without authority, you possessed ucc forms and attempted to file an interest against an officer of the New York State, specifically O. A. Rosenbaum & Superintendent, among others, and that your efforts both pre & post date the implementation of §§ 107.21 & § 3.30

B. REASONS FOR DISPOSITION:

Your actions are a specific threat to all public officials who operate to effectuate the laws of the state in their official capacities. This disposition is necessary to assist you to conform your behavior & is also necessary to dissuade other inmates from such behavior, as well as to assure public officials that their private lives need not be adversely affected by their public obligations to serve the people of the State of New York.

C. SPECIAL INSTRUCTION ON VISITATION OR CORRESPONDENCE RESTRICTIONS, REFERRALS

OR SPECIAL EVENT LOSS:

I HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF THIS HEARING DISPOSITION DATED: _____

CHAD

HEARING OFFICER SIGNATURE

refused sign

INMATE SIGNATURE

10/13/9

DATE & TIME RECEIVED

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED OF THE FOLLOWING APPEAL PROCEDURES:

FOR TIER II HEARINGS-APPEAL TO SUPERINTENDENT WITHIN 72 HOURS.

☒ FOR TIER III HEARINGS-APPEAL TO COMMISSIONER WITHIN 30 DAYS.

(31)
Rules 107.21,
& 113.30
unconstitutional

Inmate Grievances
Inter-Departmental Communication
Upstate Correctional Facility [U.C.F.]

Grievant: LeRoy Peoples Din No.: 05-A-2620
Loc.: 10-B1-7T "S.H.U. / Special Housing Unit"
Date: 3/7/11

Re: Violations of U.S. Const. Amend. 1ST, 6TH, 14TH, and,
N.Y.S. Const. Art. I, Bill of Rights.

Subj.: 'Addition' of rules # 107.21, and, #113.30 to the
'Standards of Inmate Behavior' rulebook.

DESCRIPTION OF PROBLEM: On July 24TH, 2009, Lucien J. Leclaire Jr., Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Correctional Services sent a Memorandum to 'All Superintendents' stating the 'addition' of the above rules are included in the 'Standards of Inmate Behavior' rulebook. On October 5TH, 2009, I was affected/effectuated by these rules which landed me in S.H.U. for 3 yrs., along with 3 yrs. lost of phone, package and commissary privileges. Moreover, I find these rules to be unconstitutional, in violation of my above mentioned rights. And, might I add, these rules have me facing a recommended loss of 72 mths good time credit! I'm aware of my twenty one (21) day time frame to file a grievance from the date that these rules affected/effectuated me. (see, N.Y. Comp. Codes Rules & Regs. tit 7, § 701.5 (2)(1); N.Y.S. D.O.C.S. [Pg. 1 of 2 - Grievance of 3/7/11])

directive # 4040, Inmate Grievance Program § 701.5

(a)(1). And, for a number of reasons I was not able to file my grievance within that stated time frame! However, for purposes of bringing a Civil Rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, I 'have' to exhaust my administrative grievance remedies in order to comply with 'PLRA' (Prison Litigation Reform Act) - 42 U.S.C. 1997e. Therefore, I process this grievance in compliance to the aforesaid quoted law. The Section 1983 'Statue of limitations' is 3yrs..

ACTION REQUEST: That this grievance be formally processed 'even' if denied, so that I may appeal to the next level-departmentally to ~~be~~ satisfy the necessary exhaustion prerequisites. Also, to afford ~~do~~ D.O.C.S. Officials to examine my claims, in the hopes of them coming to 'modify' said unconstitutional rules. [Note: Please find enclosed a disbursement form to deduct the necessary funds from my inmate account, as I here and now, request 8-copies in return, of this processed grievance. Please be sure to ~~include~~ include on top the 'Class Code' of this grievance.]

Dated: 3/7/11

/S/ Leroy Peoples

Din No.: 05A2620

10-BI-7T

cc: filed

[Pg. 2 of 2 - Grievance of 3/7/11]

FORM 2133 (REV. 6/06)

B

 STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES INMATE GRIEVANCE PROGRAM SUPERINTENDENT	GRIEVANCE NO. UST-45499-11	DATE FILED 3/9/11	Like Grievance No
	FACILITY Upstate Correctional Facility	POLICY DESIGNATION I	
	TITLE OF GRIEVANCE rules 107.21 + 113.30 unconstitutio	CLASS CODE 31	
	SUPERINTENDENT'S SIGNATURE 	DATE 3/15/11	
GRIEVANT PEOPLES L.	JOIN # 05A2620	HOUSING UNIT 10-B-7	

Per prior CORC response of SPT-47402-09 which states in part; The Commissioner has the authority pursuant to Correctional Law Sections 112 and 138 to promulgate rules that are necessary for the safe, secure, and orderly operation of all correctional facilities. As such, the Commissioner delegated the primary responsibility for processing the enactment of these regulations to the Department's Office of Counsel.

CORC also notes that these regulations were enacted after due consideration of serious security and operational concerns, and are not unconstitutional, nor are they retaliatory or vindictive in nature. The grievant has not provided any evidence to warrant any changes in rules 107.21 or 113.30. Grievance is denied.

APPEAL STATEMENT

If you wish to refer the above decision of the Superintendent please sign below and return this copy to your Inmate Grievance Clerk. You have seven (7) calendar days from receipt of this notice to file your appeal. * Please state why you are appealing this decision to C.O.R.C.

Supt. D. Rock & C.O.R.C. are in error about rules 107.21 &
113.30 being "not" unconstitutional. These rules are; they suppress communication
in violation of the 1st Amend. of U.S. Const. They should re-consider!!

Leroy Reeples

GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE

3/17/11

DATE

GRIEVANCE CLERK'S SIGNATURE

DATE



THE HARRISMAN STATE CAMPUS - BUILDING 2

100 Washington Avenue

ALBANY, N.Y. 12224-2650

LUCIEN J. LECIAIRE, JR.
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

TO: All Superintendents

FROM: Lucien J. Leciaire, Jr., Deputy Commissioner

DATE: July 24, 2009

RE: INMATE RULE BOOK ADDITIONS.

This memorandum is to advise you of the addition of rules #107.21 and #113.30 to the Standards of Inmate Behavior.

107.21 An inmate shall not file or record any document or instrument of any description which purports to create a lien or record a security interest of any kind against the person or property of any officer or employee of the Department, the State of New York or the United States absent prior written authorization from the superintendent or a court order authorizing such filing. II, III

New rule #107.21, "Unauthorized Lien," will subject an inmate to disciplinary action for activities related to filing or recording any document which claims to create a lien or security interest against any employee of the Department, the State, or the United States absent prior written authorization.

113.30 An inmate shall not possess any Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) Article 9 form, including but not limited to any financing statement (UCC1, UCC1Ad, UCC1AP, UCC3, UCC3Ad, UCC3AP, UCC1CA4), correction statement (UCC5) or information request (UCC11), whether printed, copied, typed or hand written, or any document concerning a scheme involving an inmate's "strawman," "House Joint Resolution 192 of 1933," the "Redemptive Process," "Appearance for Value" presentations or document indicating copyright or attempted copyright of an inmate's name absent prior written authorization from the superintendent. II, III.

New rule #113.30, "Possession of Unauthorized UCC Material" (Poss. Unauth. UCC Mat.), will subject an inmate to disciplinary action for possession of any UCC Financing Statement or other UCC Article 9 form, any document concerning the "redemptive process" scheme, or any document indicating a copyright of the inmate's name absent prior written authorization.

ng
int