

FILED
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DENVER, COLORADO

JAN 02 2018

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 Recent Continuing Unlawful Activity
by the Defendant and its Employees Germane
to the Eventual Resolution of this Case

Now comes Plaintiff, Reverend Matt
Hale, stating as follows:

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant
to 28 U.S.C. section 1746 that the following
is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

1. Contrary to representations which it has made
to this Court, the Defendant's employees are

continuing to reject correspondence that is sent to me even though it in no way mentions my title, church, or religion, the Defendant falsely claiming that the mail in question contains "gang related information." Thus, even though my correspondents are complying with the current, obviously unlawful ban upon all of my religious mail which the Defendant has admitted to have imposed, their correspondence is being rejected all the same. I believe that this conduct is part and parcel of the Defendant's desire to discriminate against ~~me~~^{me} and harass me on account of my religious beliefs as well as my prosecution of this lawsuit, conduct which the Court is of course well aware of at this juncture.

2. Indeed the Defendant's unlawful, indeed criminal activity in this case has reached such an extent that for several weeks — during the months of October and November — its employees actually returned the mail which was sent to me unopened, doing so clearly in violation of federal law and B.O.P. policy.

3. When supporters of mine, including my mother

Evelyn Hutcherson, complained to ADX Warden Fox about the return of their mail in such a fashion, Fox responded with the attached letter to my mother. It states that my address is P.O. Box 8000 and that's why the mail which had been sent to P.O. Box 8500 had been returned to sender - by the post office supposedly - unopened.

4. However, the simple fact of the matter is that my address here is P.O. Box 8500 and always has been. Furthermore, the prison information channel on my television set says that the address is 8500, my correctional counselor says that the address is 8500, and I have never been informed by any staff to the contrary, nor have any other prisoners to my knowledge. I have also been informed that the Defendant's website says that the address is 8500 and the post office, for its part, has denied returning to sender any of the mail which has been sent to my address at P.O. Box 8500. Finally, the envelopes which are given to us prisoners say 8500.

5. Thus either Fox lied to my mother or somebody lied to Fox or, to be (naively) charitable in the ~~best~~ spirit of the season, somebody in the Defendant's employ is simply grossly incompetent in the assertion that my address here is (now) P.O. Box 8000 and not the P.O. Box 8500 it has always been.

In any case, the Defendant's records are plainly untrustworthy as I argued in my response to its pending motion for summary judgment (Doc. 193 at 86-89 and Doc. 193-1 at 42-44): how can the Court trust that what the Defendant's "records" have to say about my religion, my church, and those who adhere to same is true when the Defendant doesn't even know its own address (!) or would lie to cover up the fact that it, and not the post office, returned to sender my incoming mail for weeks?

6. Based upon my own positive personal experience as well as the fact that an older brother of mine actually works for the post office in the state of Illinois, I do not believe for one minute that the employees

of the post office in Florence, Colorado would go out of their way to illegally tamper with my mail in such a fashion; indeed, the post office is the best run part of the federal government as far as I'm concerned. I am though willing to believe that the Defendant was willing to make my mail return to sender for weeks and then lie about it, due to the animus it harbors towards me for being a creator who is unpaid to assert his legal rights.

7. An addition to the problems discussed above, books and magazines ordered for me by family and friends have been confirmed to have arrived at the prison but have not been given to me by staff. Furthermore, the final Creativity book which I am currently lacking — The Racial Loyalty [Newspaper] Portfolio Vol. One — has arrived here at the prison three times now but was returned to sender unopened once and opened and rejected twice by staff because it supposedly was not sent by an "approved" bookstore, a requirement which the Defendant has apparently simply made up at this juncture

in order to deny me the book. (It is within this book that the article "Nature is our God" appears, which I naturally would like to retrieve for purposes of this lawsuit. See Doc. 193 at 25.) Bookstores don't have to be "approved"; rather, if the book is sent by a bookstore, I'm supposed to be allowed to have it, plain and simple, unless it is rejected for some other reason. Thus what the Defendant says in its motion for summary judgment about my (now) being allowed to receive and possess the books of Creativity is not quite true since I am in fact being denied this kind book.

8. I felt obliged to inform the Court about these matters. My mail situation actually appears to be better at the time of this writing but I do not know what tomorrow may bring; I am now receiving some of the mail sent to both P.O. Box 8000 and P.O. Box 8500, remarkably enough, while letters continue to be rejected for non-existent "gang activity" and known fellow adherents of Creativity have trouble reaching me at all despite their numerous attempts. A single

out R. Marques, "SIS Technician" especially,
for the blatant misconduct which has occurred
here and have sought his arrest by the
local sheriff for his criminal actions. I
have also filed a complaint against him for
mail theft and other misconduct here at the
prison.

Respectfully submitted,

Rev. Matt Hale

December 20, 2017

Rev. Matt Hale #15177-424
U.S.P. - Max.
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on December 21, 2017,
I served the foregoing document on the following
by U.S. mail: 54591 Prase, Atty. for Defendant,
Asst. U.S. Attorney, 1801 California Street, Suite 1600,
Denver, Colorado 80202.

Rev. Matt Hale



**U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons**

Federal Correctional Complex
 Administrative Maximum Security Institution
 High Security Institution
 Medium Security Institution
 Minimum Security Institution

Office of the Warden

**5880 State Highway 67 South
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226**

November 13, 2017

**Evelyn Hutcheson
200 Carlson Ave, 25 H
Washington, IL 61571**

**Re: Hale, Matthew
Register Number 15177-424**

Dear Ms. Hutcheson:

This is in response to your faxed correspondence dated November 10, 2017, and received in this office November 13, 2017. You state your letters to your son are being returned as "return to sender, unable to forward."

A review of the issue raised in your letter was conducted. It was determined the U.S. Post Office is returning the letters to the sender, because P.O. Box 8500 is designated for staff mail. In order to avoid this from occurring in the future, please use the following address for inmate mail:

**Inmate Number & Register Number
U.S. Penitentiary, Administrative Maximum
P.O. Box 8000
Florence, CO 81226**

I trust this information is responsive to your concerns.

Sincerely,

**Jack Fox
Complex Warden**

Exhibit

Mailed
12-21

Special Mail

Name: KEVIN J. WRIGHT HQ1E
Reg No: 15177-424
U.S. Penitentiary MAX
P.O. Box 9500
Florence, CO. 81226-9500

Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
901-19th St., Room A105
Denver, CO 80294-3589



Administrative Maximum
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

The enclosed letter was processed through special mailing procedures for forwarding to you. The letter has been neither opened nor inspected. If the writer raises a question or problem over which this facility has jurisdiction, you may wish to return the material for further information or clarification. If the writer encloses correct address for forwarding to another address, you should forward to that address.

DEC 21 2017