

unusual punishment by not permitting him to take his arthritis medication in the manner prescribed by his doctor. After hearing evidence and considering legal memoranda submitted by the parties, the Superior Court dismissed Watson's complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a) because Watson had failed first to exhaust the administrative remedies available to him.¹ The Superior Court found, as a matter of fact, that Watson had failed to pursue the prison grievance procedures that were available to him. The State defendants have filed a motion to affirm the Superior Court's judgment.

(2) Having carefully considered the parties' respective positions, we find it manifest that the judgment of the Superior Court should be affirmed on the basis of the Superior Court's well-reasoned decision dated May 22, 2002. The Superior Court's holding that Watson was required to exhaust the administrative remedies available to him before filing a lawsuit is a matter of settled law.²

¹ The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), provides:

No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.

² *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002) (holding that the PLRA's exhaustion requirement applies to "all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege excessive force or some other wrong.")

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Myron T. Steele
Justice