

Midalgo v. Bass, Not Reported in F.Supp.2d (2006)

2006 WL 2795332

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,
N.D. New York.

Gabriel MIDALGO, Plaintiff,

v.

Sgt. BASS, Spinner, C.O. Streeter, John
Doe,¹ Head Medical Staff, C.O. Bennet,²
Sgt. Trimm, C.O. Bouyea, Defendants.

No. 9:03-CV-1128 (NAM/RFT).

|
Sept. 26, 2006.**Attorneys and Law Firms**

Gabriel Midalgo, Plaintiff, Pro Se.

Eliot Spitzer, Attorney General for the State of New York,
Senta B. Siuda, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, Syracuse,
NY, Attorney for Defendants.**MEMORANDUM-DECISION AND ORDER**

NORMAN A. MORDUE, Chief U.S. District Judge.

*1 Presently before this Court is defendants' motion (Dkt. No. 105) for summary judgment dismissing the complaint in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In his amended complaint (Dkt. No. 8), plaintiff, an inmate in the custody of the New York State Department of Correctional Services ("DOCS"), alleges deliberate indifference towards his health and safety in violation of the Eighth Amendment, interference with mail and access to the law library in violation of the First Amendment, inadequate visitation, and harassment.

Defendants' motion was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Randolph F. Treece for a Report and Recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72.3(c). In a thorough Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 110), Magistrate Judge Treece recommends that the Court grant the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff objects (Dkt. No. 112). After the Court extended time for plaintiff to file additional objections to the Report-Recommendation

(Dkt. No. 113), plaintiff filed a second objection (Dkt. No. 114).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court conducts a *de novo* review of those parts of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which a party specifically objects. Where only general objections are filed, the Court reviews for clear error. See *Brown v. Peters*, 1997 WL 599355,*2-*3 (N.D.N.Y.), *aff'd without op.*, 175 F.3d 1007 (2d Cir.1999). Failure to object to any portion of a Report and Recommendation waives further judicial review of the matters therein. See *Roldan v. Racette*, 984 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir.1993).

Plaintiff's objections include a variety of allegations. A number of them revisit issues which are the subject of the Report and Recommendation. They do not, however, demonstrate the existence of material questions of fact which would warrant denial of summary judgment. Other allegations concern events allegedly occurring subsequent to the filing of the amended complaint herein; these are not properly the subject of this action. Upon thorough *de novo* review, the Court accepts and adopts the Report and Recommendation.

It is therefore

ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 110) is accepted and adopted in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED that defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 105) is granted and the action is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

RANDOLPH F. TREECE, Magistrate Judge.

REPORT-RECOMMENDATION and ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Gabriel Midalgo brings a civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging deliberate indifference towards his health and safety in violation of the Eighth Amendment, interference with mail and access to the law library in violation of the First Amendment, inadequate visitation, and harassment. Dkt. No. 8, Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 42-54. Defendants Bass, Sergeant at the Upstate Correctional Facility ("Upstate"), Correction Officer ("C.O.") Spinner,

C.O. Streeter, C.O. Bennett, Trimm, Sergeant at Upstate, and C.O. Bouyea, bring this Motion for Summary Judgment. Dkt. No. 105. Plaintiff opposes the Motion. Dkt. No. 106. For the reasons to follow, it is recommended that the Motion for Summary Judgment be **granted**.

I. FACTS³

*2 During the period of time of the alleged incidents, Plaintiff was incarcerated at the Upstate Correctional Facility. Dkt. No. 105, Defs.' 7.1 Statement at ¶ 3. In December 2002, an inmate was placed in Plaintiff's cell who Plaintiff alleges "was a paid informant." Am. Compl. at ¶ 16. Plaintiff further alleges that a wiretap was also placed in his cell during that time. *Id.* On February 4, 2003, Plaintiff wrote letters to the mail clerk and warden regarding his misplaced or delayed newspaper and magazine subscriptions and was told that they were handed out by correction officers. *Id.* at ¶ 23, Ex. C, Lt. to Warden, dated Feb. 4, 2003; Lt. to Mail Clerk, dated Feb. 4, 2003; Lt. from Nason to Midalgo, dated Feb. 10, 2003. Plaintiff believed his subscriptions had been misplaced or delayed since January 2003. *Id.* at ¶ 22. Plaintiff's complaints about his subscriptions were forwarded to the Deputy Superintendent of Programs. *Id.* at ¶ 23, Ex. C, Lt. from Girlich to Midalgo, dated Feb. 5, 2003. Several months later, Plaintiff alleged he still had not received his magazines and newspapers and thus canceled his subscriptions. *Id.* at ¶ 24, Ex. C, Lts. to F.H.M. & Maxim, dated Apr. 21, 2003. Then, on April 20, 2003, Plaintiff's family arrived for a visit but were delayed for several hours in seeing him. *Id.* at ¶ 25. Plaintiff also claims that on April 24, 2003, and from June to September 2003, he received rotten fruits and vegetables and spoiled milk at meal time on several occasions.⁴ *Id.* at ¶¶ 26 & 28. On April 26, 2003, Plaintiff wrote a complaint where he grieved that an officer took an excessive amount of time to read his legal mail, he received rotten food, there was a delay in visitation with his family, magazine and newspapers were intercepted and either destroyed or misplaced, his cell was wiretapped, and the outgoing and incoming mail was being read. *Id.*, Ex. A, Grievance, dated Apr. 26, 2003. Since Plaintiff received no response, he submitted a letter seeking an appeal to the Superintendent.⁵ *Id.*, Grievance Lt., dated May 27, 2003.

On June 21, 2003, Plaintiff filed a grievance concerning "continuous harassment" regarding Plaintiff's legal mail as well as complaints made about his food and recreation. Defs.'

7.1 Statement, Ex. A, Grievance, dated June 21, 2003, & Case History & Record, UST 16208-03. C.O. Streeter provided a memo based on Plaintiff's grievance stating that he did not provide Plaintiff with spoiled food and that the meal "is inspected and packed in the mess" and then it is inspected once again by him prior to going into Plaintiff's cell. *Id.*, Ex. A, Streeter Lt. to Sgt. King, dated July 20, 2003. Correction Officers Spinner and Trimm also submitted memos regarding the grievance and noted they did not refuse recreation time and the grievance may have been a result of a misbehavior report filed against Plaintiff. *Id.*, Ex. A, Spinner Lt. to Sgt. King, dated July 23, 2003, & Trimm Lt. to Sgt. King, dated July 29, 2003. Sergeant King then submitted a memo to Captain Bezio stating that after he spoke to Plaintiff, and after interviewing several corrections officers on the matter, he could find no evidence to support the allegations. *Id.*, Ex. A, Sgt. King Lt. to Captain Bezio, dated Aug. 1, 2003. Based on the above investigation, the Inmate Grievance Resolution Committee ("IGRC") recommended that the grievance complaint pass through to the Superintendent. *Id.*, Ex. A, Case History & Record on Grievance dated June 21, 2003. Thereafter, the Superintendent found that the complaint had been investigated and that there was "no evidence to support [the] complaint[.]" *Id.*, Ex. A, Superintendent's Appeal, dated Aug. 6, 2003. Plaintiff then appealed to the Central Office Review Committee ("CORC"). The CORC made several findings which included that the Superintendent's determination be upheld based on the same reasoning provided by the Superintendent and that there was no substantiation to the claim that Plaintiff was harassed nor was there sufficient evidence to conclude there was harassment and that performance of the employees' duties should not be construed as harassment.⁶ *Id.*, Ex. A, CORC Appeal, dated Oct. 1, 2003.

*3 On June 27, 2003, a Fight Investigation Form was prepared by Sergeant Bass. Am. Compl., Ex. "Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies ... [with fight investigation] ...," Fight Investigation Form, dated June 27, 2003. The form had a notation stating that Midalgo purportedly was defending himself in a fight he had with his cellmate because they had been in rival gangs. *Id.* The Sergeant's assessment was that it was a real fight and they were in rival gangs. *Id.* After the fight, Midalgo and his cellmate were placed in different cells. *Id.*

On July 1, 2003, Plaintiff sent Captain Bezio a letter stating that a known enemy had been placed in his cell and that his cell had been searched and that no contraband slip was

received by Plaintiff.⁷ Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, Pl.'s Lt., dated July 1, 2003. Captain Bezio responded stating that an investigation had been completed as to the issues Plaintiff had raised. *Id.*, Ex. A, DOCS Lt. from Captain Bezio, dated July 14, 2003. In Captain Bezio's letter, he noted that Sergeant Trimm interviewed Plaintiff about the missing materials but that Plaintiff did not provide any information. *Id.* Furthermore, the facility records were reviewed and it was found that there were no documented enemies of Plaintiff at the facility. *Id.*

On July 10, 2003, Plaintiff filed a grievance regarding bunking with an alleged known enemy, harassment, and other complaints. *Id.*, Ex. A, Grievance, dated July 10, 2003. C.O. Spinner submitted a memo to Sergeant Trimm stating that no legal material was removed from the cell and only items which were of excess were removed and logged, for which Plaintiff received a copy. *Id.*, Ex. A, Spinner Lt. to Sgt. Trimm, dated July 6, 2003. The Cell Search or Inspection Notice listed the items that were removed. *Id.*, Ex. A, Cell Search or Inspection Notice, dated June 27, 2003. Similarly, Sergeant Trimm sent a memo to Captain Bezio on July 6, 2003, stating that he had interviewed Plaintiff and that Plaintiff could provide no information as to the law books removed or any legal work that was missing. *Id.*, Ex. A, Sgt. Trimm Lt. to Captain Bezio, dated July 6, 2003. In addition, Trimm stated that Midalgo was not in a cell with a known enemy. *Id.* The IGRC recommended that the grievance complaint filed pass through to the Superintendent. *Id.*, Ex. A, Case History & Record for Grievance dated July 10, 2003. The Superintendent found that after an investigation, there was no evidence to show that Plaintiff was placed in a cell with a known enemy and that inmates are bunked together based on “[a]n assessment of compatibility” and that there was no evidence to support any of the other complaints. *Id.*, Ex. A, Superintendent's Appeal, dated July 15, 2003. Plaintiff appealed to the CORC, which found the complaint to be without merit.⁸ *Id.*, Ex. A, CORC Appeal, dated Aug. 20, 2003.

On July 17, 2003, Plaintiff wrote to food services stating he was receiving spoiled food. Am. Compl., Ex. “Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies Some Material Lost ...,” Food Services Lt., dated July 17, 2003. On August 5, 2003, in a letter from Captain Racette to Plaintiff, Captain Racette stated that after conducting an investigation “a check with the messhall indicates that the trays were received in the proper condition” and that no other inmate had any problems with the trays. *Id.*, Ex. “Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies

Some Material Lost ...,” Mem. from Captain Racette, dated Aug. 5, 2003.

*4 On July 28, 2003, Plaintiff received a letter stating two books he was requesting from the law library were not required to be provided by the facility's law library and that the other book he sought should be available and if it was missing, then a replacement would be ordered. *Id.*, Ex. D, Lt. from Litzenberger, dated July 28, 2003. On August 3, 2003, Plaintiff wrote a letter to Jean Botta stating that the library staff was refusing to provide him with a law book and that he had been told that two books were not available at the facility.⁹ *Id.*, Ex. D, Lt. to Botta, dated Aug. 3, 2003. Then, on August 4, 2003, Plaintiff submitted a letter to “D.S.G. Kiebert” stating he was receiving the wrong books and cases from the law library.¹⁰ *Id.*, Ex. C, Lt., dated Aug. 4, 2003. He also noted that he did not receive a law book that was supposed to be available. *Id.* On August 5, 2003, Midalgo received a memo from Captain Racette stating that his complaints were investigated and that when Plaintiff was interviewed, he did not provide any further information, which resulted in a finding that the staff acted properly. *Id.*, Ex. “Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies Some Material Lost ...,” Mem. from Captain Racette, dated Aug. 5, 2003. On August 19, 2003, Plaintiff received a letter from the Law Library Supervisor, C.O. Bennett, stating one book requested was available but since it was in looseleaf and because Plaintiff was in SHU, he could request a photocopy of the materials. *Id.*, Ex. D., Lt. from Bennett, dated Aug. 19, 2003.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Summary Judgment Standard

Pursuant to [FED. R. CIV. P. 56\(c\)](#), summary judgment is appropriate only where “there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and ... the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” The moving party bears the burden to demonstrate through “pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with affidavits, if any,” that there is no genuine issue of material fact. [F.D.I. C. v. Giammettei](#), 34 F.3d 51, 54 (2d Cir.1994) (citing [Celotex Corp. v. Catrett](#), 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986)). “When a party has moved for summary judgment on the basis of asserted facts supported as required by [Federal

Rule of Civil Procedure 56(e)] and has, in accordance with local court rules, served a concise statement of the material facts as to which it contends there exist no genuine issues to be tried, those facts will be deemed admitted unless properly controverted by the nonmoving party.” [Glazer v. Formica Corp.](#), 964 F.2d 149, 154 (2d Cir.1992).

To defeat a motion for summary judgment, the nonmoving party must “set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial,” and cannot rest on “mere allegations or denials” of the facts submitted by the moving party. *FED.*

R. CIV. P. 56(e); see also [Scott v. Coughlin](#), 344 F.3d 282, 287 (2d Cir.2003) (“Conclusory allegations or denials are ordinarily not sufficient to defeat a motion for summary judgment when the moving party has set out a documentary case.”); [Rexnord Holdings, Inc. v. Bidermann](#), 21 F.3d 522, 525-26 (2d Cir.1994). To that end, sworn statements are “more than mere conclusory allegations subject to disregard ... they are specific and detailed allegations of fact, made under penalty of perjury, and should be treated as evidence in deciding a summary judgment motion” and the credibility of such statements is better left to a trier of fact.

[Scott v. Coughlin](#), 344 F.3d at 289 (citing [Colon v. Coughlin](#), 58 F.3d 865, 872 (2d Cir.1995) and [Flaherty v. Coughlin](#), 713 F.2d 10, 13 (2d Cir.1983)).

*5 When considering a motion for summary judgment, the court must resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party. [Nora Beverages, Inc. v. Perrier Group of Am., Inc.](#), 164 F.3d 736, 742 (2d Cir.1998). “[T]he trial court’s task at the summary judgment motion stage of the litigation is carefully limited to discerning whether there are any genuine issues of material fact to be tried, not to deciding them. Its duty, in short, is confined at this point to issue-finding; it does not extend to issue-resolution.” [Gallo v. Prudential Residential Servs., Ltd. P’ship](#), 22 F.3d 1219, 1224 (2d Cir.1994).

B. Eleventh Amendment

Plaintiff brings suit against Defendants Bass, Spinner, Streeter, Bennett, Trimm, and Bouyea in both their individual and official capacities. See Am. Compl. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief as well as compensatory damages against

these individuals in their individual and official capacities. *Id.* at Wherefore Clause.

The Eleventh Amendment states “[t]he Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.” *U.S. CONST. amend. XI*. The Eleventh Amendment bars a suit against the state in federal court unless the state consents to being sued or Congress legislatively overrides a state’s immunity.

[Huang v. Johnson](#), 251 F.3d 65, 69 (2d Cir.2000). The state’s immunity extends to state officials “act[ing] on behalf of the state” when the state is the “real, substantial party in interest.” *Id.* at 69-70 (citing [Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Auth. v. Metcalf & Eddie, Inc.](#), 506 U.S. 139, 142-47 (1993) & quoting [Pennhurst State School and Hosp. v. Halderman](#), 465 U.S. 89, 101-02 (1984)). Moreover, the Eleventh Amendment will bar recovery for money damages in a suit “against state officials in their official capacities.” [Ford v. Reynolds](#), 316 F.3d 351, 354 (2d Cir.2003).

Therefore, the Defendants cannot be sued in their official capacities in a claim for money damages. However, Midalgo may seek damages from them in their individual capacities. Furthermore, Plaintiff may sue the Defendants for injunctive relief in both their individual and official capacities because “official-capacity actions for prospective relief are not treated as actions against the State.” [Cruz v. Gomez](#), 202 F.3d 593, 595 n. 2 (2d Cir.2000) (quoting [Will v. Michigan Dep’t of State Police](#), 491 U.S. 58, 71 n. 10 (1989)).

C. Exhaustion of Remedies

Defendants claim that Plaintiff has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies as to the following claims: 1) medical care;¹¹ 2) mail tampering; 3) law library issues; and 4) family visitation. Dkt. No. 105, Defs.’ Mem. of Law at p. 4.

The Prisoner Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (“PLRA”), 42 U.S.C. § 1997(e)(a), states that “[n]o action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under [section 1983], 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.” This 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.” [Porter v. Nussle](#), 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002); see also [Ziemba v. Wezner](#), 366 F.3d 161, 163 (2d Cir.2004).

*6 The New York State Department of Corrections has created a three-step process to exhaust all administrative remedies available to inmates. See [Abney v. McGinnis](#), 380 F.3d 663, 668 (2d Cir.2004). First, the inmate must file a grievance complaint with the Grievance Clerk within fourteen (14) days of the incident. N.Y. COMP.CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.7(a)(1). The complaint is then submitted to the IGRC to review the grievance. N.Y. COMP.CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.7(a)(2)-(5). Second, the inmate may appeal the IGRC decision to the Superintendent. See N.Y. COMP.CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.7(b). Third, if the inmate appeals the Superintendent's determination, the CORC is to make a final administrative determination. N.Y. COMP.CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.7(c). Upon the completion of all three steps, an inmate may “seek relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.” [Colon v. Harvey](#), 344 F.Supp.2d 896, 897 (W.D.N.Y.2004) (citing [Neal v. Goord](#) 267 F.3d 116, 122 (2d Cir.2001) & [Santos v. Hauck](#), 242 F.Supp.2d 257, 259 (W.D.N.Y.2003)). Moreover, “[e]ven if a prisoner receives no reply to a grievance or appeal, he is not excused from completing the appeals process. The rules provide that matters not decided within the prescribed time limits must be appealed to the next level of review.” [Walters v. Carpenter](#), 2004 WL 1403301, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2004) (citing N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.8¹² & [Mendoza v. Goord](#), 2002 WL 31654855, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 21, 2002)).

The Second Circuit has suggested a three-step inquiry when the inmate opposes a defendant's assertion that the inmate did not exhaust his remedies.

Depending on the inmate's explanation for the alleged failure to exhaust, the court must ask whether administrative remedies were in fact “available” to the prisoner. [Abney v. McGinnis](#), 380 F.3d 663, 667-68 (2d Cir.2004). The court should also inquire as to whether the defendants may have forfeited the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it, [Johnson v. Testman](#), 380 F.3d 691, 695 (2d Cir.2004), or

whether the defendants' own actions inhibiting the inmate's exhaustion of remedies may estop one or more of the defendants from raising the plaintiff's failure to exhaust as a defense, [Ziemba v. Wezner](#), 366 F.3d 161, 163 (2d Cir.2004). If the court finds that administrative remedies were available to the plaintiff, and that the defendants are not estopped and have not forfeited their non-exhaustion defense, but that the plaintiff nevertheless did not exhaust available remedies, the court should consider whether “special circumstances” have been plausibly alleged that justify “the prisoner's failure to comply with administrative procedural requirements.” [Giano v. Goord](#), 380 F.3d at 675 (citing [Berry v. Kerik](#), 366 F.3d 85, 88 (2d Cir.2003); [Rodriguez](#) order).

[Hemphill v. New York](#), 380 F.3d 680, 686 (2d Cir.2004); see also [Braham v. Clancy](#), 425 F.3d 177, 181-82 (2d Cir.2005).




*7 Since failure to exhaust is an affirmative defense and defendants may be estopped from asserting the defense as “special circumstances may excuse a prisoner's failure to exhaust,” the specific circumstances of each case must be examined. [Giano v. Goord](#), 380 F.3d 670, 675 (2d Cir.2004) (citations omitted). Some special circumstances include, but are not limited to, occasions when prison officials “inhibit an inmate's ability to utilize administrative grievance procedures,” if the prisoner received a favorable disposition from his grievance but the time to appeal had expired and no relief was forthcoming, and all appeals were undertaken but prison officials did not respond within the required time period. [Id.](#) at 677. The effect of a plaintiff's justification as to why there was no exhaustion “is that, even though the administrative remedies are no longer available for reasons of timing or other procedural restrictions, such restrictions cannot serve to keep the plaintiff's suit from proceeding.” [Id.](#) at 676. Additionally, “exhausted claims filed alongside unexhausted ones may proceed even though the unexhausted claims must be dismissed.” [Id.](#) at 675.



Here, the Amended Complaint was filed on October 24, 2003. Dkt. No. 8. Any grievances filed subsequent to that date are untimely and irrelevant to the current action.¹³ Therefore, only grievances filed prior to the date the Amended Complaint was filed will be considered.




Plaintiff's June 21st complaint grieved the issues of harassment, food, and recreation. *See* Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, Grievance, dated June 21, 2003. Plaintiff's other complaint in July addressed the issues of a known enemy in his cell, harassment, and a cell search where items were taken. *Id.*, Ex. A., Grievance, dated July 10, 2003. Both of these grievances were appealed to the Superintendent and CORC, thus, they are exhausted.

As to Plaintiff's claims regarding the law library, outgoing/incoming mail, and visitation, Defendants assert such were not fully exhausted. Plaintiff states that he did exhaust all his remedies as shown by the Exhibits to his Amended Complaint. Dkt. No. 106, Pl.'s Mem. of Law at Point Two. Plaintiff claims that Defendant Spinner destroyed legal documents that showed he attempted to exhaust. *Id.* Midalgo also alleges that he "filed and appealed at least ten grievances" and that "more than half were ignored or intercepted" by Defendant Streeter. *Id.*

Plaintiff did provide a copy of his grievance on the law library, outgoing/incoming mail, and visitation issues, which was dated April 26, 2003; however, the CORC stated they never received any grievances from April 2003. Am. Compl., Ex. A, Grievance, dated Apr. 26, 2003; Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, CORC Appeal, dated Oct. 1, 2003. Plaintiff also submitted a letter stating that since he received no response that he sought an appeal to the Superintendent. Am. Compl., Ex. A, Grievance Lt., dated May 27, 2003. No other appeals were instituted on that grievance. Nonetheless, even if the CORC stated they did not receive the grievance, Plaintiff attempted to fulfill the exhaustion requirement by seeking an appeal to the next level as required when he received no response. *See Walters v. Carpenter*, 2004 WL 1403301, at *3; N.Y. COMP.CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.8.

*8 Since Defendants put forth the affirmative defense of failure to exhaust, this Court will make the three-step inquiry set forth by the Second Circuit. With the first inquiry, depending on the prisoner's explanation, the Court must decide whether the remedies were "available." " 'Available' means more than the mere presence of a grievance system but also that the system is functionally available to the prisoner."  *Shaheen v. Hollins*, 2005 WL 2179400, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 7, 2005) (citing  *Hemphill v. New York*, 380 F.3d at 686-87 ("[I]n some circumstances, the behavior of the defendants may render administrative remedies unavailable.")); *see also*  *Abbas v. Senkowski*,

2005 WL 2179426, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 2005). The "proper test for determining whether ordinary grievance procedures were 'available' [is] whether 'a similarly situated individual of ordinary firmness [would] have deemed them available.'" *McCullough v. Burroughs*, 2005 WL 3164248, at *3 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 29, 2005) (quoting  *Hemphill v. New York*, 380 F.3d at 688). In addition, "threats or other intimidation by prison officials may well deter a prisoner of 'ordinary firmness' from filing an internal grievance, but not from appealing directly to individuals in positions of greater authority within the prison system, or to external structures of authority such as state or federal courts." *McCullough*, 2005 WL 3164248, at *3 (quoting  *Hemphill v. New York*, 380 F.3d at 688). Here, administrative remedies were available as a similarly situated inmate of ordinary firmness could deem the remedies available and because Plaintiff stated he did actually file the grievances, copies of which were provided to the Court.

As remedies were "available," it must be determined if the Defendants' own actions estop them from raising the failure to exhaust affirmative defense. The Second Circuit has held that "prison officials' threats or other inhibiting conduct may estop defendants from asserting the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion."  *Hemphill v. New York*, 380 F.3d at 688. Also, in making a determination based on the second inquiry, "[t]o establish equitable estoppel, the party claiming estoppel must show: (1) a misrepresentation by the opposing party; (2) reasonable reliance on that misrepresentation; and (3) detriment." *McCullough*, 2005 WL 3164248, at *4 (quoting  *Lewis v. Washington*, 300 F.3d 829, 834 (7th Cir.2002)). In addition, "[w]hen asserting equitable estoppel against the government, one must also prove affirmative misconduct." *McCullough*, 2005 WL 3164248, at *4 (quoting  *Lewis v. Washington*, 300 F.3d at 834). In this case, Plaintiff claims that Defendant Spinner destroyed legal documents showing he attempted to exhaust his administrative remedies and that "more than half [of the grievances] were ignored or intercepted" by Defendant Streeter. Pl.'s Mem. of Law at Point Two. Plaintiff's claim raises a matter of credibility but, for the purposes of this Motion, drawing all inferences in favor of Plaintiff, since Plaintiff set forth allegations of affirmative misconduct that could be considered "inhibiting," Defendants shall be deemed estopped from asserting the affirmative defense of failure to exhaust. Since we are considering Defendants actions as inhibiting, again for the purposes of this Motion, the claims will be deemed exhausted.

D. Eighth Amendment Claims

*9 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Bass and Trimm were deliberately indifferent to his health and safety when they placed incompatible cellmates or known enemies in Plaintiff's cell. Am. Compl. at ¶ 42. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants Bouyea, Spinner, and Streeter served him spoiled food which caused him psychological harm. *Id.* at ¶ 54.

The Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. Prohibited punishment includes that which “involve[s] the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.” *Chance v. Armstrong*, 143 F.3d 698, 702 (2d Cir.1998) (quoting *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 173 (1976)). To state a claim under § 1983, the inmate “must allege actions or omissions sufficient to demonstrate deliberate indifference; mere negligence will not suffice.” *Hayes v. New York City Dep't of Corr.*, 84 F.3d 614, 620 (2d Cir.1996).

The Supreme Court has delineated a two-part test for deliberate indifference. First, the “deprivation alleged must be, objectively, sufficiently serious,” and “the inmate must show that he is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834 (1994) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Second, the prison official must “know[] of and disregard[] an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference.” *Id.* at 837; see also *Hayes v. New York City Dep't of Corr.*, 84 F.3d at 620.

The Eighth Amendment also imposes on prison officials “a duty ... to protect prisoners from violence at the hands of other prisoners.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. at 833 (citation omitted). Nonetheless, prison officials may not be constitutionally liable for every injury an inmate suffers at the hands of other inmates. *Id.* at 834. A plaintiff may recovery for injuries received while in custody “if the injury resulted from the defendant prison official's purposeful subjection of the prisoner to a ‘substantial risk of serious harm’ or from the official's deliberate indifference to that risk.” *Fischl v.*

Armitage, 128 F.3d 50, 55 (2d Cir.1997) (quoting *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. at 834). The Second Circuit has stated that “[t]he failure of custodial officers to employ reasonable measures to protect an inmate from violence by other prison residents has been considered cruel and unusual punishment.”

Ayers v. Coughlin, 780 F.2d 205, 209 (2d Cir.1985) (citing *United States v. Bailey*, 444 U.S. 394, 423 (1980)). However, “[a]n isolated omission to act by the state prison guard does not support a claim under section 1983 absent circumstances indicating an evil intent, or recklessness, or at least deliberate indifference to the consequences of his conduct for those under his control and dependent upon him.”

Id. (quoting *Williams v. Vincent*, 508 F.2d 541, 546 (2d Cir.1974)). Instead, “reckless disregard of plaintiff[s] right to be free from attacks by other inmates may be shown by the existence of a pervasive risk of harm to inmates from other prisoners and a failure by prison officials to reasonably respond to that risk.” *Knowles v. New York City Dep't of Corr.*, 904 F.Supp. 217, 221-22 (S.D.N.Y. 1995) (citing *Rucco v. Howard*, 1993 WL 299296, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 4, 1993) & *Martin v. White*, 742 F.2d 469, 474 (8th Cir.1984)) (internal quotation marks omitted) (alteration in original). Furthermore, “an inmate must inform a correctional official of the basis for his belief that another inmate represents a substantial threat to his safety before the correctional official can be charged with deliberate indifference.” *Sims v. Bowen*, 1998 WL 146409, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 23, 1998). Moreover, there is no constitutional right to the cellmate of a prisoner's choice even if a prisoner is not getting along with his cellmate. *Harris v. Greer*, 750 F.2d 617, 618 (7th Cir.1984).

*10 Here, Plaintiff claims a known enemy was placed in his cell. Midalgo states that he filed a grievance expressing his fear that he would be placed with a “known or made for hire enemy” and that on June 27, 2003, he was bunked with a known enemy and a fight broke out where Plaintiff suffered injuries to his face, eye, knees, and tricep. Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 27 & 31. However, Captain Bezio stated in a letter to Midalgo that “there [was] no evidence to indicate that [he] was placed in a cell with a known enemy. A review of facility records reveal[ed] that there [were] no documented enemies of [his] at [the] facility” and that if an inmate should be considered an enemy, Midalgo should contact the assigned Correction Counselor. Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, DOCS Lt. from Captain Bezio, dated July 14, 2003. Defendant Trimm also conducted an investigation into the grievance and found



that there was no evidence that there was a known enemy placed in Midalgo's cell. *Id.*, Ex. A, Sgt. Trimm Lt. to Captain Bezio, dated July 6, 2003. Even the Superintendent stated that inmates were bunked based on compatibility. *Id.*, Ex. A, Superintendent's Appeal, dated July 15, 2003.

When questioned about how Plaintiff knew there was a known enemy placed in his cell, Plaintiff stated that his "circumstantial evidence clearly proves that [he] was placed in the cell with a known enemy. The timing, the dates, [his] grievances, [his] appeals, the coincidences, everything[.]" Dkt. No. 105, Ex. A., Pl.'s Dep. at p. 63, lines 5-8. He also stated he told his correction counselor he was in danger from "all gang members" but then stated that he did not tell his counselor anything of such nature since "there was no counselor for [him] to speak to" until after the incident occurred. *Id.* at pp. 63, lines 12-14, 64, lines 17-20, & 65, lines 17-23. Plaintiff further stated that the fights he had with his cellmate occurred because his cellmate made "homosexual advances" on him. *Id.* at p. 16, line 14. After that cellmate, Plaintiff had approximately twenty (20) more cellmates because "things weren't working out" and he was fighting with them as well over alleged homosexual advances. *Id.* at pp. 25, lines 11-14 & 30, lines 21-24, & 31, lines 1-11. Plaintiff stated he had "plenty of fights" with other cellmates. *Id.* at p. 31, lines 16-24.

Midalgo has failed to meet the Eighth Amendment standard of deliberate indifference. First, Midalgo must show that he was incarcerated under conditions that posed a substantial risk of serious harm. Plaintiff has stated he fought with many of his cellmates and was injured, especially with his first cellmate whom "Sergeant Bass thought was a rival gang member." Am. Compl., Ex. "Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies ... [with fight investigation] ...," Fight Investigation Form, dated June 27, 2003. However, Plaintiff has not shown that the injuries he received were based on the purposeful subjection of Midalgo to a substantial risk of serious harm or by deliberate indifference to the risk. Plaintiff's claims were investigated and found to be without merit as there were no known enemies in the facility. Furthermore, after Plaintiff's fight with his cellmate, they were separated and placed in different cells. *Id.* Moreover, Plaintiff, over time, had numerous cellmates because they were not compatible. Prison officials took appropriate measures to protect Midalgo after the fights by removing the other inmate from the cell. Therefore, Plaintiff has failed to prove that any deprivation alleged was serious and that he was incarcerated under conditions that posed a substantial risk of harm.

*11 Even if Plaintiff could satisfy the first prong, Plaintiff clearly fails on the second prong. Midalgo has not shown that the Defendants knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to his health or safety. This is evidenced by the fact that he had nearly twenty other cellmates. He was not forced to bunk with another cellmate for an extended period of time. Even with his first cellmate, he only bunked with him for a month or so. Pl.'s Dep. at pp. 16, lines 12-24, & 17, lines 1-3. Investigations were conducted into the matter and no evidence was found to support Plaintiff's claim that there was a known enemy placed in his cell. Plaintiff also admitted that many of his fights were because he thought other inmates were making homosexual advances towards him. *Id.* at pp. 30, lines 21-24, & 31, lines 1-11. Although there is a duty to protect placed on prison officials, the injuries were not a result of indifference on the part of the officials. Furthermore, Plaintiff did not inform the correction officials of his belief until a fight ensued. *Id.* at p. 65, lines 22-23. Plaintiff seemingly would prefer to choose his own cellmate, however inmates do not possess such a right, and the Superintendent noted that cellmates were chosen based on compatibility.

Plaintiff also claims that Defendants Spinner, Streeter, and Bouyea brought him spoiled or rotten food on several occasions and that from June to September 2003, Defendants Spinner and Streeter served Midalgo "moldy cheese, bread, spoiled milk and rotten fruits ." *Id.* at p. 14, lines 3-6; Am. Compl. at ¶ 28.

The Eighth Amendment places a duty upon prison officials to ensure that prisoners receive adequate food.  *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. at 832. In that context, prisoners are to be provided with "nutritionally adequate food that is prepared and served under conditions which do not present an immediate danger to the health and well being of the inmates who consume it."  *Robles v. Coughlin*, 725 F.2d 12, 15 (2d Cir.1983) (citation omitted); see also *Lunney v. Brureton*, 2005 WL 121720, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 21, 2005).

Here, C.O. Streeter stated that he did not provide Plaintiff with spoiled food and that meals are inspected and placed on the trays at the messhall and then are further inspected once again by him prior to Plaintiff receiving the food. Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, Streeter Lt. to Sgt. King, dated July 20, 2003. The Superintendent found no evidence to support Plaintiff's claim on this issue. *Id.*, Ex. A, Superintendent's Appeal, dated Aug. 6, 2003. Plaintiff admits that the officers

do not prepare food trays and that they merely inspect them before they get to Plaintiff. Pl.'s Dep. at pp. 36, lines 19-24, & 37, lines 1-5. Midalgo also stated that while in the normal population, all the meals are sealed but in SHU some items are not sealed, however some do remain sealed such as cheese and meat. *Id.* at p. 38, lines 2-14. Plaintiff further stated that he received expired milk from the correction officers and that Defendants Spinner and Streeter provided spoiled food during breakfast and lunch from June to September 2003. *Id.* at pp. 41, lines 23-24, 42, lines 1-13, 50, lines 16-24, & 51, lines 1-12. On October 10, 2003, Plaintiff received a memo from the Food Services Administrator stating that his kosher meal was prepared in accordance with the guidelines set by the Department of Correctional Services. Pl.'s Mem. of Law, Ex., Inter-Departmental Memo from Haug to Midalgo, dated Oct. 10, 2003. The memo also states that items such as milk and bread are prepackaged and the trays are checked and wrapped with cellophane before they are delivered to the inmates. *Id.* The Superintendent further stated that after an investigation was conducted with the Food Service Administrator, since the food is prepackaged, contact between an officer and the trays are limited. Pl.'s Mem. of Law, Ex. Superintendent's Appeal, dated Oct. 28, 2003. Midalgo states, however, that he had to beg other prisoners to sell him food so that he "wouldn't starve or get sick" and that as a result he received psychological harm which include "anxiety, nightmares about being poisoned, delusions and dizziness." *Id.* at p. 50; Am. Compl. at ¶ 54.







*12 Prison officials are required to provide nutritionally adequate meals that are served under conditions which do not present an immediate danger to the health and well being of an inmate. Here, Plaintiff received kosher meals for several years because the food was more healthy than regular food received by the inmates. Pl.'s Dep. at pp. 38, lines 15-24, & 39, lines 1-18. Upstate provided the kosher meals since Plaintiff made the request. *Id.* at p. 39, lines 1-18. Furthermore, Midalgo only stated he received psychological harm from the alleged incident. There was no immediate danger to his health or well being. Plaintiff did not starve nor was he denied meals. He also does not state he had weight loss or anything of the sort which would put his health in immediate danger. He stated that he purchased food from other inmates. Moreover, investigations were conducted into Plaintiff's spoiled and rotten food claims and the claims were found to be unsupported by any evidence as most items were prepackaged and wrapped in cellophane. Moreover, Plaintiff admits that the Defendants he seeks to hold liable had no control over the contents on his foodtrays.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claims be **granted**.



E. First Amendment Claims



Plaintiff claims that Sergeant Trimm and "her C.O.s" were misplacing or destroying his magazine and newspaper subscriptions and that his outgoing mail/legal mail was read by Defendant Bouyea in order to "play mind games with [Plaintiff]." Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 22 & 46. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant Bennett purposefully gave him the wrong books and cases and lost legal documents which resulted in frustrating Plaintiff's lawsuit and an inability to file a 440 motion pursuant to New York State's Criminal Procedure Law. *Id.* at ¶ 48.







"Interference with legal mail implicates a prison inmate's rights to access to the courts and free speech as guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S.





Constitution."  *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d 346, 351 (2d Cir.2003). In order to state a claim for lack of access to the courts by interference with legal mail, "an inmate must allege that a defendant's deliberate and malicious interference actually impeded his access to the court or prejudiced an existing action."  *Cancel v. Goord*, 2001 WL 303713, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2001) (citing  *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 349 (1996)). However, "[a] delay in being able to work on one's legal action or communicate with the courts does not rise to the level of a constitutional violation."  *Cancel v. Goord*, 2001 WL 303713, at *5 (citing *Jermosen v. Coughlin*, 877 F.Supp. 864, 871 (S.D.N.Y.1995) &  *Jones v. Smith*, 784 F.2d 149, 151-52 (2d Cir.1986)). But, if an adverse judgment to an "otherwise meritorious" motion resulted from defendants' delay, then a  § 1983 claim is stated. *Id.*

A prisoner maintains the right to the flow of incoming and outgoing mail as protected by the First Amendment.

 *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d at 351 (citing, *inter alia*,  *Heimerle v. Attorney General*, 753 F.2d 10, 12-13 (2d Cir.1985)). Any "[r]estrictions on prisoners' mail are justified only if they 'further [] one or more of the substantial governmental interests of security, order, and rehabilitation ... [and] must be no greater than is necessary or essential to the protection of the particular governmental interest involved.'

“ *Id.* (quoting   *Washington v. James*, 782 F.2d 1134, 1139 (2d Cir.1986)) (alterations in original). Therefore, “in balancing the competing interests implicated in restrictions on prison mail, courts have consistently afforded greater protection to legal mail than to non-legal mail, as well as greater protection to outgoing mail than to incoming mail.”

Id. (citing, *inter alia*,  *Thornburgh v. Abbott*, 490 U.S. 401, 413 (1989)). Although an inmate has the right to be there when his legal mail is opened, an isolated event of tampering will be insufficient to allege a constitutional violation unless the inmate can show “that prison officials ‘regularly and unjustifiably interfered with the incoming legal mail.’ “ *Id.* (quoting  *Cancel v. Goord*, 2001 WL 303713, at *6); *see also*  *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 574-76 (1974);  *Morgan v. Montanye*, 516 F.2d 1367, 1371 (2d Cir.1975);   *Gill v. Riddick*, 2005 WL 755745, at *15 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2005).


*13 With regard to non-legal incoming mail, a prison’s “regulations or practices affecting a prisoner’s receipt of non-legal mail must ‘be reasonably related to legitimate penological interests[.]’ “  *Cancel v. Goord*, 2001 WL 303713, at *6 (quoting  *Thornburgh v. Abbott*, 490 U.S. 401, 409 (1989)). “[P]rison security is a sufficiently important governmental interest to justify limitations on a prisoner’s [F]irst [A]mendment rights.” *Id.* (quoting   *Gaines v. Lane*, 790 F.2d 1299, 1304 (7th Cir.1986)). In order to state a claim for interference with incoming non-legal mail, the inmate will have to show a pattern and practice of interference without the legitimate penological interest. *Id.*

With regard to Plaintiff’s legal mail being read, Plaintiff states that C.O. Bouyea “mumble[d] something similar to what [Plaintiff] wrote in [his] legal mail under his breath.” Am. Compl. at ¶ 26. Bouyea purportedly repeated “something verbatim to a letter” Midalgo had written to a legal organization and that there were similar occurrences on several occasions. Pl.’s Dep. at pp. 39, lines 19-24, & 40, lines 1-6. Plaintiff claims that Bouyea whispered so that only Plaintiff could hear the statements. *Id.* at p. 40, lines 19-23. When Plaintiff was asked about the statement made in his Amended Complaint that “outgoing mail/legal mail was being read due to a fabricated penological interest” Midalgo stated that he believed his mail was read because he “agitated [the facility’s] security interest and that ... gave them a reason

to read [his] mail and things [he] was writing in [his] mail.” *Id.* at p. 83, lines 3-8. Another reason Plaintiff believed the mail was read was because the inmates who became his cellmates “would try to start a whole situation based on letters” that Plaintiff had written. *Id.* at p. 83, lines 9-12. Plaintiff had submitted a grievance about his legal mail and it was found to have no merit and that there was no evidence to support his complaint. Defs.’ 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, Sgt. King Lt. to Captain Bezio, dated Aug. 1, 2003; Ex. A, Superintendent’s Appeal, dated Aug. 6, 2003.

Here, Plaintiff has failed to show that there was interference with his legal mail. Plaintiff has not alleged any deliberate and malicious interference that actually impeded his access to the courts nor prejudiced an existing action. Plaintiff also provides no proof that his mail was read except that he states Defendant Bouyea was mumbling under his breath something similar to what had been written in Plaintiff’s letters. Moreover, Midalgo has not shown that Bouyea opened and read his mail on a regular and unjustifiable basis.

Plaintiff further states he was not receiving his magazine and newspaper subscriptions and that Defendant Trimm “was aware that her C.O.s were purposefully misplacing [his] magazines and newspaper subscription” or providing them to other inmates. Am. Compl. at ¶ 22; Pl.’s Dep. at p. 34. Midalgo says he knew some of his magazines that were in the “rec room” were his because he saw his name on the label. Pl.’s Dep. at p. 34, lines 2-4. He also stated he wrote to the mail clerk to inquire about his mail, the mail clerk told him that magazines were given to the correction officers to be handed out, that they were not delivered to him. *Id.* at p. 34, lines 8-12. Then when Plaintiff spoke to Sergeant Trimm about the situation, she gave him “a devious smile and wrote something out on a pad and said she would look into it and she never did.” *Id.* at p. 34, lines 16-19.

*14 In regards to the non-legal mail, Plaintiff does have a right to incoming, non-legal mail, although to a lesser extent than legal, outgoing mail. *See*  *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d at 351. Plaintiff would have to show a pattern and practice of interference without a penological interest or purpose. Midalgo makes the general claim that he did not receive his subscriptions for several months. In a letter to the Warden, Plaintiff provides the names of five different magazines which were not delivered to him. Plaintiff only submitted two letters to the Court that were sent to two different magazine companies stating he needed to cancel his subscriptions due to his failure to receive the magazines. Am. Compl., Ex. C,

Lt. to Warden, dated Feb. 4, 2003; Lts. to F.H.M. & Maxim, dated Apr. 21, 2003. Midalgo also states he received one issue per each subscription. Lts. to F.H.M. & Maxim, dated Apr. 21, 2003. Plaintiff states he received one issue of Maxim after it had gone through the procedure of media review. Pl.'s Dep. at pp. 34, lines 20-24, & 35, lines 4-12. Despite the letters, Plaintiff has not shown that there was a pattern and practice in not receiving his subscriptions. Plaintiff has not stated with any specificity which magazines he did not receive and, more importantly, for what time periods he did not receive them. *See* Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 22-24; Pl.'s Mem. of Law at Point Five. Plaintiff merely makes a generalization that from January 2003 until he cancelled his subscriptions, his magazines and newspapers were misplaced and that several months had passed without receiving any subscriptions. Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 23 -24. More to his detriment, Plaintiff does not state which officers misplaced or destroyed his magazines nor does he show that there was a practice of this by the Defendants.¹⁴ Therefore, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim on his non-legal, incoming mail.

In addition, “personal involvement of defendants in alleged constitutional deprivations is a prerequisite to an award of damages under § 1983.” *Wright v. Smith*, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir.1994) (quoting *Moffitt v. Town of Brookfield*, 950 F.2d 880, 885 (2d Cir.1991)). Even if the Court were to draw all inferences in favor of Plaintiff that a pattern and practice has been established, Plaintiff has failed to allege the personal involvement of Defendant Trimm or any other Defendant. Furthermore, to the extent Plaintiff states that Defendant Trimm would be liable in a supervisory capacity, Plaintiff has failed to show what supervisory position Defendant Trimm holds as to the corrections officers who may have misplaced or destroyed his magazines.

Plaintiff further makes the claim that he received the wrong books and cases from the law library or that he never received the books requested. *Id.* at ¶ 48. Midalgo also alleges that his legal documents were lost and he was unable to file court documents as a result. *Id.*

Under the First Amendment, “prisoners have a constitutional right of access to the courts.” *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 821 (1977); *Bourdon v. Loughren*, 386 F.3d 88, 92 (2d Cir.2004). This right “requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the

law.” *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. at 828; *Bourdon v. Loughren*, 386 F.3d at 92 (quoting *Bounds*). However, there is no “abstract, freestanding right to a law library or legal assistance, [and] an inmate cannot establish relevant actual injury simply by establishing that his prison's law library or legal assistance program is subpar in some theoretical sense.”

Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. at 351. The Supreme Court held that in order to fulfill the actual injury requirement, derived from the constitutional doctrine of standing, on a law library claim where there is a lack of access to the courts, the inmate must be pursuing direct appeals from the conviction for which he or she was incarcerated, a *habeas corpus* petition, or a civil rights claim pursuant to § 1983 “to vindicate basic constitutional rights.” *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. at 354.

*15 As to Plaintiff's law library claim, in regards to some of the books Midalgo sought, he received a letter stating that the law library was not required to carry two of the books he requested and that the other book should have been available and if it was missing, then a replacement would be ordered. Am. Compl., Ex. D, Lt. from Litzenberger, dated July 28, 2003. Then Plaintiff wrote two letters noting that the library staff was refusing to provide him with a law book, that he had been told that two books were not available at the facility, and that he was receiving the wrong books and cases from the law library. *Id.*, Exs. D, Lt. to Botta, dated Aug. 3, 2003 & Ex. C, Lt., dated Aug. 4, 2003. However, Plaintiff received a memo noting that an investigation had been completed and that the staff had acted properly. *Id.*, Ex. “Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies Some Material Lost ...,” Mem. from Captain Racette, dated Aug. 5, 2003. Midalgo also received a letter from C.O. Bennett whereby Plaintiff was told that one book he had requested was available but that because Plaintiff was in SHU and since the book was looseleaf, he could request a photocopy of the materials. *Id.*, Ex. D., Lt. from Bennett, dated Aug. 19, 2003. However, Plaintiff claims that the book was not in looseleaf and that Defendant Bennett had lied and then stated the book was missing after Plaintiff claimed that all he received was the index. Pl.'s Dep. at pp. 78, lines 14-24, & 79, lines 1-3. Plaintiff alleges that every book he requested from the law library was missing and that one book that he did receive had a section ripped out that Plaintiff needed. *Id.* at p. 85, lines 1-18. However, Plaintiff states that he would not say it was Defendant Bennett's fault but that it is his duty to oversee the law library. *Id.* at p. 86, lines 18-24.

Additionally, Plaintiff states that he was trying to find out how to copyright some of his poetry. *Id.* at p. 74, lines 22-23.

Midalgo further acknowledges he was trying to file a N.Y. CRIM. PROC. LAW 440 motion because he claims he was wrongfully convicted and that he is still unable to file the motion because he received the wrong books and cases. *Id.* at pp. 74, line 24, & 75, lines 1-20. Plaintiff claims that he sent legal documents, which were exhibits Plaintiff wanted to attach to his 440 motion, to the law library to be copied, but that they were never returned even though the request was made. *Id.* at pp. 79, lines 16-24, & 80, lines 1-8. As a result, Plaintiff claims that this was another reason why he was unable to file the motion. *Id.* at p. 80, lines 1-5. Midalgo stated that he did not file the 440 motion prior to arriving at Upstate because he had been studying the process and procedures. *Id.* at p. 81, lines 18-21. Plaintiff alleges that if not Defendant Bennett, then either Defendants Streeter or Spinner lost his copies because “[t]hey colluded together” and conspired against Plaintiff. *Id.* at pp. 87, lines 10-24, & 88, lines 1-4. Midalgo avers that his claim could be proven by “circumstantial evidence,” which would include his grievances and hearings. *Id.* at p. 88, lines 7-17.

*16 Here, Plaintiff does have a constitutional right to the access of the courts and, in turn, the right to an adequate law library or assistance from those trained in the law when preparing and filing legal documents. Plaintiff does not state a claim as to the availability of books he sought for the purposes of his copyright lawsuit. See [Lewis v. Casey](#), 518 U.S. at 354. Plaintiff does state a claim in regards to the missing books and copies of exhibits to his 440 motion as he seeks to challenge his conviction, which would provide standing as it would be a direct appeal from the conviction for which he was incarcerated. *See id.*

However, the Second Circuit has held that “personal involvement of defendants in alleged constitutional deprivations is a prerequisite to an award of damages under § 1983.” [Wright v. Smith](#), 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir.1994) (quoting [Moffitt v. Town of Brookfield](#), 950 F.2d 880, 885 (2d Cir.1991)). In this case, as only Plaintiff’s law library claim as to his 440 motion could proceed, Plaintiff has failed to allege any personal involvement on the part of any of the Defendants. Plaintiff states that Defendant Bennett was not at fault for the missing books. That statement belies the notion that there was any personal involvement. In addition, Plaintiff fails to state a claim for supervisory liability against Defendant Bennett for the missing books as Plaintiff does not state which Defendants Bennett was supervising. Furthermore, as to the missing copies of exhibits for the

440 motion, Plaintiff merely claims that Defendants Bennett, Streeter, and Spinner were involved because he believes there was a conspiracy. That allegation does not constitute personal involvement.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Motion for Summary Judgment be **granted** on the First Amendment claims.

F. Inadequate Visitation

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Trimm delayed his visit with his mother for several hours causing him emotional distress. Am. Compl. at ¶ 50.

“Although inmates do not relinquish their constitutional rights when imprisoned, implicit with incarceration is the fact that confinement imposes a limitation on privileges and rights.” [Henry v. Coughlin](#), 940 F.Supp. 639, 642 (S.D.N.Y.1996) (citing, *inter alia*, [Sandin v. Conner](#), 515 U.S. 472, 485 (1995)). Restrictions that are placed upon an inmate’s constitutional rights “may be upheld as long as they are ‘reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.’” [Hernandez v. McGinnis](#), 272 F.Supp.2d 223, 226 (W.D.N.Y.2003) (quoting [Turner v. Safley](#), 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987)). However, family visitations for inmates only constitute a privilege and not a right. *See* [Block v. Rutherford](#), 468 U.S. 576, 589 (1984); [Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners’ Labor Union, Inc.](#), 433 U.S. 119, 125-26 (1977) (holding that one of the more obvious constitutional rights curtailed by confinement is the right to freely associate with those outside the penal institution); *see also* [Lynott v. Henderson](#), 610 F.2d 340, 342 (5th Cir.1980) (stating that “[c]onvicted prisoners have no absolute constitutional right to visitation”); [Oxendine v. Williams](#), 509 F.2d 1405, 1407 (4th Cir.1975) (holding that a “[prisoner] has no constitutional right to physical contact with his family”); [Hernandez v. McGinnis](#), 272 F.Supp.2d at 227.

*17 Here, Plaintiff does not claim that he was denied visitation nor has he stated that visitation was delayed at any other time than the one time alleged. He merely states that a visit with his mother and brother was delayed by a few hours. Am. Compl. at ¶ 25. As there is no constitutional right to visitation and because of the fact that Plaintiff did actually receive visitation that same day, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Motion for Summary Judgment be **granted** as to the visitation claim.

G. Harassment

Plaintiff claims that Defendants Trimm and Bass harassed him by placing a wiretap in his cell as well as confidential informants and/or hired help in order to cause him physical and psychological harm.¹⁵ Am. Compl. at ¶ 52.

In terms of the wiretap, the claim would turn on whether a plaintiff had a legitimate expectation of privacy with respect to his conversations. To assess the expectation, “the person asserting a privacy interest must demonstrate a subjective expectation of privacy.” *George v. Carusone*, 849 F.Supp.

159, 165 (D.Conn.1994) (citing *California v. Greenwood*, 486 U.S. 35, 39 (1988)) (further citations omitted). Then “that person’s subjective expectation must be one that society accepts as reasonable.” *Id.* (citing *California v. Greenwood*, 486 U.S. at 39) (further citations omitted). The Second Circuit has held that “a convict has no expectation of privacy in his prison cell” because “society is not prepared to recognize as legitimate any subjective expectation of privacy that a [prisoner] might have in his prison cell[.]” *Willis v. Artuz*, 301 F.3d 65, 66, & 69 (2d Cir.2002) (citing *Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 526 (1984)).

Here, besides alleging that a wiretap was placed in his cell, Plaintiff does not provide a shred of evidence that there was actually a wiretap placed within his cell. Plaintiff sets forth certain circumstances, which to him seem like too much of a coincidence that a wiretap had to have been placed in his cell. Pl.’s Mem. of Law at Point Eight. Plaintiff merely states that he **thought** there was a wiretap because his cellmate attempted to talk about illegal activity and that his neighbor was trying to get Midalgo to bring back drugs. Pl.’s Dep. at p. 15, lines 13-17. He also stated the lights would flicker and that some of the officers would talk about the same things Midalgo and his cellmate had discussed. *Id.* at p. 15, lines 18-24. Even though Plaintiff does not have an expectation of privacy in his cell, Plaintiff fails to allege any facts that are not general or conclusory as to state any claim in regards to the alleged wiretap.

With regard to his claim of a confidential informant or hired help being placed in his cell to harass him, Plaintiff states that he believes his cellmate was a confidential informant because Officer Bouyea, Officer Streeter, and others gave the cellmate extra food trays, magazines, and books. Pl.’s Dep. at pp. 17, lines 4-12 & 29, lines 4-10. Other than supposition, Plaintiff has not provided any proof or evidence that his cellmate was a confidential informant. Midalgo’s claims are merely conclusory and unsupported by any facts. Furthermore, the Superintendent stated that inmates are placed together based on compatibility. Defs.’ 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, Superintendent’s Appeal, dated July 15, 2003. Plaintiff has not stated any type of claim available and moreover, Plaintiff would not have any choice in who was placed within his cell as inmates do not have a constitutional right to the cellmate of their choice. *Harris v. Greer*, 750 F.2d 617, 618 (7th Cir.1984).

*18 Therefore, it is recommended that the Motion for Summary Judgment be **granted** on his claim.

H. John Doe Defendant

As noted previously, Defendant John Doe has not been identified or appeared in this action. *See* Dkt No 12. FED.R.CIV.P. 4(m) states that “[i]f service of the summons and complaint is not made upon a defendant within 120 days after the filing of the complaint, then the court, upon motion or on its own initiative after notice to the plaintiff, shall dismiss the action without prejudice as to that defendant or direct that service be effected within a specified time[.]” Furthermore, pursuant to the Local Rules for the Northern District of New York, “service of process [is required] upon all defendants within sixty (60) days of the filing of the complaint.” N.D.N.Y.L.R. 4.1. Plaintiff’s time for service on John Doe has expired, per both the Local Rules and the Federal Rules, as the date of the filing of the Amended Complaint was October 24, 2003. *See* Dkt. No. 8. Since Plaintiff has failed to properly identify this Defendant, such claims should be dismissed.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, it is hereby

RECOMMENDED, that the Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 105) be **GRANTED**; and it is further

RECOMMENDED, that all claims against the John Doe Defendant be **DISMISSED** due to Plaintiff's failure to timely identify and serve such Defendant; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the Court serve a copy of this Report-Recommendation and Order upon the parties to this action.

Pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#), the parties have ten (10) days within which to file written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the

Clerk of the Court. ***FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW.*** [Roldan v. Racette](#), 984 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir.1993) (citing [Small v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.](#), 892 F.2d 15 (2d Cir.1989)); *see also* [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#); [FED.R.CIV.P. 72, 6\(a\), & 6\(e\)](#).

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2006 WL 2795332

Footnotes

- 1 Defendant John Doe has not been identified and therefore has not been served with the Amended Complaint or otherwise appeared in this action. See Dkt No 12.
- 2 Plaintiff mistakenly spells Defendant Bennett's name as "Bennet." See Dkt. No. 23, Answer at n. 1. The Court will refer to this Defendant by the proper spelling.
- 3 Plaintiff's response to the Motion for Summary Judgment fails to comport with the requirements of the Local Rules for the Northern District of New York. Plaintiff only submitted a Memorandum of Law and some Exhibits but did not provide a Statement of Material Facts as required. See N.D.N.Y.L.R. 7.1(a). Normally, if no Statement of Material Facts are filed, Defendants' Statement of Material Facts are deemed admitted. N.D.N.Y.L.R. 7.1(a)(3). This Court, nonetheless, will proceed to decide this Motion with the aid of Defendants' Statement of Material Facts with accompanying Exhibits and Plaintiff's Verified Amended Complaint with Exhibits. Although no exhibits were attached to the Amended Complaint on the Docket Report, attachments were available with the Original Complaint and will hereby be incorporated into the Amended Complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 1 & 8.
- 4 Plaintiff does not provide any specific dates as to when he received rotten or spoiled food.
- 5 It is unknown to this Court whether a response from the Superintendent was received.
- 6 The CORC also stated that no grievances were received by the IGRC in April or May 2003, as Plaintiff has alleged he filed grievances during those months. Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, CORC Appeal, dated Oct. 1, 2003; Am. Compl., Ex. A; *see also supra* p. 3.
- 7 It is unclear to this Court as to which cellmate Plaintiff referred to as a known enemy in the grievance.
- 8 Once again, the CORC noted that IGRC had not received grievances on April 26 or June 21, 2003, as Plaintiff has alleged he filed grievances on those dates. Am. Compl. at ¶ 27; Defs.' 7.1 Statement, Ex. A, CORC Appeal, dated Aug. 20, 2003.
- 9 Jean Botta is not named as Defendant in this action.
- 10 "D.S.G. Kiebert" is also not named as a Defendant in this action.
- 11 As to Plaintiff's medical care claim, Plaintiff may have grieved his medical care issues. See Am. Compl., Ex. "Exhaustion of my Administrative Remedies Some Material Lost ...," Grievance, dated Aug. 13, 2003. However, since the Eighth Amendment medical indifference claim is against the John Doe Defendant who was never identified nor appeared in this action, the issue will not be addressed further.
- 12 [N.Y. COMP.CODES R. & REGS. tit. 7, § 701.8](#) states: "[t]ime limit extensions may be requested at any level of review, but such extensions may be granted only with the written consent of the grievant. Absent such extension, matters not decided within the time limits may be appealed to the next step."

- 13 As Exhibits to their 7.1 Statement, Defendants include grievances filed by Plaintiff on April 27, 2004, and May 20, 2004, which clearly were submitted after the filing of the Amended Complaint.
- 14 The Court also notes that the Defendants fail to address whether or not there was a penological interest in the regulations or practices that may have affected Midalgo's receipt of non-legal mail. See Defs.' Mem. of Law.
- 15 Although Plaintiff does not specify what aspect of the Constitution was violated, though Plaintiff does insert a short sentence saying Defendants were deliberately indifferent, this Court will analyze the wiretap claim pursuant to the Fourth Amendment. See Am. Compl. at ¶ 52.

End of Document

© 2021 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

2014 WL 4365274

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,
N.D. New York.

Patrick GUILLORY, Plaintiff,

v.

Kurt ELLIS, et al, Defendants.

No. 9:11-CV-600 (MAD/ATB).

|
Signed Aug. 29, 2014.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Patrick Guillory, Dannemora, NY, pro se.

Office of the New York State Attorney General, The Capitol,
Gregory J. Rodriguez, AAG, of Counsel, Albany, NY, for
Defendants.

MEMORANDUM-DECISION AND ORDER

MAE A. D'AGOSTINO, District Judge.

I. INTRODUCTION

*1 Plaintiff, an inmate currently in the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (“DOCCS”), commenced this civil rights action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, on May 31, 2011. *See* Dkt. No. 1. The remaining claims are that Defendants violated Plaintiff’s constitutional rights under the First Amendment’s Free Exercise Clause, as well as his rights under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person’s Act (“RLUIPA”), and subsequently retaliated against him for attempting to exercise these rights by destroying Plaintiff’s mail and thus denying him access to the courts. *See* Dkt. Nos. 1, 210.

In a very thorough Report–Recommendation dated July 23, 2014, Magistrate Judge Baxter recommended that the Court grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint in its entirety. *See* Dkt. No. 210. Specifically, Magistrate Judge Baxter first found that in relation to the December 7, 2010 incident, Defendant Ready acted within the bounds of his employment and according to the documentation before him and thus, his

inadvertent denial that caused Plaintiff to miss one religious service did not substantially burden Plaintiff’s free exercise of his religion. *See id.* at 14. With regards to the March 20, 2011 incident, Magistrate Judge Baxter found that Defendant Ellis was not responsible for the shortened duration of the Purim celebration, and that while the delay may have been an inconvenience, Plaintiff was still able to participate in the service, thus satisfying the requirements of the First Amendment and RLUIPA. *See id.* at 19–20. Magistrate Judge Baxter also found that neither Defendant Ellis, nor Defendant Ready engaged in the conduct mentioned above as a way to retaliate against Plaintiff for any grievances that he had previously filed either against them or any other correctional officer. *See id.* at 39–40. Moreover, Magistrate Judge Baxter found that Defendant Kupiec did not interfere with Plaintiff’s mail as a means to either retaliate against him or to deny him access to the courts. *See id.* 35–36. Finally, Magistrate Judge Baxter found that Plaintiff failed to establish that he suffered an adverse action as a result of Defendant Kupiec’s alleged conduct. On August 4, 2014, the Court received objections to the Report–Recommendation from Plaintiff. *See* Dkt. No. 211.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Plaintiff’s objections

In his objection to Magistrate Judge Baxter’s Report–Recommendation, Plaintiff states that he objects to the Report in its entirety. *See id.* Plaintiff relays his astonishment at Magistrate Judge Baxter’s choice to “excuse Def [endant] Kupiec’s conduct” and at his finding that Plaintiff’s position is “unfounded.” *See id.* Plaintiff further objects to Magistrate Judge Baxter’s Report on the grounds that he looked outside the pleadings and “only to the Defendants Affidavits” when making his determination to grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. *See id.*

B. Standard of review

*2 A court may grant a motion for summary judgment only if it determines that there is no genuine issue of material fact to be tried and that the facts as to which there is no such issue warrant judgment for the movant as a matter of law. *See Chambers v. TRM Copy Ctrs. Corp.*, 43 F.3d 29, 36 (2d Cir.1994) (citations omitted). When analyzing a summary judgment motion, the court “cannot try issues of fact; it can only determine whether there are issues to be

tried.” [Id.](#) at 36–37 (quotation and other citation omitted). Moreover, it is well-settled that a party opposing a motion for summary judgment may not simply rely on the assertions in its pleadings. See [Celotex Corp. v. Catrett](#), 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986) (quoting Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c)(e)).

In assessing the record to determine whether any such issues of material fact exist, the court is required to resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party. See [Chambers](#), 43 F.3d at 36 (citing [Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.](#), 477 U.S. 242, 255, 106 S.Ct. 2502, 2513–14, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986)) (other citations omitted). Where the non-movant either does not respond to the motion or fails to dispute the movant's statement of material facts, the court may not rely solely on the moving party's Rule 56.1 statement; rather the court must be satisfied that the citations to evidence in the record support the movant's assertions. See [Giannullo v. City of N.Y.](#), 322 F.3d 139, 143 n. 5 (2d Cir.2003) (holding that not verifying in the record the assertions in the motion for summary judgment “would derogate the truth-finding functions of the judicial process by substituting convenience for facts”).

“[I]n a *pro se* case, the court must view the submissions by a more lenient standard than that accorded to ‘formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.’” [Govan v. Campbell](#), 289 F.Supp.2d 289, 295 (N.D.N.Y.2007) (quoting [Haines v. Kerner](#), 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972)) (other citations omitted). The Second Circuit has opined that the court is obligated to “make reasonable allowances to protect *pro se* litigants” from inadvertently forfeiting legal rights merely because they lack a legal education. [Govan v. Campbell](#), 289 F.Supp.2d 289, 295 (N.D.N.Y.2007) (quoting [Traguth v. Zuck](#), 710 F.2d 90, 95 (2d Cir.1983)). “However, this does not mean that a *pro se* litigant is excused from following the procedural requirements of summary judgment. See [id.](#) at 295 (citing [Showers v. Eastmond](#), 00 CIV. 3725, 2001 WL 527484, *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 16, 2001)). Specifically, “a *pro se* party's ‘bald assertion,’ completely unsupported by evidence, is not sufficient to overcome a motion for summary judgment.” [Lee v. Coughlin](#), 902 F.Supp. 424, 429 (S.D.N.Y.1995) (citing [Cary v. Crescenzi](#), 923 F.2d 18, 21 (2d Cir.1991)).

When a party files specific objections to a magistrate judge's report-recommendation, the district court makes a “*de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#). However, when a party files “[g]eneral or conclusory objections or objections which merely recite the same arguments [that he presented] to the magistrate judge,” the court reviews those recommendations for clear error. [O'Diah v. Mawhir](#), No. 9:08-CV-322, 2011 WL 933846, *1 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 16, 2011) (citations and footnote omitted). After the appropriate review, “the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendation made by the magistrate judge.” [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#).

C. Application

*3 In the present matter, although Plaintiff has filed objections to Magistrate Judge Baxter's Report–Recommendation, the objections that are given are mostly conclusory and “merely recite the same arguments” that were originally presented to Magistrate Judge Baxter. See [O'Diah](#), 2011 WL 933846, at *1; see generally Dkt. No. 211. Moreover, some of the objections that Plaintiff makes are of an accusatory nature, in that he charges Magistrate Judge Baxter with excusing the behavior of Defendant Kupiec based on her race, and supporting “the Defendants [r]eckless lies.” See Dkt. No. 211 at 1 (“I'm sure if Kupiec was black you would have treated her like all of the blacks who appear before you who are ‘ignorant of the law’”). Nearly all of Plaintiff's “objections” lack the specificity needed to make a *de novo* determination. In light of his *pro se* status, however, the Court will address the arguments raised.

Plaintiff argues that Magistrate Judge Baxter improperly considered disputed facts in rendering his recommendation. See Dkt. No. 211 at 3. Having reviewed the Report–Recommendation, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Baxter correctly relied only on undisputed facts in rendering his determination or construed any disputed facts in Plaintiff's favor in finding that Plaintiff's allegations were insufficient as a matter of law to support his claims. See, e.g., Dkt. No. 210 at 39 (finding that “neither the action allegedly taken by defendant Ready, nor the action allegedly taken by defendant Ellis rises to the level of an ‘adverse action’ under the case law”). Further, contrary to Plaintiff's allegations, Defendants' motion for summary judgment was properly supported by the record, including affidavits and deposition transcripts.

Finally, contrary to Plaintiff's assertions, Magistrate Judge Baxter correctly determined that Defendant Boll was not personally involved in the alleged conduct. The letter to which Plaintiff refers clearly establishes that Defendant Boll did not conduct an investigation into the underlying subject of Plaintiff's grievance, but was merely conducting an "investigation" into the status of Plaintiff's grievance and a reminder that the "Inmate Grievance Program was instituted to handle issues such as yours." Dkt. No. 202–6 at Exhibit "A." Defendant Boll then stated that "[t]he CORC will conduct a thorough investigation to assure that your rights are observed and your issues are addressed. If any corrective action is needed, you will be notified. As your appeal to the CORC is pending, it is recommended that you await the decision." *Id.* Magistrate Judge Baxter correctly determined that Defendant Boll's response to Plaintiff was insufficient to establish her personal involvement. *See Rivera v. Fischer*, 655 F.Supp.2d 235, 238 (W.D.N.Y.2009).

The Court has thoroughly reviewed the parties' submissions and Magistrate Judge Baxter's comprehensive Report–Recommendation and finds that Magistrate Judge Baxter correctly recommended that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss this case.

III. CONCLUSION

*4 After carefully reviewing Magistrate Judge Baxter's Report–Recommendation, the parties' submissions and the applicable law, and for the reasons stated herein, the Court hereby

ORDERS that Magistrate Judge Baxter's Report–Recommendation (Dkt. No. 210) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety for the reasons stated therein; and the Court further

ORDERS that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 202) is **GRANTED**; and the Court further

ORDERS that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in Defendants' favor and close this case; and the Court further

ORDERS that the Clerk of the Court shall serve a copy of this Memorandum–Decision and Order on all parties in accordance with the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

REPORT–RECOMMENDATION

ANDREW T. BAXTER, United States Magistrate Judge.

This matter has been referred to me for Report and Recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and LOCAL RULES N.D.N.Y. 72.3(c). In this civil rights complaint, plaintiff alleges that defendants subjected him to religious discrimination, denial of access to courts, and retaliation for the exercise of his First Amendment Rights, while he was incarcerated at Mid–State Correctional Facility. (Compl.; Dkt. 1). Plaintiff seeks monetary and injunctive relief.

I. Procedural History

This case has had a long and complicated procedural history, complete with an appeal of the denial of a preliminary injunction to the Second Circuit, which dismissed plaintiff's appeal as lacking an arguable basis in law or fact.¹ (Dkt. No. 133). The court will attempt to briefly state the important aspects of the docket and outline the remaining issues. On October 31, 2012, defendants made a motion for judgment on the pleadings. (Dkt. No. 123). Plaintiff responded in opposition to that motion, but then also made a variety of other motions relating to venue, recusal, and discovery. (Dkt. Nos.119, 139, 140, 144, 145, 149).

On April 3, 2013, I issued an Order and Report–Recommendation, denying some of plaintiff's non-dispositive motions and recommending dismissal of some of his substantive claims on the pleadings. (Dkt. No. 148). On May 15, 2013, Judge D'Agostino affirmed my order and approved my recommendation. (Dkt. No. 155). Judge D'Agostino's order also disposed of plaintiff's Motion Requesting the Court to Take Judicial Notice of Plaintiff's State Court Decision (Dkt. No. 149), his "Motion for Reconsideration," (Dkt. No. 122), and ordered a response to plaintiff's discovery motion (Dkt. No. 119). (Dkt. No. 155).

After Judge D'Agostino's Order, plaintiff filed additional motions: another Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 159) and a Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 160). On July 2, 2013, I held a telephonic conference with the parties regarding the outstanding motions, denying in part and granting in part, plaintiff's motions to compel (Dkt.Nos.119, 159); denying his motion for sanctions (Dkt.Nos.160); and finding that no action was necessary on other letters submitted

by plaintiff. (Dkt.Nos.161–62). On September 13, 2013, plaintiff made a motion to “stop transfer” and requested that his deposition be held at his current facility, Wyoming Correctional Facility. (Dkt.Nos.173, 175). Plaintiff’s transfer to Greene Correctional Facility rendered that motion moot, and it was denied on that basis. (Dkt. No. 178).

*5 On October 10, 2013, plaintiff made a motion for injunctive relief and appointment of counsel, which plaintiff later clarified was only a motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt.Nos.182, 187). This court denied the motion on October 31, 2013, and plaintiff then sent the court a letter stating that he did not wish to be appointed counsel at the time of trial. (Dkt.Nos.189, 190). On January 7, 2014, plaintiff stipulated to the dismissal of all claims against defendants Fischer and Marlenga, which was “so ordered” by Judge D’Agostino on January 8, 2014. (Dkt.Nos.196–97). Defendants filed this summary judgment motion on February 4, 2014. (Dkt. No. 202). Plaintiff responded in opposition to the motion, and requested oral argument. (Dkt. Nos.205, 207). I denied plaintiff’s motion for oral argument on April 18, 2014. (Dkt. No. 208).





Presently pending before me is the remaining defendants’ motion for summary judgment, together with plaintiff’s response in opposition. (Dkt.Nos.202, 205). Based upon Judge D’Agostino’s order approving my recommendation on May 15, 2013 (Dkt. No. 155) and the parties’ stipulation to dismiss all claims against defendants Fischer and Marlenga, the following defendants and claims remain:


1. A First Amendment Free Exercise Clause claim against defendants Ready and Ellis. (Compl.¶¶ 37–47, 65).
2. A Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (“RLUIPA”), claim against defendants Ready and Ellis. (*Id.*)
3. A retaliation claim against defendants Ready and Ellis relating to the above First Amendment and RLUIPA issues.
4. First Amendment retaliation claims against defendant Kupiec relating to the opening, loss, or destruction of plaintiff’s mail in retaliation for grievances filed against Kupiec and defendant Ready. (Compl.¶¶ 58–64).
5. A First Amendment denial of access to courts claim against defendant Kupiec. (Compl.¶¶ 67).



II. Facts





Rather than engage in a lengthy discussion of the facts at the outset, the court will discuss the facts associated with each of plaintiff’s claim within the relevant sections below.

III. Summary Judgment

Summary judgment is appropriate where there exists no genuine issue of material fact and, based on the undisputed facts, the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed.R.Civ.P. 56;   *Salahuddin v. Goord*, 467 F.3d 263, 272–73 (2d Cir.2006). “Only disputes over [“material”] facts that might affect the outcome of the suit under the governing law will properly preclude the entry of summary judgment.”  *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). It must be apparent that no rational finder of fact could find in favor of the non-moving party for a court to grant a motion for summary judgment.  *Gallo v. Prudential Residential Servs.*, 22 F.3d 1219, 1224 (2d Cir.1994).

The moving party has the burden to show the absence of disputed material facts by informing the court of portions of pleadings, depositions, and affidavits which support the motion.  *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). If the moving party satisfies its burden, the nonmoving party must move forward with specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.


  *Salahuddin v. Goord*, 467 F.3d at 273. In that context, the nonmoving party must do more than “simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts.”






 *Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986). However, in determining whether there is a genuine issue of material fact, a court must resolve all ambiguities, and draw all inferences, against the movant. See  *United States v. Diebold, Inc.*, 369 U.S. 654, 655 (1962);   *Salahuddin v. Goord*, 467 F.3d at 272.






IV. Religion Claims




A. Legal Standards

1. First Amendment

*6 Inmates have the right under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to freely exercise a chosen religion.  *Ford v.*

McGinnis, 352 F.3d 582, 588 (2d Cir.2003) (citing  *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. 817, 822 (1974)). However this right is not limitless, and may be subject to restrictions relating to legitimate penological concerns.  *Benjamin v. Coughlin*, 905 F.2d 571, 574 (2d Cir.1990). The analysis of a free exercise claim is governed by the framework set forth in  *O'Lone v. Estate of Shabazz*, 482 U.S. 342 (1987) and  *Turner v. Safely*, 482 U.S. 78, 84 (1987). This framework is one of reasonableness and is less restrictive than the standard ordinarily applied to the alleged infringements of fundamental constitutional rights.  *Ford*, 352 F.3d at 588.

In *O'Lone*, the Supreme Court held that a regulation that burdens a protected right withstands a constitutional challenge if that regulation is reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.  482 U.S. at 349 (quoting  *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 89). An individualized decision to deny an inmate the ability to engage in a religious exercise is analyzed under the same standard.   *Salahuddin v. Goord*, 467 F.3d 263, 274 n. 4 (2d Cir.2006) (citations omitted). In  *Farid v. Smith*, 850 F.2d 917, 926 (2d Cir.1988), the Second Circuit held that to assess a free exercise claim, the court must determine “(1) whether the practice asserted is religious in the person's scheme of beliefs and whether the belief is sincerely held; (2) whether the challenged practice of prison officials infringes upon the religious belief; and (3) whether the challenged practice of the prison officials furthers some legitimate penological interest.”

The court must examine whether the challenged action has a legitimate, rational connection to the governmental objective; whether prisoners have alternative means of exercising the burdened right; the impact on guards, inmates, and prison resources of accommodating that right; and the existence of alternative means of facilitating the exercise of that right that have only a *de minimis* adverse effect on the valid penological interests. See *King v. Bennett*, No. 02–CV–349, 2007 WL 1017102, at *4 (W.D.N.Y. March 30, 2007) (citing   *Salahuddin*, 467 F.3d at 274). Finally, once prison officials state a legitimate penological interest to justify their actions, the burden shifts to plaintiffs to show that the defendants' concerns are “irrational.”  *Ford*, 352 F.3d at 595.





2. Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act





RLUIPA provides that

No government shall impose a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person residing in or confined to an institution ... even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability, unless the government demonstrates that imposition of the burden on that person—

(A) is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest; and

(B) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

*7  42 U.S.C. § 2000cc–1(a). Under RLUIPA, the plaintiff bears the burden of showing that his religious exercise has been burdened and that the burden is substantial.  *Marria v. Broaddus*, 200 F.Supp.2d 280, 297 (S.D.N.Y.2002) (citing  42 U.S.C. § 2000cc–2(b)). The burden then shifts to the government to show that the burden furthers a compelling governmental interest **and** that it is the **least restrictive** means of achieving that interest. *Id.* The act defines “religious exercise” to include “any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief.”  42 U.S.C. § 2000cc–5(7)(A).

A “substantial burden” is one that places “substantial pressure on an adherent to modify his behavior and to violate his beliefs.”  *Singh v. Goord*, 520 F.Supp.2d 487, 498 (S.D.N.Y.2007) (citing, *inter alia*,  *Jolly v. Coughlin*, 76 F.3d 468, 477 (2d Cir.1996)). Inconvenience alone is insufficient to establish a substantial burden. *Id.* (citing *Westchester Day School v. Village of Mamaroneck*, 379 F.Supp.2d 550, 557 (S.D.N.Y.2005)). Furthermore, the substantial evidence test presupposes that some inconveniences may be so minor that they do not amount to a violation. See  *McEachin v. McGuinnis*, 357 F.3d 197, 203 n. 6 (2d Cir.2004) (discussing in a footnote the applicability of the “time-honored maxim ‘*de minimis non curat lex*’ “). However, the court should not attempt to engage in resolving disputes as to whether a particular practice is “central” or “mandatory” to a particular religion in determining whether a burden was substantial. See  *Ford v. McGinnis*, 352

F.3d 582, 593–94 (2d Cir.2003) (discussing First Amendment protections).

B. Application

1. December 7, 2010 Incident:

Plaintiff alleges that defendant Ready denied plaintiff the right to attend Jewish Services for Lubavitch on December 7, 2010, even though he was on the call-out list for the service, and while making disparaging remarks about plaintiff's religion. (Compl. ¶¶ 37–47). This court originally recommended denying defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, notwithstanding defendants' argument that one interference with plaintiff's religious services would not rise to the level of a constitutional violation. I found, instead, that plaintiff claimed that Ready intentionally denied plaintiff the opportunity to attend this religious service, and that this action was also in retaliation for plaintiff filing a successful grievance against defendants Johnston and Ellis. (Dkt. No. 148 at 13). Based only on the facts as stated by plaintiff, and with a very liberal review by the court, this court recommended denying the motion for judgment on the pleadings.² (*Id.* at 14) (this court also noted that it was “unclear” how plaintiff's claims would fare after a well-supported summary judgment motion).

Defendant Ready has submitted a declaration in support of summary judgment. He states that he has been a corrections officer (“CO”) at Mid–State since September of 2010. (Ready Decl. ¶ 2) (Dkt. No. 202–3). On December 7, 2010, he was working on Unit 7–2. (*Id.* ¶ 5). His duties included running the desk at the entrance door of Building 7—the Program Building, ensuring that inmates were where they were scheduled to be, and permitting movement as necessary pursuant to “call-out sheets.” (*Id.*) When an inmate is listed on a call-out sheet, defendant Ready requires the inmate to sign out from his program, and then he is allowed to go to the “call-out.” (*Id.* ¶ 6).

*8 Defendant Ready states that on December 7, 2010, plaintiff came to him and stated that he had to leave his program for a “call-out.” However, plaintiff's name was not listed on the call-out sheets that defendant Ready was given for that day. (*Id.* ¶ 8). If an inmate's name is not on the sheet, he is not permitted to go to the “call-out,” so defendant Ready informed plaintiff that he had to return to his program because his name was not on the sheet. (*Id.* ¶ 1). Defendant Ready states that he never made any comment about plaintiff's religion. (*Id.* at 11). Plaintiff did not seem upset or angry,

did not ask to see a sergeant or supervisor, and “merely complied with [defendant Ready's] instructions and returned to class.” (*Id.* ¶ 12).

Defendant Ready states that the only reason that he prevented plaintiff from going to the call-out (religious service) was because his name was not on any of the call-out sheets that he had been given, and defendant Ready was not authorized to allow plaintiff to attend the call-out. (*Id.* ¶¶ 10, 14). Finally, defendant Ready points out that he had just transferred to Mid–State in September of 2010, thus, he was not aware of plaintiff's September 2010 grievance when Ready did not allow plaintiff to attend the religious service on December 7, 2010. (*Id.* ¶ 13).

As Exhibit I to plaintiff's complaint, he attaches a copy of the “call-out” for Tuesday, December 7, 2010. Plaintiff's name clearly appears on that call-out. (Compl.Ex. I). Father Robert Weber³ has filed a declaration in support of defendants' motion for summary judgment, stating that in December 2010, he was the Coordinating Chaplain at Mid–State. (Weber Decl. ¶ 3) (Dkt. No. 202–7). Father Weber states that when he arrived at work on December 7, 2010, he realized that there was no call-out for the Lubavitch Youth Organization, members of which were visiting the Jewish inmates for Chanukah. (*Id.* ¶ 6). In an attempt to rectify this error, Father Weber “caused a callout to be generated with the names of those inmates who regularly attend Jewish Services .” (*Id.* at 7). Although Father Weber states that a copy of the call-out is attached to his declaration as Exhibit A, no such copy is attached. The court will assume that the call-out to which Father Weber refers is the one that is attached to plaintiff's complaint as Exhibit I. (Dkt. No. 1 at 46). Plaintiff's name is on that call-out.

Father Weber then states that, after Deputy Superintendent for Programs (“DSP”) Phillips approved the call-out, it was “hand-delivered to the Housing Units within the correctional facility.” (Weber Decl. ¶ 8). “Inadvertently, the callout was not added to the daily callout packet nor was it delivered to the program areas that day.” (*Id.* ¶ 9). Although plaintiff's name certainly appears on the call-out, unfortunately defendant Ready, who was at the Program Building that day, did not have that call-out in front of him when plaintiff approached to ask about going to services, and defendant Ready was justified in refusing to let plaintiff attend the services. The Superintendent's investigation of plaintiff's grievance resulted in the same finding:

*9 The facility investigation revealed that the Jewish Services call-out was not submitted with the other scheduled inmate call-outs on the day before (12/6/10), which is normal procedure; therefore, it was not included with 12/7/10 facility call-out packet. The inmate call-out packets are normally distributed to all program areas, housing units as well as other staff/inmate areas the day before the call-outs are scheduled. On the morning of the posted call-out (12/7/10), this error was brought to the attention of the Coordinating Chaplain, who then had the Jewish Services call-out hand delivered to the housing units but not to the program areas. Although the 7–2 officer [Ready] and the grievant's general business instructor [Gruen] reviewed the p.m. call-outs to verify/confirm the grievant's statements, neither staff member would have been aware the grievant was listed on the 12/7/10 Jewish Services call-out scheduled for 2:00 p.m. nor would they have been aware that there was an addition to the original call-out packet because it was never delivered to their program area.

(Compl.Ex. L) (Dkt. No. 1 at 50).⁴ This document, attached as an exhibit to plaintiff's complaint, corroborates defendant Ready's and Father Weber's version of the events. Defendant Ready did not intentionally deny plaintiff the opportunity to attend the service on December 7, 2010 because although plaintiff's name was on the call-out list, defendant Ready did not have that list in front of him,⁵ and he would not even have been aware that the list existed because it was not delivered to the program area. This one, clearly inadvertent incident, does not rise to the level of a constitutional violation committed by defendant Ready.⁶

In his response to defendants' motion for summary judgment, plaintiff states that the defendants are lying, and that the

call-out was delivered to “all” program areas. (Pl.'s Mem. ¶ 10) (Dkt. No. 205–1 at 9). Plaintiff states that he reaches this sweeping *conclusion* because “[t]he location where the Jewish Services [are] held (Building # 101) is *a Program Area*,” and security staff in that area must have had the call-out because they would not have let the thirteen other Jewish inmates in the building. (*Id.*) (emphasis added). If one program area had the call-out, then all the program “areas” must have had the call-out. However, plaintiff's argument misses the point. Defendant Ready was not in Building # 101. He was in Unit 7–2 in Building 7,⁷ and the fact that the building in which the religious services were actually held had the call-out,⁸ does not “prove” or even raise a question of fact regarding whether the call-out had been sent to the other program areas, in the face of Father Weber's sworn statement that he did not send the call-out to the program areas. Although plaintiff states that Building # 101 is “a” program area, it is not “the” Program Building.⁹

In my prior report, I recommended denying defendants' motion to dismiss on the pleadings, notwithstanding case law holding that missing one religious service does not constitute a substantial burden on the inmate's right to the free exercise of his religion under either under the First Amendment or under RLUIPA. (Dkt. No. 148 at 13) (citing inter alia [Troy v. Kuhlmann](#), No. 96 Civ. 7190, 1999 WL 825622, at * 15 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 15, 1999)). In granting *summary judgment*, the court in *Troy* stated that “courts in the Second Circuit have held that an inmate's right to practice his religion is not substantially burdened if an inmate missed one religious service for *a valid reason*.” *Id.* (emphasis added). I did not rely on *Troy* in my prior report, because the defendants in this case brought a motion for judgment on the pleadings, and this court was bound by the facts as stated in plaintiff's complaint. Now that defendants have moved for summary judgment, the court may consider material outside the complaint, such as sworn declarations, in determining that, while plaintiff missed one religious service through the actions of defendant Ready, this inadvertent denial did not substantially burden the plaintiff's free exercise of his religion. In denying plaintiff the opportunity to attend his call-out, defendant Ready acted according to the documentation before him. Even if a mistake were made, it was the lack of proper documentation that caused plaintiff to miss his service.¹⁰ Neither the First Amendment, nor RLUIPA was violated by defendant Ready.

2. The March 20, 2011 Incident

*10 The second incident occurred on March 20, 2011, when plaintiff claims that defendant Ellis intentionally cut short a visit from Lubavitch Rabbis who had come from Brooklyn to see plaintiff¹¹ at the facility. (Compl.¶ 65). Plaintiff claims that he was scheduled to meet with the Rabbis for one and one half hours in order to celebrate the Purim holiday. (*Id.*) Plaintiff claims that defendant Ellis cut the service to a matter of minutes and sent all of the Jewish inmates back to their housing units.

Defendant Ellis has submitted a declaration in support of defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Ellis Decl.) (Dkt. No. 202–5). Kurt Ellis is employed by DOCCS as a Protestant Reverend, and at the time of the declaration, held the position of Chaplain at Mid–State. (Ellis Decl. ¶¶ 1–2). Defendant Ellis states that on March 20, 2011, Rabbi Theodore Max scheduled a Purim celebration in the small chapel at MidState with some members of the Lubavitch organization. (*Id.* ¶ 5). The call-out was approved for 2:30 p.m. on March 20, 2011. Defendant Ellis spoke with Corrections Officer (“CO”) Backer, the Building 101 main console officer and explained that the call-out was for 2:30, but that the Rabbi might be late because he was making Purim rounds at other facilities, and a delay was possible. (*Id.* ¶¶ 6–7).

Defendant Ellis states that at approximately 1:45 p.m., he noticed that plaintiff was working in the Law Library, which is adjacent to the Building 101 console. (*Id.* ¶ 8). Defendant Ellis mentioned to CO Backer that plaintiff was on the Purim call-out, but Ellis was not sure if plaintiff would need to go back to his housing unit at the 2:15 “go back” and then return for the Purim call-out. (*Id.*) CO Backer told defendant Ellis that plaintiff would have to go back to his housing unit and then return when it was time for the Purim call-out. (*Id.*)

Defendant Ellis told plaintiff that he knew that plaintiff had “an issue” before, and Ellis wanted to make sure that plaintiff did not have any trouble that day. (*Id.* ¶ 9). Ellis told plaintiff that, because he was currently signed out for the Law Library, he would have to go back to his housing unit at 2:15 p.m. and then return “when they call for the service.” Plaintiff responded that he did not have to go back and asked the Law Library officer whether plaintiff could go directly to the service from the Law Library at 2:30. CO Ippolito, the Law Library Officer gave plaintiff permission to do so. Defendant Ellis states that he left, but informed CO Backer what CO Ippolito told plaintiff, and CO Backer agreed that CO Ippolito “should not have said that.” (*Id.*)

Reverend Ellis states that he has no authority over the procedure for “inmate movement” at the facility because movement is a matter of security. (*Id.* ¶ 10). At approximately 2:30 p.m., defendant Ellis went to the small chapel to see if the Rabbi had arrived, but the Rabbi was not there yet. Defendant Ellis went to check with CO Backer. Plaintiff also approached the “security bubble” to check with CO Backer. Plaintiff was told by CO Backer and by defendant Ellis that the Rabbi had not arrived, and plaintiff went back to the Law Library. (*Id.* ¶ 11).

*11 Defendant Ellis then went to see if Rabbi Max had arrived, but was told that the Rabbi had not been seen. Defendant Ellis did his “weekly rounds in the Visitor’s Center, signing into the Log Book at 2:45 p.m.” (*Id.* ¶ 12). After a brief conversation with a staff member, defendant Ellis saw the Lubavitch volunteers pulling into the parking lot. Defendant Ellis greeted Rabbi Max and continued on his daily rounds, stopping at the Watch Commander’s Office to inform him that Rabbi Max had arrived. (*Id.*)

Defendant Ellis states that he was not involved in calling inmates for the Purim Service, nor did he attend the Service on March 20, 2011.¹² Defendant Ellis continued with his daily rounds and did not return to his office until approximately 3:45 p.m., at which time he noticed the inmates in the small chapel with the Rabbis. (*Id.* ¶ 16). Defendant Ellis states that after the service ended, he spoke to Rabbi Max, who stated that the service went well. (*Id.* ¶ 17). Defendant Ellis states that he was not in charge of the Service, he had no involvement in the time that the Service began or ended, and he did not order the inmates back to their housing units at the conclusion of the Service. (*Id.* ¶¶ 18–20).

Defendants have also submitted the declaration of Rabbi Theodore Max,¹³ who states that he is a Chaplain who is responsible for leading the primary congregational worship and prayer services for Jewish inmates. (Max Decl. ¶¶ 1–3). He is assigned to multiple correctional facilities, including Mid–State. (*Id.* ¶ 4). Rabbi Max states that he coordinated the Purim celebration, and he was advised to schedule the call-out for 2:30, even though he was not scheduled to arrive until 2:45 that day. The Service was scheduled to last approximately one hour. (*Id.* ¶¶ 6–7). Rabbi Max states that he was on a “very tight” schedule on March 20, 2011 because he was scheduled to visit “at least three correctional facilities” before his visit to Mid–State. (*Id.*) When he and the members of the Lubavitch organization arrived at Mid–State, there was a long line of visitors, which delayed their entrance into the facility, causing



the Purim celebration to begin later than 2:45 p.m. (*Id.* ¶¶ 10–11). Rabbi Max states that pursuant to facility rules, the inmates were still required to return to their cells at 3:45 p.m., and that the Purim celebration ended at that time. (*Id.* ¶ 12).

Plaintiff does not claim that he missed the celebration, only that the celebration was shorter than originally scheduled. Rabbi Max has explained that he arrived late, causing the service to begin later, and run shorter than anticipated. Defendant Ellis had nothing to do with scheduling the event, with Rabbi Max being late, or with shortening the service.

Plaintiff argues that defendant Ellis sent plaintiff back to the law library and the other Jewish inmates back to their housing units, for the purpose of shortening the service. In his response to the motion for summary judgment plaintiff states that during *his* deposition, the defendants “admitted” that defendant Ellis sent the Jewish inmates back to their cells to shorten the service. (Pl.’s Mem. ¶ 19) (citing Deposition Transcript (“DT”) at 49). The deposition transcript is not an “admission” by defendants, and does not state that defendant Ellis sent the inmates back to their cells.

*12 During his deposition, plaintiff testified that Reverend Ellis allows *Protestant* inmates to come to the chapel before Ellis is ready to conduct the service, but does not allow Jewish inmates to go to their place of worship and wait if the Rabbi is not there. (DT at 49). “Whenever we go to the Jewish services, he sends us all back. ‘Go back to your housing unit.’ “ (*Id.*) Defense counsel then asked plaintiff a question: “even though the rabbis came a little bit late, and even though they sent some of the inmates back to their cells, you were able to meet with the rabbis that day and have a short prayer service.” (*Id.*) This *question by counsel* is **not** an *admission by a defendant*, and counsel was making the point that “even if” what plaintiff said were true—that someone sent the Jewish inmates back to their cells because Rabbi Max had not arrived—plaintiff still attended the service, notwithstanding that it was shorter than anticipated.

Rabbi Max’s declaration shows that *he* was late beginning the service, and the inmates were required to return to their cells at 3:45. Defendant Ellis had nothing to do with the length of the service.¹⁴ Under the appropriate definition, plaintiff’s religious rights were not substantially burdened. In order for the defendant’s interference to be a “substantial burden” on the inmate’s religious exercise, the interference must be more than an inconvenience, and plaintiff must demonstrate that the government’s action pressured plaintiff



to commit an act forbidden by his religion or prevented him from engaging in conduct or having a religious experience mandated by his faith.  *Pugh v. Goord*, 571 F.Supp.2d 477, 504–05 (S.D.N.Y.2008);  *Graham v. Mahmood*, No. 05–10071, 2008 WL 1849167, at * 14 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 22, 2008); *Gill v. Defrank*, No. 98 Civ. 7851, 2000 WL 897152, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 6, 2000) (citing *Boomer v. Irvin*, 963 F.Supp.2d 227, 230 (W.D.N.Y.1997)).





In addition, although plaintiff may disagree, the shortening of his Purim celebration because the Rabbi was late or because plaintiff had to wait for other inmates to come back from their housing units did not amount to a “substantial burden.” This delay may certainly have been “an inconvenience.” However, plaintiff admits that the Service did occur, that prayers were said, and that the inmates were allowed to eat the food, albeit too quickly for plaintiff’s liking. Thus, neither the Constitution, nor RLUIPA were violated by defendant Ellis. Plaintiff’s retaliation claim will be discussed below.

V. Mail/Access to Courts/Retaliation







A. Legal Standards




1. Mail




Among the protections enjoyed by prison inmates, subject to appropriate limitations, is the right “to the free flow of incoming and outgoing mail” guaranteed by the First Amendment. *LeBron v. Swaitek*, No. 05–CV–172 (GLS/DRH), 2007 WL 3254373, at *6 (N.D.N.Y. Nov. 2, 2007) (Sharpe, J.) (quoting  *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d 346, 351 (2d Cir.2003)). “The boundary between an inmate’s First Amendment right to free speech and the ability of prison officials to open or otherwise interfere with an inmate’s mail is not precise.”  *Cancel v. Goord*, No. 00 CIV 2042, 2001 WL 303713, at *5 (S.D.N.Y. March 29, 2001). This right, however, must yield to the legitimate penological interests of prison officials when mail is monitored for the purpose of ensuring order in the prison by preventing illegal activities.



 *Duamutef v. Hollins*, 297 F.3d 108, 112–13 (2d Cir.2002) (citing, *inter alia*,   *U.S. v. Workman*, 80 F.3d 688, 699 (2d Cir.1996)). “The [Supreme] Court has counseled judicial restraint in the federal courts’ review of prison policy and administration, noting that ‘courts are ill equipped to deal with the increasingly urgent problems of prison administration and reform.’ “  *Giano v. Senkowski*, 54 F.3d 1050, 1053

(2d Cir.1995) (quoting  *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 84 (1987)).



*13 Actions taken by prison administrators directed toward inmate mail are subject to the overarching consideration that a prison regulation infringing on an inmate's constitutional rights is valid so long as the regulation is “reasonably related to the legitimate penological interests.”  *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. at 89. Applying this precept, “[c]ourts have constitutionally afforded greater protection ... to outgoing mail than to incoming mail.”  *Davis*, 320 F.3d at 351 (citations omitted). Nonetheless, the Second Circuit has held that “ ‘where good cause is shown, outgoing mail can be read’ without violating inmates’ First Amendment rights.”   *Workman*, 80 F.3d at 698 (quoting  *Wolfish v. Levi*, 573 F.2d 118, 130 n. 27 (2d Cir.1978), *rev'd in part on other grounds sub nom.*,  *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520 (1979)).






Prison security is a legitimate penological interest that justifies limitations on an inmate's First Amendment rights related to regular mail. See  *Cancel v. Goord*, 2001 WL 303713, at *6. “[T]he interception of a prisoner's correspondence does not violate that individual's First Amendment rights ‘if prison officials had good or reasonable cause to inspect the mail.’” *Knight v. Keane*, No. 99 Civ. 3955, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18702, at *18 (S.D.N.Y. August 26, 2005) (citing  *United States v. Felipe*, 148 F.3d 101, 108 (2d Cir.1998)) (Rep't–Rec.), *adopted* 2006 WL 89929 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 12, 2006). To establish a claim for interference with regular, non-legal mail, the plaintiff must show “ ‘a pattern and practice of interference that is not justified by any legitimate penological concern.’” *Singleton v. Williams*, No. 12 Civ.2021, 2014 WL 2095024, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. May 20, 2014) (quoting *Cancel*, *supra.*) An isolated incident is generally insufficient to establish a constitutional violation. *Id.* (citing  *Davis*, 320 F.3d at 351).

Legal mail is entitled to a higher degree of protection than regular mail, and “prison policies or practices which interfere with legal mail on a regular basis whether incoming or outgoing must be supported by a legitimate penological interest other than mere general security concerns which permit interference with regular mail.”  *Cancel v. Goord*, 2001 WL 303713, at *6–7 (citing   *Washington v. James*, 782 F.2d 1134, 1139 (2d Cir.1986)). Plaintiff must still show

that prison officials “ ‘regularly and unjustifiably interfered with the ... legal mail.’” *Singleton*, 2014 WL 2095024, at *4 (quoting *Cancel*, *supra.*) As few as two incidents of mail tampering may constitute an actionable violation if the incidents suggest an ongoing practice of censorship that is unjustified by a substantial governmental interest or if the tampering unjustifiably chilled the inmate's right to access to courts as discussed below or impaired legal representation that plaintiff received. *Vega v. Rell*, No. 3:09–CV–737, 2013 WL 6273283, at *10 (D.Conn. Dec. 4, 2013) (citing   *Washington*, 782 F.2d at 1139).

2. Access to Courts

*14 Legal mail claims are sometimes related to claims that defendants have denied an inmate access to courts by interfering with legal mail. It is well-settled that inmates have a constitutional right to “meaningful” access to the courts.  *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 823 (1977). The Supreme Court held in *Bounds* that “the fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law.”  430 U.S. at 828.

“Mere ‘delay in being able to work on one's legal action or communicate with the courts does not rise to the level of a constitutional violation.’”  *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d 346, 352 (2d Cir.2003) (citing *Jermosen v. Coughlin*, 877 F.Supp. 864, 871 (S.D.N.Y.1995)). In addition, “to establish a constitutional violation based on a denial of access to the courts, a plaintiff must show that the defendant's conduct was deliberate and malicious, and that the defendant's actions resulted in actual injury to the plaintiff.”  *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 351 (1996). See   *Collins v. Goord*, 581 F.Supp.2d 563, 573 (S.D.N.Y.2008). In order to show actual injury, the defendants' conduct must have “hindered [plaintiff's] efforts to pursue a legal claim.”  518 U.S. at 351.

3. Retaliation

In order to establish a claim of retaliation for the exercise of a First Amendment right, plaintiff must show that he engaged in constitutionally protected speech or conduct, and that the protected activity was a substantial motivating factor for

“adverse action” taken against him by defendants. [Bennett v. Goord](#), 343 F.3d 133, 137 (2d Cir.2003) (citing [Gayle v. Gonyea](#), 313 F.3d 677 (2d Cir.2002); see also [Hendricks v. Coughlin](#), 114 F.3d 390 (2d Cir.1997)). The Second Circuit has defined “adverse action” in the prison context as “retaliatory conduct ‘that would deter a similarly situated individual of ordinary firmness from exercising ... constitutional rights.’” [Gill v. Pidlypchak](#), 389 F.3d at 381 (citation omitted). This objective test applies whether or not the plaintiff was himself subjectively deterred from exercising his rights. *Id.*

To establish retaliation, the plaintiff must also establish a causal connection between the protected speech or conduct and the adverse action. [Gill v. Pidlypchak](#), 389 F.3d 379, 380 (2d Cir.2004). Although a “ ‘plaintiff can establish a causal connection that suggests retaliation by showing that protected activity was close in time to the adverse action[,]’ “[s]uch circumstantial evidence of retaliation, ... without more, is insufficient to survive summary judgment.” [Roseboro v. Gillespie](#), 791 F.Supp.2d 353, 370 (S.D.N.Y.2011) (citations omitted).

Even if plaintiff makes the appropriate showing of retaliation, defendants may avoid liability if they demonstrate that they would have taken the adverse action even in the absence of the protected conduct. [Id.](#) at 371. “Regardless of the presence of retaliatory motive, ... a defendant may be entitled to summary judgment if he can show ... that even without the improper motivation the alleged retaliatory action would have occurred.” [Scott v. Coughlin](#), 344 F.3d 282, 287–88 (2d Cir.2003) (citing [Mt. Healthy City Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle](#), 429 U.S. 274, 287 (1977)).

*15 The court must keep in mind that claims of retaliation are “easily fabricated” and “pose a substantial risk of unwarranted judicial intrusion into matters of general prison administration.” Accordingly, plaintiff must set forth non-conclusory allegations to sustain a retaliation claim. [Bennett](#), 343 F.3d at 137. Even where a complaint or affidavit contains specific assertions, the allegations “may still be deemed conclusory if [they are] (1) ‘largely unsubstantiated by any other direct evidence’ and (2) ‘so replete with inconsistencies and improbabilities that no reasonable juror would undertake the suspension of disbelief necessary to credit the allegations made in the complaint.’

“ [Smith v. Woods](#), 9:03–CV–480 (DNH/GHL), 2006 WL 1133247, at *3 & n. 11 (N.D.N.Y. Apr. 24, 2006) (quoting [Jeffreys v. City of New York](#), 426 F.3d 549, 554–55 (2d Cir.2005)). To be sufficient to create a “factual issue,” in the context of a summary judgment motion, an allegation in an affidavit or verified complaint “must, among other things, be based ‘on personal knowledge.’” [Id.](#), 2006 WL 1133247, at *3 & n. 7 (collecting cases); Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c)(4).

B. Application

1. Defendant Kupiec

a. Relevant Facts—Interference/Retaliation

In his complaint, plaintiff alleged that after he filed a grievance against defendant Ready, which was denied on January 14, 2011, defendant Kupiec¹⁵ began to lose and/or destroy plaintiff’s packages that were received in the mail room.¹⁶ (Compl.¶¶ 57–64). Plaintiff claims that on January 14, 2011, the same day that the Superintendent rendered a decision on plaintiff’s grievance against defendant Ready, plaintiff received a package from Stratford Career Center, to study for his paralegal degree. (Compl.¶ 58). Plaintiff states “Defendant Theda Kupiec ‘got word’ of the complaint contra the aforesaid officers and started to intentionally lose and destroy the plaintiff’s legal packages from said school.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff states that the “package” with his text and exams was never recovered, but he did “receive the Paralegal Course from the school on the said date in question.”¹⁷ (*Id.* & Ex. M).

Plaintiff states that he “was never once called down to the package room or mail room in the entire month of [J]anuary, 2011.” (Compl.¶ 58). He then states that “this only indicates that anytime an inmate (in this case the plaintiff) files a grievance against the defendant’s [sic]—retaliation takes place.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff speculates that retaliation can take the form of missing packages or “planting weapons on the inmate ... to make sure that the inmates [sic] goes to the box (Special Housing Units) where he is limited to legal materials.”¹⁸ (*Id.*)

The complaint also alleges that after he appealed the Superintendent’s decision regarding the December 7, 2010 incident against Ready, a “Notice of Intention to File a Claim” (“Notice”) was improperly sent “regular” mail, rather than by Certified Mail as is required under New York State

Law and notwithstanding that plaintiff paid for certified mail. (Compl. ¶¶ 60–63). Plaintiff alleges that on March 15, 2011, his parents sent him a food package that he never received, purportedly due to the retaliation by defendant Kupiec. (Compl. ¶ 63). Several paragraphs later, plaintiff states that, on May 17, 2011, defendant Kupiec “slashed open” plaintiff’s legal mail, removed the documents outside of his presence, and sent the documents to plaintiff in a coffeestained, “stampless” envelope. (Compl. ¶ 82). In plaintiff’s response to defendants’ motion for summary judgment, he also mentions an incident that is not part of the complaint. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Kupiec opened his mail and ripped up his “law school exam scores.” (Dkt. No. 205–1, ¶ 33). This court will not consider this final allegation against defendant Kupiec.¹⁹

*16 Defendants have filed the declaration of defendant Theda Kupiec, Senior Mail Clerk at Mid–State. (Kupiec Decl. ¶¶ 1–2) (Dkt. No. 202–4). Defendant Kupiec states that her responsibilities include sorting outgoing mail and placing the appropriate postage after verification that the inmate has sufficient funds, in addition to sorting incoming mail for distribution to the housing units. (*Id.* ¶ 6). Defendant Kupiec states that she has no responsibility “whatsoever” with respect to “packages” that are received for inmates. She states that the mail room in which she works is located in Building 20 of the Administration Building, which is located outside of the secure fence around the facility. However, the “package room” is located in Building 101, which is located inside the secure fence. (*Id.* ¶¶ 7–8).

Defendant Kupiec states that she was not aware of any grievance plaintiff may have filed against defendant Ready, and that she does “not personally know Correction Officer Ready.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 11–12). Defendant Kupiec states that “at some point,” she became aware of plaintiff’s claim that he did not receive the Stratford Career Institute package, but because defendant Kupiec does not work in the package room, and has no responsibility for packages, she has no knowledge of the result of plaintiff’s complaint. (*Id.* ¶ 14).

Defendant Kupiec states that she did inadvertently mail plaintiff’s Notice via regular mail. (*Id.* ¶ 15). Plaintiff requested that the envelope be sent Certified, and defendant Kupiec first sent the mail to the Business Office to verify that plaintiff had adequate funds for certified mail. When the mail was returned to her with the authorization, defendant Kupiec inadvertently sent the mail with regular postage. Defendant Kupiec states that she realized her mistake when plaintiff filed a grievance, to which she responded by admitting her error

and reimbursing plaintiff for the difference in the postage. Defendant Kupiec states that the mistake was hers, and no one “told” her to send the mail out via regular mail rather than certified. (*Id.* ¶¶ 15–16 & Ex. A). Exhibit A to defendant Kupiec’s declaration is a copy of the memorandum that she sent to plaintiff apologizing for the error and reimbursing him for the cost of the mailing.²⁰ Defendant Kupiec states that she is completely unaware of plaintiff’s missing food package because she does not work in the package room. (*Id.* ¶ 17).

Defendant Kupiec also states that on May 18, 2011, she received a manila envelope from the package room with plaintiff’s name and DIN number on it, with no indication that it was legal mail.²¹ She opened the envelope to record the contents, and when she realized that the mail was from a court, she wrote which court the mail came from on the front of the envelope and send the mail to the Legal Officer. (*Id.* ¶ 19 & Ex. B). Exhibit B is the memorandum that defendant Kupiec wrote to the IGRC, explaining what happened with the manila envelope.²² (*Id.*) Defendant Kupiec states that she did not open plaintiff’s legal mail intentionally or in retaliation for any grievance, but merely in the “normal course of [her] job duties” (*Id.* ¶ 20).

b. Discussion

*17 These incidents do not show constitutional interference with plaintiff’s mail, nor do the facts show that defendant Kupiec was retaliating against plaintiff for his grievances. First, it is clear that defendant Kupiec does not work in the package room, and had no personal involvement in, and would not have been responsible for, either plaintiff’s alleged text book “loss” or the alleged loss of his kosher food.²³ The court will focus on plaintiff’s allegations that defendant Kupiec tampered with his mail on February 25, 2011 (certified mail claim) and on May 17, 2011 (opening of legal mail).

The fact that plaintiff’s Notice was sent regular mail, rather than certified is not interference with plaintiff’s mail. The mail was sent, it was just sent by a different method of delivery.²⁴ This mistake shows neither intent, nor a “pattern and practice” of interference. At worst, it shows an error by defendant Kupiec in sending out plaintiff’s mail, for which plaintiff was reimbursed.²⁵ The incident in which defendant Kupiec sent plaintiff documents in a plain manilla envelope after she realized that the documents were sent by a court also shows an error by facility staff in the package room, that defendant Kupiec attempted to rectify by writing which

court the documents came from on the envelope and having it delivered to plaintiff through the proper channels for legal mail.²⁶ Defendant Kupiec states that the court documents were already in the plain manilla envelope when she received them.

Plaintiff claims that defendant Kupiec was retaliating against plaintiff for the grievances that he filed. Plaintiff first mentions the grievance he filed against defendant Ready after the December 7, 2010 incident, which was denied by the Superintendent on January 14, 2011.²⁷ Plaintiff's statement that defendant Kupiec was aware of plaintiff's grievance against defendant Ready because an inmate named "Rogers" told defendant Kupiec about the grievance, is completely conclusory. The first time plaintiff ever mentioned inmate Rogers was at plaintiff's deposition. (Pl.'s Dep. at 61). Plaintiff stated that Inmate Rogers worked in the grievance office and knew who was filing grievances against officers, so Inmate Rogers told defendant Kupiec about the decision on plaintiff's grievance against Ready "because [plaintiff] was already putting in paperwork on why my legal mail was being messed with." (Pl.'s Dep. at 62). This statement by plaintiff is not even plausible. See *Jeffreys v. City of New York*, 426 F.3d 549, 555 (2d Cir.2005) (no genuine issue of material fact when plaintiff's explanation is not even plausible); *Haust v. United States*, 953 F.Supp.2d 353, 361 (N.D.N.Y.2013) (court may discredit plaintiff's self-serving testimony when it is so replete with inconsistencies and improbabilities that no reasonable fact-finder would undertake the suspension of disbelief necessary to credit the allegations made in his complaint) (quoting *Jeffreys*, *supra*).

***18** Defendant Kupiec states that she does not know defendant Ready, and that plaintiff's allegation that an inmate named "Rogers" informed Kupiec of the grievance against Ready is untrue. (Kupiec Decl. ¶ 13). Although defendant Kupiec is aware that Inmate Rogers works in the grievance office, she could not identify Rogers, nor has she ever had any contact with him. (*Id.*) The grievance against defendant Ready had to do with religion, not mail. The fact that plaintiff may have begun "putting paperwork together" regarding a grievance about his legal mail against defendant Kupiec, which plaintiff did not file until March or April of 2011, would not support Inmate Rogers deciding to tell defendant Kupiec about a grievance filed against a different defendant, coincidentally on the same day that plaintiff claims a package was delivered for him.²⁸ As stated above, defendant Kupiec does not work in the package room and would not have been

responsible for the alleged loss of any package delivered to the facility for plaintiff in January of 2011 or any other time.

In addition, it is difficult to establish one defendant's retaliation for complaints against another defendant. *See, e.g., Hare v. Hayden*, 09 Civ. 3135, 2011 WL 1453789, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 14, 2011) ("As a general matter, it is difficult to establish one defendant's retaliation for complaints against another defendant.") (citing *Wright v. Goord*, 554 F.3d 255, 274 (2d Cir.2009) (dismissing retaliation claim against a corrections officer when only alleged basis for retaliation was complaint about a prior incident by another corrections officer); *Roseboro v. Gillespie*, 791 F.Supp.2d 353, 369 (S.D.N.Y.2011) (plaintiff failed to provide any basis to believe that a corrections counselor would retaliate for a grievance that she was not personally named in) (collecting cases); *Ciaprazi v. Goord*, No. 9:02-CV-915 (GLS/DEP), 2005 WL 3531464, at *8-9 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 22, 2005) (granting summary judgment and dismissing retaliation claim based only on plaintiff's conclusory allegations that the manifest falsity of the misbehavior report and testimony during the disciplinary hearing indicated the disciplinary matters were motivated by retaliatory animus due to grievances plaintiff filed against individuals other than the defendants involved in the disciplinary action). *See also Faulk v. Fisher*, 545 F. App'x 56, 58-59 (2d Cir.2013) (temporal proximity to the protected action and excellent disciplinary history prior to the allegedly retaliatory misbehavior reports were insufficient to avoid summary judgment when there was no additional evidence, and neither of the officers were involved in the successful grievance); *Bennett v. Goord*, No. 06-3818-pr, 2008 WL 5083122, at *2 (2d Cir. Dec. 2, 2008) (citing *inter alia* *McPherson v. N.Y. City Dep't of Educ.*, 457 F.3d 211, 215 (2d Cir.2006) (speculation alone is insufficient to defeat a motion for summary judgment)).

***19** Plaintiff also may be claiming that defendant Kupiec's subsequent actions were in retaliation for the grievance that plaintiff ultimately filed against defendant Kupiec in March or April of 2011. In her declaration, defendant Kupiec denies ever opening plaintiff's legal mail in retaliation for a grievance filed against *her*.²⁹ (Kupiec Decl. ¶ 18). In any event, plaintiff suffered no adverse action, as defined by the case law,³⁰ as the result of defendant Kupiec inadvertently opening plaintiff's legal mail that was sent to her from the package room.³¹ This action would not deter a similarly situated inmate from exercising his constitutional rights. This action

also would not deter a similarly situated inmate from asserting his rights.³² It does not show malice or retaliation by defendant Kupiec. Plaintiff's mail interference and retaliation claims may be dismissed.

b. Access to Courts

Plaintiff claims that defendant Kupiec's failure to send his Notice by certified mail denied plaintiff access to courts because he was forced to withdraw his action.³³ Plaintiff's allegation has no basis whatsoever. Plaintiff concedes that he withdrew his New York Court of Claims action of his own accord. At his deposition, plaintiff stated "I had to dismiss [the Court of Claims action] because after I found out about these reckless lies, I had to dismiss it." (Pl.'s Dep. at 79). At plaintiff's deposition, the Assistant Attorney General asked why plaintiff did not just send a new Notice if he really believed that his case would be dismissed without a notice sent by certified mail. It was clear that plaintiff would have had time to send a new one, and plaintiff had been reimbursed for the mail that was improperly sent. (*Id.* at 80–82). Plaintiff then stated that the notice covered earlier incidents, and would have been untimely for the "earlier" incidents. (*Id.* at 82).


At the same time, plaintiff stated that he withdrew the action because he "wanted to change his theory" and go to federal court, because plaintiff stated that the "Court of Claims is only [for] negligence and property damage." (*Id.* at 83). Plaintiff then reasserted that the "Court" *would have* stricken his "motion"³⁴ because he did not serve the Attorney General with his Notice by certified mail. Plaintiff cannot "create" an access to courts claim by voluntarily withdrawing his action and then speculating what the court would have done if he had not withdrawn the action.

According to plaintiff, the Notice was required to be served on the Attorney General, not the Court. (T. 81). The court would have no way of knowing that the Notice was not served by certified mail, unless the Attorney General made a motion to dismiss on that basis. Even if the Attorney General made such a motion, plaintiff could have opposed the motion by stating that a mistake was made in mailing the item. There is no way to know that plaintiff's case would have been dismissed. In any event, it is clear from plaintiff's deposition that he would not have stayed in the Court of Claims. At his deposition, he clearly stated that he "wanted to change his theory" and go to Federal Court. (DT at 83). That is not a denial of access to courts "caused" by defendant Kupiec's conduct. Thus, plaintiff's access to courts claim may be dismissed.

2. Defendants Ready and Ellis

*20 Plaintiff alleges that the actions taken by defendants Ready and Ellis were taken in retaliation for a grievance that plaintiff filed on September 20, 2010 against defendant Ellis and CO Johnston.³⁵ Defendant Ready states that he did not know about the September 20, 2010 grievance on December 7, 2010, because he was transferred to Mid-State in September of 2010. (Ready Decl. ¶ 13). In his response, plaintiff argues that defendant Ready must have known about the September grievance because "it was not until November 24, 2010 that the Grievance Supervisor disciplined the officers including Ready regarding allowing inmates ... to adhere to Jewish memos and callouts." (Pl.'s Mem. at ¶ 24) (Dkt. No. 205–1 at 18).

First, the court notes that there is no indication the Ready, or any other officer was "disciplined." The Superintendent's response states that the facility policies were reviewed and "corrective action taken."³⁶ This does not mean "discipline." The Superintendent's response also states that the "referenced employees were advised and clarification given with regards to this matter." (Pl.'s Ex. N(1) (Dkt. No. 205–1 at 93). Defendant Ready was not one of the employees referenced in the grievance and was not involved in the September incident.³⁷ Thus, he would not have been disciplined or even "advised" of the incident. The memorandum cited by plaintiff, dated November 24, 2010 was between C. Tapia, the IGP Supervisor and DSP Phillips.




The fact that the defendants work in the same facility, or even on the same unit, is not sufficient to show that defendant Ready was aware of plaintiff's grievance against two other officers or that he would have retaliated against plaintiff for a grievance in which she was not involved. As stated above, generally, it is difficult to show retaliation for actions taken against another officer. *Hare v. Hayden, supra*, 09 Civ. 3135,  2011 WL 1453789, at *4.





Further, the court finds that neither the action allegedly taken by defendant Ready, nor the action allegedly taken by defendant Ellis rises to the level of an "adverse action" under the case law. Keeping plaintiff out of one service because defendant Ready did not have the correct call-out list, is not an action that would deter a "similarly situated" individual from exercising his rights. With respect to defendant Ellis, even assuming that he had anything to do with shortening the



Purim service (which this court has found that he did not), this action would certainly not deter someone similarly situated to plaintiff from asserting his rights.³⁸ Additionally, plaintiff claims that defendant Ellis was responsible for sending *all* the inmates back to their housing unit to wait for the Rabbis. Clearly, even if that were true, plaintiff concedes that he did not return to his housing unit, and defendant Ellis could not have been retaliating against plaintiff by taking action against other inmates.³⁹ Therefore, any retaliation claims against defendants Ellis and Ready may be dismissed.

VII. Personal Involvement



A. Legal Standards

*21 Personal involvement is a prerequisite to the assessment of damages in a  section 1983 case, and respondeat superior is an inappropriate theory of liability.  *Wright v. Smith*, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir.1994) (citation omitted); *Richardson v. Goord*, 347 F.3d 431, 435 (2d Cir.2003). In  *Williams v. Smith*, 781 F.2d 319, 323–24 (2d Cir.1986), the Second Circuit detailed the various ways in which a defendant can be personally involved in a constitutional deprivation, and thus be subject to individual liability.

A supervisory official is personally involved if that official directly participated in the infraction. *Id.* The defendant may have been personally involved if, after learning of a violation through a report or appeal, he or she failed to remedy the wrong. *Id.* Personal involvement may also exist if the official created a policy or custom under which unconstitutional practices occurred or allowed such a policy or custom to continue. *Id.* Finally, a supervisory official may be personally involved if he or she were grossly negligent in managing subordinates who caused the unlawful condition or event. *Id.* See also   *Iqbal v. Hasty*, 490 F.3d 143, 152–53 (2d Cir.2007) (citing  *Colon v. Coughlin*, 58 F.3d 865, 873) (2d Cir.1995)), *rev'd on other grounds*,  *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).

The mere receipt of a letter or similar complaint is insufficient to constitute personal involvement; otherwise, a plaintiff could create personal involvement by any supervisor simply by writing a letter. (*Id.*) (citing   *Johnson v. Wright*, 234 F.Supp.2d 352, 363 (S.D.N.Y.2002)). In order for a letter to suffice to establish personal involvement, plaintiff

would have to show that the supervisor conducted a personal investigation or personally took action on the letter or grievance. *Rivera v. Fischer*, 655 F.Supp.2d 235, 238 (W.D.N.Y.2009); *Bodie v. Morgenthau*, 342 F.Supp.2d 193, 203 (S.D.N.Y.2004). However, personal action does *not* include referring the letter to a subordinate for investigation.

Id. (citing  *Sealy v. Giltner*, 116 F.3d 47, 51 (2d Cir.1997));  *Hartnett v. Barr*, 538 F.Supp.2d 511, 524 (N.D.N.Y.2008).

B. Application

In my April 3, 2013 recommendation, I noted that in Judge D'Agostino's initial order, the allegations of personal involvement against defendants Fischer and Boll were “rather sparse.” (Dkt. No. 148 at 24). Notwithstanding these “sparse” allegations, Judge D'Agostino allowed the case to continue as against these supervisory defendants. (*Id.*) In a conclusory fashion, plaintiff claimed that he had so many documents from these two defendants, he could “flood the docket.” (*Id.*) (citing Dkt. No. 129 at 22). Plaintiff's response to the defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings implied that he could make the appropriate showing, perhaps by amending his complaint. Because at that time, I was recommending that this action proceed at least to a properly supported motion for summary judgment, I did not recommend dismissing the action as against defendants Fischer and Boll based on lack of personal involvement. (*Id.*)

*22 Plaintiff did not amend his complaint, and he later stipulated to dismissing the action as against Fischer. However, in his response to the motion for summary judgment, he maintains that defendant Boll was personally involved in the alleged constitutional violations because she stated in her response to interrogatories that her “office” became aware of plaintiff's September 9, 2010 grievance when a copy of plaintiff's correspondence to a Deputy Commissioner of Program Services was “forwarded to my office.” (Dkt. No. 205–3 at 355). Defendant Boll states that she had no personal knowledge or recollection of the grievance itself because the Office of Counsel is not the appropriate department to file a grievance. (*Id.* at 355–56). Defendant Boll also states that “upon receipt of your letter, the matter was investigated by the Office of Counsel, and I responded to you on December 2, 2010. (Exhibit B attached hereto).” (*Id.* at 356). Plaintiff seizes upon this statement, and accuses defendant Boll of lying to the court because she “admits” that she responded to plaintiff.

First, it is unclear whether plaintiff's September 9, 2011 grievance against defendant Ellis has anything to do with the facts of this case.⁴⁰ Plaintiff has seen fit not to include the letter that defendant Boll said that she wrote to him in response.⁴¹ However, defendant Boll has included the letter as an attachment to her declaration in support of the summary judgment motion. (Boll Decl. Ex. A) (Dkt. No. 202–6). In her declaration, defendant Boll states that as Deputy Commissioner and Counsel for DOCCS, she serves as legal counsel for the Commissioner of DOCCS and oversees DOCCS Office of Legal Counsel which is responsible for all of the legal services necessary for the day-to-day operation of the DOCCS Central Office and the correctional institutions that make up the department. (Boll Decl. ¶ 5).

Defendant Boll states that her office routinely received hundreds of letters per year from inmates or on behalf of inmates. (*Id.* ¶ 6). When the Office receives one of these letters, one of the defendant's support staff reads it and determines which of the attorneys on her staff or other staff person should address the issues in the letter. The letter is then forwarded to the attorney or other staff person to investigate and prepare a response, if warranted. The response may be prepared for the attorney's signature, a Deputy Counsel's signature, or defendant Boll's signature “depending on the circumstances.” (*Id.*)

Contrary to plaintiff's accusations that defendant Boll is somehow trying to hide her involvement, defendant Boll admits responding to three letters received from the plaintiff. (*Id.* ¶ 7). The letter that plaintiff apparently believes is the “smoking gun” which shows that defendant Boll was personally involved in whatever constitutional violation the plaintiff alleged, is actually a letter reminding plaintiff that he had filed a grievance, and that his grievance had been appealed to the Central Office Review Committee (“CORC”), and a decision was pending. (*Id.* ¶ 8). In the letter, plaintiff was advised that the CORC would conduct a thorough investigation, and that plaintiff would be notified of its decision. (*Id.* & Ex. A). Defendant Boll states that she did not take any action to “investigate the claims contained in plaintiff's Inmate Grievance Complaint that [she] referenced in [her] December 2, 2010 letter to plaintiff.”⁴² (*Id.* ¶ 9).

*23 A reading of defendant Boll's letter supports her declaration. Her office's “investigation” was not an investigation of the “merits” of the grievance, it was merely an “investigation” of the status of plaintiff's grievance and a reminder that the “Inmate Grievance Program was instituted

to handle issues such as yours.” (*Id.* Ex. A). Defendant Boll was reporting to plaintiff that an investigation had been conducted by other officials of DOCCS. Defendant Boll then stated:

The CORC will conduct a thorough investigation to assure that your rights are observed and your issues are addressed. If any corrective action is needed, you will be notified. As your appeal to the CORC is still pending, it is recommended that you await the decision.

(*Id.*) If an individual were able to create “personal involvement” by simply writing a letter to a superior, who was good enough to answer with an explanation such as this, it would eviscerate the well-settled principle that respondeat superior does not apply in civil rights cases. Clearly, defendant Boll did not conduct a “personal investigation” of the religious issue outlined in plaintiff's grievance.

Defendant Boll wrote another letter, dated January 28, 2011, in response to a new letter from plaintiff, dated December 20, 2011. (Boll Decl. ¶ 10 & Ex. B). Defendant Boll's letter merely stated that she had already written to plaintiff on December 2, 2010, and noted that the CORC had completed its review by correspondence dated December 8, 2010, accepting plaintiff's grievance in part. (Boll Decl. Ex. B). Defendant Boll further stated that plaintiff had been told “to bring further concerns to the attention of area supervisory staff, at [his] facility, at the time of the incident, for any remedial action deemed necessary.” (*Id.*)

By the time of plaintiff's second letter to defendant Boll, the December 7th incident had occurred, and defendant Boll noted the “reoccurrence,” stating that Superintendent William Hulihan had investigated the incident, “and advised you of his findings and actions on January 14, 2011.” (*Id.*) Defendant Boll's explanatory letter does not create personal involvement as it is clear from the letter that she did not have anything to do with investigating the incident. She just determined that an investigation had taken place and was advising the plaintiff that he “should continue to follow the Directive for any further incidences that [h]e may have.” (*Id.*)

Finally, plaintiff wrote to defendant Boll again, and she responded on March 3, 2011. (Boll Decl. ¶ 12 & Ex. C). Plaintiff claimed that no corrective action had been taken with regard to one of his grievances, and defendant Boll merely advised plaintiff that her office had contacted the staff at the correctional facility, who advised defendant Boll that plaintiff's claims had been properly investigated and corrective action had been taken. Defendant Boll took no further action. (Boll Decl. ¶¶ 12, 14). Defendant Boll states that she took no investigative action on any of plaintiff's letters. (Boll Decl. ¶ 15). She merely inquired into the status of plaintiff's grievances and reported her findings to plaintiff. Defendant Boll's letters support her assertions, and plaintiff's attempt to create personal involvement by citing portions of one of the defendant's letters, without the entire letter must fail.

*24 Plaintiff may not understand the above-cited law and may be under the misapprehension that the simple fact that defendant Boll responded to his letters made her personally involved in the subject matter of the letter. The cases cited above show that this is not the law. Plaintiff is confusing the difference between a letter, telling him that someone else did an investigation, with a personal investigation of the merits after receipt of the letter. The former is not personal involvement, while the latter is personal involvement. Thus,

the complaint may also be dismissed as against defendant Boll on this basis as well.

WHEREFORE, based on the findings above, it is

RECOMMENDED, that defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 202) be **GRANTED** and the complaint **DISMISSED IN ITS ENTIRETY**.

Pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#) and Local Rule 72.1(c), the parties have fourteen (14) days within which to file written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court. **FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW.** [Roldan v. Racette](#), 984 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir.1993) (citing [Small v. Secretary of Health and Human Services](#), 892 F.2d 15 (2d Cir.1989)); [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#); FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e), 72.

Dated: July 23, 2014.

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp.3d, 2014 WL 4365274

Footnotes

- 1 Plaintiff then attempted to appeal the Second Circuit decision to the United States Supreme Court. (Dkt. No. 130) (Notice of Appeal).
- 2 Plaintiff's response seems to take issue with the fact that defendants have now filed a motion for summary judgment because the case survived a prior motion for summary judgment, filed by plaintiff and a motion for judgment on the pleadings, filed by defendants. (Pl.'s Mem. at ¶¶ 1–7) (Dkt. No. 205–1). Plaintiff faults the court for allowing defendants to respond to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment with a letter. (*Id.* ¶ 5). The court would point out that the lack of a “formal” response from the defendants did not prejudice plaintiff. The defendants did not, as plaintiff put it, “[get] away” with anything. See Pl.'s Mem. at 5. I noted in the Report–Recommendation that defendants had not formally responded to the motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 54 at 8–9). The standard for summary judgment places the burden on the party moving for summary judgment to show that no question of material fact exists. [Celotex Corp. v. Catrett](#), 477 U.S. at 323; [Fed.R.Civ.P. 56\(a\)](#). Unless that initial burden is met, the non-moving party need not make any showing. See [Salahuddin v. Goord](#), 467 F.3d at 272–73. Only if the moving party satisfies its burden, is the non-moving party required to move forward with specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial. *Id.* The fact that the court found, based upon the documents submitted by plaintiff, that a genuine issue of fact existed does not preclude a subsequent motion for *summary judgment* by defendants. The

defendants' interim motion for judgment on the pleadings was denied because, based upon the facts stated in the complaint, plaintiff's claims had been stated. The summary judgment motion contains additional facts in the form of affidavits and deposition testimony. See *Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c)*. Even if the defendants had made a prior motion for summary judgment, the court has the discretion to consider multiple motions for summary judgment if the successive motion is supported by new material. *Robinson v. Henschel*, No. 10 Civ. 6212, 2014 WL 1257287, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. March 26, 2014) (citing inter alia *Wechsler v. Hunt Health Sys., Ltd.*, 198 F.Supp.2d 508, 514 (S.D.N.Y.2002)). See also *Rodriguez v. It's Just Lunch, Internat'l*, No. 07 Civ. 9227, 2013 WL 1749590, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. April 23, 2013) (considering cross-motions for summary judgment “[f]ollowing discovery proceedings and multiple motions to dismiss.”)

3 Father Weber is not a defendant in this action.






4 Unless otherwise specified, the pages associated with a docket number will be the pages assigned to the document by the court's electronic filing system. (CM/ECF).

5 Plaintiff was deposed on October 8, 2013, and a copy of his deposition transcript has been included in defendants' summary judgment motion. (Dkt. No. 202–2). During his deposition, plaintiff testified that defendant Ready “had the call-out on his desk.” (Dkt. No. 202–2 at 22). While defendant Ready may have had a call-out or call-outs on his desk, he did not have one with the plaintiff's name on it.

6 Plaintiff has also alleged a retaliation claim based on this incident, and the court will discuss that claim below. (Ready Decl. ¶¶ 5).

8 This court makes no such finding.

9 Plaintiff's own exhibits confirm this finding. (Pl.'s Ex. G) (Dkt. No. 205–3 at 26). In his grievance documents, plaintiff states that “I signed out of Mr. Gruen's class and informed him that I had a call-out per DSP Phillips to **report to Bldg # 101** to attend Jewish Services. I subsequently attempted to sign out @ the 7–2 security desk whereby Correctional Officer Ready ... asked me where I was going.” (*Id.*) Clearly, Building # 101 is not the same as Building # 7. Thus, whether an officer in Building # 101 has a document does not prove that someone in Building # 7 was given the same document.

10 To the extent that the failure to provide the appropriate call-out sheet was negligent or simply a mistake, defendant Ready was not responsible for that omission, and in any event, negligence is not actionable under  section 1983. *Riehl v. Martin*, No. 13–CV–439, 2014 WL 1289601 at *8 n. 14 (N.D.N.Y. March 31, 2014). In his response to the motion for summary judgment, plaintiff asks why, even if defendant Ready did not have the call-out, “did he fail to pick up the phone and just call the Chaplain's Office to verify that the [plaintiff] was on the call-out?” (Pl.'s Mem. at 15). The fact that defendant Ready may or may not have acted correctly or logically, at worst, could constitute negligent action, which is not actionable under  section 1983 or under RLUIPA. *Id.* See also *Booker v. Maly*, No. 9:12–CV–246, 2014 WL 1289579, at *25 (N.D.N.Y. March 31, 2014) (mistake not actionable under the U.S. Constitution) (citations omitted); *Scott v. Shansiddeen*, No.2013 WL 3187071, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. June 20, 2013) (negligent actions that ‘impinge to some degree on an inmate's religious practices’ are insufficient to support a claim under RLUIPA) (citing  42 U.S.C. § 2000cc, et seq.; *Carter v. Washington Dep't of Corr.*, No. C11–5626, 2013 WL 1090753, at *14 (W.D.Wash. Feb. 27, 2013);   *Lovelace v. Lee*, 472 F.3d 174, 194 (4th Cir.2006) (simple negligence does not suffice to meet the fault requirement under section 3 of RLUIPA)).

11 Although the complaint initially states that the Rabbis came to see “the plaintiff,” it is clear that there were other Jewish inmates who were scheduled to participate in the Purim Services.

12 The declaration says “March 20, 2011.” Although plaintiff refers to this as the March 30, 2011 incident, Purim was actually March 19–20, 2011. The discrepancy in the dates is not relevant to this court's decision because it is clear that all parties are referring to the same incident.



13 Rabbi Max is not a defendant in this action.

14 In his response to defendants' motion for summary judgment, plaintiff has submitted his grievance and the Superintendent's response to plaintiff's grievance regarding this incident. (Dkt. No. 205–3, Pl.'s Exs. R–Z). In this grievance, plaintiff alleged that defendant Ellis “felt the need to answer for the officers in the bubble by

stating ... 'The Rabbi is not here so go back to the law library.' " (Pl.'s Ex. R at 2; CM/ECF p. 123). Plaintiff claimed that he complied, after the other officer repeated that plaintiff should go back to the law library. (*Id.*) Plaintiff asked to use the bathroom, and while using the bathroom, "he overheard the the 'voice over the mic [sic]' direct the other Jewish inmates back to their housing units because the Rabbis had not arrived." (*Id.* & Ex. Z). The issue in the grievance appeared to be that the inmates were not allowed to enter the chapel and wait for the Rabbis. Plaintiff complained that "the Rabbis arrived at approximately 2:43 p.m., and by the time the inmates who were sent back to their units arrived for the second time; the services did not start until 3:15 p.m. **As a result, the Jewish Services were shortened** and they were dismissed at 3:45 p.m." (Pl.'s Ex. Z) (emphasis added). The fact that the inmates were not allowed to enter the chapel prior to the Rabbi's arrival, has nothing do with shortening the service (which would have been cut short anyway, because it is clear that the Rabbis were late in arriving). Plaintiff seems to speculate that Ellis was responsible for the other officer ordering the inmates back to their units. (Pl.'s Ex. R, Dkt. No. 205–3 at 123). In his declaration, defendant Ellis states that he disagreed that plaintiff should have been allowed to return to the library to wait for the Rabbis, but this did not affect plaintiff's attendance at the Purim celebration.

- 15 Plaintiff originally named Sheila Marlenga, the "Facility Steward," as a defendant in connection with plaintiff's mail claims. The complaint was dismissed with prejudice as against Ms. Marlenga by stipulation, dated January 8, 2014. (Dkt. No. 197). Thus, the complaint has proceeded only as against defendant Kupiec with regard to the remaining issues.
- 16 The court notes that the allegations in plaintiff's complaint relate more to retaliation than simply interference with his mail. However, in his memorandum of law in opposition to defendants' summary judgment motion he has one paragraph in which he discusses both interference and retaliation separately. (Dkt. No. 205–1 at ¶ 34). Because interference with mail may be a separate and independent claim from retaliation, the court will discuss all possible claims that plaintiff may have regarding the alleged interference with his mail.
- 17 The allegations in the complaint are a little unclear. In his deposition, plaintiff states that he ultimately received the package. (DT at 107). A reading of plaintiff's grievance documents indicates that he may have received a replacement package after plaintiff's father contacted the school to explain that plaintiff did not receive the January 2011 package. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(12), Dkt. No. 205–3 at 223). The court also notes that materials relating to a paralegal "course" do not constitute "legal mail." Legal mail is included in the definition of "Privileged Correspondence" and is defined, in relevant part, as correspondence with attorneys, legal representatives, and legal services organizations. See DOCCS Directive 4421(II)(A)(2) (citing 7 NYCRR § 721.2).
- 18 The court notes that plaintiff's statement about "planting weapons" is irrelevant because there is no such claim in this case.
- 19 A plaintiff may not amend his complaint in a memorandum of law or other filing. *Bryant v. Greater New Haven Transit Dist.*, No. 3:12–CV–71, 2014 WL 2993754, at *7 (D.Conn. July 2, 2014) (citation omitted). The court notes that this final incident could not have been included in the complaint because it occurred after plaintiff filed this action, and plaintiff was still exhausting administrative remedies regarding this allegation, long after this complaint was filed. (See Pl.'s Ex. Z(16), Dkt. No. 205–3 at 250) (IGRC's September 22, 2011 response to plaintiff's grievance—this action was filed on May 31, 2011). Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by this court's failure to consider this allegation against defendant Kupiec because he has raised the same claim in a subsequent action that has been assigned to Senior Judge Lawrence E. Kahn and Magistrate Judge Treece. *Guillory v. Fischer*, No. 9:12–CV–280. Magistrate Judge Treece declined to recommend dismissal of this allegation in a Report–Recommendation, noting that notwithstanding my consideration of the issue in recommending denial of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, the claim was more properly before him. See *id.* at 13–16 (Dkt. No. 46 in 12–CV–280). It is more appropriate for Judge Treece to consider the allegations regarding plaintiff's test scores along with another factual allegation against defendant Kupiec that has not been mentioned in any part of this action and that occurred after the filing of this case.
- 20 A review of plaintiff's exhibits shows that, at the time plaintiff filed this action in May of 2011, he had not completed the exhaustion of administrative remedies as to his certified mail claim. He did not receive the CORC denial of his grievance until July 27, 2011. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(24), Dkt. No. 205–3 at 275). Although defendants

raised failure to exhaust as a defense in their answer (Dkt. No. 46, ¶ 12), they have not argued failure to exhaust in their motion for summary judgment. While defendants would not have had the opportunity to argue non-exhaustion for claims that had not been raised prior to the motion for summary judgment (the test score claim discussed above), they would have had the opportunity to argue non-exhaustion as to claims that were in the complaint. Technically defendants have not waived the exhaustion requirement by raising it in their answer. *Castillo v. Rodas*, No. 09 Civ. 9919, 2014 WL 1257274, at *15 (S.D.N.Y. March 25, 2014). This court finds that it may recommend dismissal on the merits and will do so, rather than finding only that administrative remedies were not exhausted because defendants did not argue this in their motion.

- 21 A review of plaintiff's exhibits also shows that when he filed this action, he had not exhausted his administrative remedies regarding the allegation that defendant Kupiec "destroyed" his legal mail. The document, purporting to be a "grievance," in addition to various other things, was dated May 23, 2011. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(32), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 291-302, 293). It was addressed not only to the "Complaint Department" at Mid-State, but also to District Court Judge Mordue, Ruth Goldway from the Postal Regulatory Commission, and Anne Gallaudet from the U.S. Postal Service. (*Id.* at 291). The Superintendent's decision was dated June 16, 2011, after plaintiff filed this action. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(33), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 304). However, defendants have not argued non-exhaustion in their motion, and as stated in footnote 20 above, the court will consider the merits of the claim.
- 22 The memorandum explains that the envelope must have been delivered inadvertently to the package room. (Kupiec Decl. Ex. B). An individual working in the package room (defendant Kupiec speculated that it might have been a "fill in"), opened the envelope, realized it was legal mail, put it in a plain manilla envelope with plaintiff's name and number on it, and then sent it "over to the Mailroom for processing." (*Id.*) She noted that this was the "normal procedure for mail received in packages." (*Id.*) The court also notes that this memorandum is further support for defendant Kupiec's statement that the mail room and the package room are in two different locations.
- 23 Personal involvement is a prerequisite to the assessment of damages in a  section 1983 case. *Richardson v. Goord*, 347 F.3d 431, 435 (2d Cir.2003).
- 24 Contrary to plaintiff's implication, there is no indication that defendant Kupiec would have been aware of the effect of her action. Defendant Kupiec is the senior mail room clerk. There is no indication that defendant Kupiec has any legal training or would have known the possible effect of sending plaintiff's Notice by regular mail.
- 25 To the extent that defendant Kupiec's actions could be considered negligent, as stated above, negligence is not actionable under  section 1983. See n. 10, *supra*.
- 26 Plaintiff's response makes much of the fact that the "package" went to defendant Kupiec's office when she stated that she had nothing to do with packages. Plaintiff believes that this "admission" proves that defendant Kupiec was also tampering with his packages. Clearly, the item was not a "package," and that is why the package office sent it to defendant Kupiec. Unfortunately someone in the package office had already made a mistake in opening the envelope, placing the documents in another envelope with plaintiff's name and prison number on it. The only contact that defendant Kupiec states that she had with this mail was to place the name of the court on the envelope and have it delivered to plaintiff through the proper channels. This statement is not, as plaintiff claims, inconsistent with defendant Kupiec's statement that she does not work in the package room and has nothing to do with the packages that are delivered for inmates.
- 27 (Dkt. No. 1 at 50) (Superintendent's Decision dated 1/14/11). The September 2010 grievance is mentioned in this decision, but that grievance was against defendant Ellis. (*Id.*)
- 28 It is also unclear how inmate Rogers would know that plaintiff was contemplating a grievance against Kupiec because plaintiff only stated that he was "putting paperwork together" for a grievance about his mail, not that such a grievance had been filed. The connection between defendant Kupiec and defendant Ready is non-existent.
- 29 Plaintiff filed a grievance against defendant Kupiec on April 22, 2011. (Compl.Ex. Z(23)). The only actions that could have conceivably been in retaliation for grievances against defendant Kupiec herself would have been

the May 17, 2011 incident involving the manilla envelope with court documents inside and the inadvertent tearing of plaintiff's test scores (which is not part of this action and apparently occurred in August of 2011, based on the August 22, 2011 memorandum of apology from defendant Kupiec). None of defendant Kupiec's other actions took place subsequent to the March or April grievance against her. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(19), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 256). Plaintiff filed a grievance about his test scores on September 1, 2011. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(18), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 254) (CORC decision dated January 18, 2012). At his deposition, plaintiff testified that he did not think he had filed any prior grievances against defendant Kupiec, and there are no documents in the record reflecting grievances prior to April 22, 2011. (DT at 111).

30 *Gill, supra.*

31 Contrary to plaintiff's assertion, this action by an employee in the package room does not prove that all packages go through defendant Kupiec. The legal mail was delivered to the package room in error, someone opened it, determined that it was *not* a "package," placed the documents in a plain manilla envelope with plaintiff's name and DIN number on it, and sent it to the mail room where defendant Kupiec works. She determined that the documents were from a court, placed them back in the manilla envelope, together with writing the name of the court from which they came, and sent them through the proper channels for legal mail. (Pl.'s Exs. Z(36); Z(35), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 316, 318) (CORC Determination dated 10/15/11; Memorandum from defendant Kupiec to DSP Phillips). Although plaintiff claimed that his legal mail was "destroyed," that is clearly not true, only the envelope was missing, and defendant Kupiec had nothing to do with that. See Pl.'s Ex. Z(32), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 293).

32 Even if the court were considering the test score incident, the court would find no adverse action because in a letter, dated November 14, 2011, Acting Commissioner for Program Services Catherine M. Jacobsen wrote to plaintiff, explaining the facility's response to the test tearing incident. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(31)) (Dkt. No. 205-3 at 289). The facility informed Acting Commissioner Jacobsen that "the mail was taped and placed into an envelope with a note of apology explaining the error." (*Id.*)

33 Plaintiff claims that the withdrawal of his action constitutes the "actual injury" he needs to establish an access to courts claim.

34 It is not clear what "motion" would have been stricken.

35 CO Johnston is a former defendant who was dismissed from this action pursuant to Judge D'Agostino's September 27, 2011 Order. (Dkt. No. 19).

36 The September incident was only tangentially related to the exercise of plaintiff's religious rights. Plaintiff had attended a religious service in the morning of September 9, 2010, and because of the religious holiday, he was excused from all programming on that day. Plaintiff chose to attend the law library in the afternoon because he had been excused from his other program, based upon a memorandum written by DSP Phillips. Plaintiff was prevented from doing so, but the grievance was resolved in his favor. However, plaintiff did not miss a religious service, he was only prevented from spending his free afternoon, pursuing non-religious activities the way he wished.

37 In fact, plaintiff was convinced that no "corrective action" was taken. However, he has included a memorandum from Christopher Tapia (IGP Supervisor) to Julie Dennis, dated December 7, 2010, stating that, after receiving a telephone call from DSP Phillips, Director Tapia spoke with CO Johnson the day that Director Tapia received the plaintiff's complaint. (Pl.'s Ex. Z(42), Dkt. No. 205-3 at 341). Director Tapia explained the proper procedure and "clarified" the memo. "The corrective action was that the memo was clarified. All referenced staff are now aware and no other complaints received." (*Id.*) No "discipline" was involved, and there is no reference to defendant Ready in this memorandum and no reason that he would have been advised of the issue because he was not involved in the incident.

38 In fact, the only adverse action alleged in plaintiff's grievance (aside from the shorter service) was that the inmates were not allowed to wait in the chapel for the rabbi or rabbis to arrive. Clearly, this is not "adverse" within the meaning of a retaliation claim.

39 During his deposition, plaintiff testified that Ellis was "taking it out" on all the other Jewish inmates because of a grievance written by plaintiff against him. (Pl.'s Dep. at 54). Plaintiff's complaint was that "Ellis won't even

open the door until the last minute, so we all just hanging out outside the chapel because Ellis won't open the door." (*Id.* at 55). Failure to open a door before services are about to start can hardly be categorized as "adverse action." Once again, the court does not make any findings against defendant Ellis. The court is assuming the facts, hypothetically, for purposes of this particular discussion.

40 Plaintiff's interrogatory asks when defendant Boll became "aware" of plaintiff's September 9, 2010 grievance against defendant Ellis. (Dkt. No. 205-3 ¶ 7). However, none of the claims in this law suit relating to defendant Ellis occurred in September of 2010. Thus, any information in the September 9, 2010 grievance would not have even made defendant Boll aware of the claims in this action.

41 Clearly plaintiff received a copy of the letter as indicated in the response to the interrogatory. The letter is not supportive of plaintiff's claim, and it is disingenuous of plaintiff to omit the letter and cite only parts of defendant Boll's response to the interrogatories. Plaintiff's accusations that defendant is "lying" to the court are completely unfounded, and apparently plaintiff did not read the defendant's affidavit or see the letter that was attached. Plaintiff is constantly accusing others of nefarious conduct, while omitting important facts himself.

42 The court must point out that the incident with defendant Ready did not occur until December 7, 2010, and the incident with defendant Ellis did not occur until March of 2011, so the plaintiff's first letter and defendant Boll's December 2nd response could not have been related to an incident that had not yet occurred and could not have "created" any personal involvement in any event.

End of Document

© 2021 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.