

FILED
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DENVER, COLORADO

JUN 07 2017

JEFFREY P. COLWELL
CLERK

In the United States District Court
For the District of Colorado

Civil Action No. 14-cv-00245-MSK-MJW

Reverend Matt Hale,
Plaintiff,

v.

Federal Bureau of Prisons,
Defendant.

Notice of Open Letter to Susan Prose,
Attorney for Defendant

Plaintiff, Reverend Matt Hale, requests
that the Court (likewise) read and take note
of the following letter which he is mailing to
Susan Prose, counsel for the Defendant in this
case.

Respectfully submitted,

Rev. Matt Hale

June 4, 2017

Susan Prose
Asst. U.S. Attorney
1801 California St., Suite 1600
Denver, CO 80202

Re: Hale v. B.O.P., 14-cv-00245-MSK-MJW

Dear Ms. Prose,

Since your "client" is continuing to ban me unlawfully from corresponding with my family and friends and is even holding me in isolation likewise from my fellow prisoners at this time on the flagrant basis of my religious beliefs, I felt that I might as well write somebody whom I can get a letter to: you.

In light of yet another incident of mass murder being committed last night — this time in London, England — by

adherents of a religion which the B.O.P. not only "recognizes" but coddles within its walls - Islam - I felt compelled to write you and urge you to admit the wrongfulness of your client's actions in this case without any further ado, accept that it is liable for those actions, and end this pathetic but sick farce. The very idea that the B.O.P. refuses to "recognize" my Creativity religion as a religion is itself abhorrent and repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and frankly you should be ashamed of yourself for asserting that your "client" has the power to engage in such blatantly discriminatory practices. Please let me remind you that your "client" is none other than ^{an} agency of the federal government itself, and that it is the duty of "the law" to uphold the law more than anyone else, not less. Somehow or other your "client" has completely abdicated its understanding and adherence of that

basic fact. Never in my life have I seen the federal government so blatantly violate the religious liberties of one of its citizens as I have seen in the course of this case, and many times I have wanted to ask you — since you are an assistant U.S. attorney after all — to prosecute your client for its illegal acts, not defend its quasi-criminal conduct. After all, where does a citizen turn when the government itself violates the law? Is it not your duty to oppose such law violators, not support them?

You took an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States when you became a licensed attorney and yet your defense of your "client" in this case is nothing other than an attempt to destroy that very Constitution for those of us who happen to hold a different religion dear

to our hearts. I can only bring your attention to the wrong that you are doing in that regard in the hopes that you may cease it. I deny that you have any ethical duty, as an Assistant U.S. attorney, to assist the federal government in its violation, indeed destruction, of the Constitution, a Constitution which created that federal government in the first place. Further, your duty is to uphold that Constitution, the desires and whims of your "client" if necessary be damned. You know full well that Creativity is the religion that it has always claimed to be, and it is a blemish upon your honor as a person that you would lend your name to an effort designed to tear us believers in Creativity out of the very Constitution that was written by our forefathers. I mean no offense to you by saying that; indeed, I happen to believe that

you are a better human being than the task which has been assigned to you in this case. Please just ask yourself the following question: how is your defence of the B.O.P. in this case consistent with the oath that you took to become a licensed attorney?

Now I am well aware of the defence which your client is making to the allegations which I have made in my amended Complaint. After all I have heard and seen enough speculations, innuendoes, fantasies, and downright slanders of my person by the employees of your client during the course of discovery so as to make me physically ill. However, you surely must be aware of the fact that 90% of the garbage which your client has offered ~~thus~~ far in its defence is inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence and thus will never see the light of

day at the trial of this case. I can only say then that it is a sad day when people who are themselves moral pygmies feel themselves entitled to attack the character of a man whose shoes they do not deserve to shine.

Next, you have told me that you will be filing a motion for summary judgment on behalf of your "client" — regardless of the fact that such a motion would be frivolous, of course. Again though, such a course of conduct would be violative of your oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, not aid in its destruction. I therefore cannot help but urge you to refrain from such a course of conduct. We creators have as much right to exist as any other religion in this country and we have the right to show that we are indeed the religion that we are at the trial of this case; that is, if you

are not willing to admit the wrongdoings of your "client" in the meantime and end this side fence of willful religious discrimination on your "client's" part.

Lastly, your "client" has cited the supposed "documented history of violence" allegedly committed by creators during the history of our religion as justification for its actions in discriminating against us, and indeed persecuting us, within the walls of the B.O.P. Well, as I watch my television set and read about the mass murder presently being committed by adherents of the "B.O.P.-approved" religion of Islam on a daily basis, all around the world, I know that the sick and reprehensible actions of the B.O.P. in our regard will not stand. Are you really prepared to argue that the adherents of my religion are more violence-prone than the adherents of Islam, the rights of

whom are protected by the B.O.P.?
I am ready to counter such an idiotic
notion any day of the week but in
any case, the very idea that the
government of the United States is
allowed to treat the adherents of
particular religions worse than that of
others because some of their adherents
have committed crimes — in the past —
is repugnant to the Constitution in
itself. The federal courts have right
now blocked President Trump's
travel ban on residents from six
Muslim countries from entering the
U.S. under the notion that that would
violate their "rights," and yet you
want to tell me that I, as an
American citizen, don't even have the
right to practice my own religion,
without persecution, in my own country?
I therefore urge you and your "client"
— the very government which the
Constitution was meant to bind — to

reconsider its course of conduct in this case. It is tremendously offensive to know that the religion of Islam — with its unparalleled track record of violence all over the world — is favored by the federal government of the United States while my peaceful and legal religion of Creativity, and its adherents, are persecuted beyond belief.

Very Truly Yours,

Rev. Matt Hale

Rev. Matt Hale #15177-424
U.S. Penitentiary MAX
PO Box 8500
Florence, Colorado 81226

Certificate of Service

I, Reverend Matt Hale, hereby certify that on June 5, 2017 I duly mailed the foregoing to Susan Prose, attorney

for the Defendant as specified, at
1801 California Street, Suite 1600,
Denver, Colorado 80202, postage
fully prepaid.

Per. Matt Hale

PO Box 8500
Florence, Colorado 81226

mm

Special Mail

Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
901-19th St., Room 4105
Denver, CO 80294-3589



Mailed
6-5

Special
Mail

Administrative Mailroom
P.O. Box 51130
Florence, CO 81220-0130

The enclosed letter was processed through special mailing procedures for forwarding to you. The letter has been neither opened nor inspected. If the writer wishes a correction or explanation over which this facility has jurisdiction, you may wish to return the letter for further investigation or clarification. If the writer wishes to request assistance for forwarding to another address, please return the enclosure to the above address.

JUN 06 2017