# Letter Of Retification

To those with authority, obligation, alliance and/or the will invested in them by either the media, the Governor of Missouri, the Director of Adult Institutions and any other officials that hold office of any significance not mentioned herein. . .

"We, the prisoner's of the State of Missouri, who resides at the address of the South Central Correctional Center, voice our concerns to those with the authority to rectify problems and/or laws that are being consistently and persistently broken, rights that are being unjustly violated and treatment that is tediously unbearable and inhumane that is being inflicted upon us seriatim through the misconduct, ignorance and unprofessionalism of the employees and officials of this institution".

As prisoner's in the State of Missouri and of the United States of America, we are still protected by and through the liberty and justice of the United States Constitution. Therefore, certain rights shall be granted and guaranteed to us under such doctrine and law. Heretofore, the following will provide explanation in reason for the birth of this letter and blatant cry for assistance.

To limit the space; This letter will deal solely with the totality of conditions of our confinement.

1). The First Amendment to the United States Constitution states; "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;

abridging the Sreedom os speech, or os the press os the people
reaceably to assemble, and to petition the government Sor a
dress os grievance." The right to contract our Samily is
otected under this clause and Amendment. The right to
intimate association involves an indivisuals right to enter
nto and saintain intimate or private relationships Sree os
rbitr intrusions.
Roi Lamanda (Roi Strat v. University os Pittsburgh, 229, F, 3d 435,
441 (3rd Sir. 2000)
The Sourt has ruled that certain restrictions sray be placed
n the access to telephones and telephone useage i.e., amount
; calls, time limits, etc., but "sust" be applied in a reasonable
sanner. Being housed in Housing Units # 1 and # 2 the
Administrative Segregation units, although we are allowed
xse limited accessible restrictions to the telephones (use)
or prisoners here Seel that the criteria to utilize this access
is partial and unSair, considering the guidelines in which they
erate us under.
Sor example: inorder to utilize our phone privileges, one
has to be Sree os conduct violations Sor the duration
s 90 days and not a dayless to be eligible to use the phone
nd then sray use the telephone every 30 days thereaster,
s he is violation Sree.
This rule constitutes as partial, bias and unSair due to
e Sact that every offender that's assigned to the Ad-Seg
nits sray not be assigned Sor the duration os 90 days or longer.
A sreo sajority os the offenders that visits this unit
ay only be assigned Sor 30 or 60 (violation Sree), therefore

making them ineligible to utilize the phone privileges.
Furthermore, if an offenders was to be brought to H.U.#2 say; ( under investigation or protective custody needs, they would become priority over the offender(s) that has been 30 or 60 days violation free and become eligible to utilize their phone privileges.

Housing Unit #1 is "supposedly" designed to be more of a restrictive Unit in comparison to H.U.#2 for "out of control" offenders (assault assaults, rapes etc.,) thus, if H.U.#1 is based to be more restrictive toward offenders based on the criteria of certain types of adv's and behavorial modifications then why are offenders in H.U.#2 with less severe conduct violations are subjected under the same telephone restrictions?

This restriction is inflicted upon us without any penological legitimacy and constitutes as unreasonable. A more reasonable solution to this problem would be to give offenders who have been conduct violation free for the duration of 30 days or more should receive for a phone call for that month and every month thereafter.

2). Violation of Due Process:

a) The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution states; "No state shall make or enforce any laws which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws".

III.

Our protection under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Due Process Clause is being excessively violated by the way that we are being sanctioned on the infractions of the institutional rules in Administrative Segregation.

For example; We are being given sanctions before we are termed, heared and a findings is deemed on our alleged infractions. e.g. limited property (property impoundment), alternative meal (meal loaf) etc, which results in violation of our "procedural due process". Now, the classification and custody staff will argue that these sanctions are not sanctions at all nor are the disciplinary imposed but yet, the Offenders Rulebook section D.6 defines "property impoundment" as; "the loss & use of unauthorized property for a period of time", hereof classifying this action as an disciplinary sanction that can be carried outs by the classification staff.

In addition to these facts, Chapter 217.040 N.R.S. early states; "All offenders confined in Correctional Centers shall be supplied with a sufficient quantity of wholesome food. Deprivation of food shall not be used as a disciplinary action". The fact that classification (the Disciplinary Hearing Officer) not imposing these sanctions upon us themselves does not satisfy it as not being a sanction, it furthermore sustain the fact that our procedural due process is being violated. The purpose of the Due Process Clause is to protect the individual from arbitrary and erroneous state action by requiring some kind of hearing prior to the deprivation of "life, liberty or property". When state law mandated that no prisoner "may be punished except after a finding

of guilt by the Disciplinary Hearing Officer." Yet, Offenders are being placed on Removal of Property status, Alternate meal status, before a hearing is held.

See Gibbs v. King, 779 F.2d 1040, 1044 (5th Cir. 1985) and Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545, 550 (1965). Whereas, our right to procedural due process means that the prison must provide us with some category of protection (like a hearing) before the prison does something that harms our life, liberty or interest. Hence, receiving an sanction before we can properly or adequately prepare a defense, are heard, tested and deemed a findings on the pending infraction deprives us of such rights.

According to IS19-1.1, Informal Sanctions are sanctions which are Verbal or written that may be used as outlined for informal resolutions of a minor rule violations.

Informal Sanctions are as follows:

a) Warning / reprimand
b) activity restrictions
c) living area restriction
d) extra duty, and
e)* property impoundment*

So, if such are considered as informal "resolutions" of a minor rule violations, Why are we being subjected to these sanctions before guilty findings of our violations are deemed? Moreover, our due process is being infringed upon by prisoners being found guilty solely upon an Reporting Officer's statement and conduct violation report, where

nduct violations are concerned.

b) IS19-13 supports this theory by stating; "When
numenting the evidence used to support the decisions, specific
idence is to be indicated.

a) Making the statement "based on conduct violation report"
s not sufficient."

But trick/catch 22 language within this policy gives the
rrectional staff a scapegoat to manipulate policy in section (b)
f this same policy by stating:

(b) "Specific statements of evidence, which may be obtained
rom the body of the conduct violation report must be made",
Hereby, D.H.O's are basing their guilty findings solely by reciting
e specifics of the allegations in the pending cdv(s) against us.

"Several Courts have decided that inorder to satisfy this
nstitutional mandate, prison officials must do more than give
ilerplate statements that they accept the officer's misconduct
port. Rather they must engage in specific fact finding".

But this theory is heavily disregarded as non existent dealing
ith the disciplinary officials of this institution. We are
enied our due process and institutional policy procedural
ght to present "documentary evidence" in some cases
r use institutional camera footage as a witness in most
ases.

c) In addition to these issues; Officials at
is institution are combining administrative segregation
nd disciplinary segregation in their entirety instead of
reating them in their individual capacities as State
laws, Standard Operating Procedure and Institutional

policy requires. Chapter 217.370 V.A.C.S states; The director shall establish rules and regulations pertaining to offender disciplinary procedure. The Unies administrative officer of each Correctional Center shall observe these rules and procedures at all times" Obviously the C.O.O of this institution has either overlooked this statue deliberately or is blantantly sidestepping the issue(s) of this establishment.

Disciplinary segregation is used solely for punitive purpose and administrative segregation is not. Here at SCCC there isn't anything distinguishing the two entities from one another besides recreation privileges. Even still, there are offenders with so much dis-seg time stockpiled on top of one another that the mandatory 3 hours of outside recreation /exercise weekly, is practically non-existotent.

217.380 states; "An offender who has violated any published rule or regulation of the division or correctional facility relating to the conduct of offenders may, after proper hearing and upon order of the Unies administrative officer or his designee of the correctional facility, be confined thirty days. Disciplinary segregation of more than ten days may only be given for a serious conducts violation as defined by rule or regulation of the division. Violation of this statute is constant.

Every offender that is assigned to the segregation unit is automatically assigned to and referred to the Administrative Segregation committee, no matter is we are only serving dis-seg time. We are given 30 days administrative segregation time. Classification and the administration is using Ad-Seg as a form of punishments and disciplinary sanctions, which

olicy and law prohibits. For those offenders who are on administrative segregation status they are'nt awarded any ncentives, i.e., personal property, walkmans, canteen privileges eyond the norm, as one would think. Ad-seg status offenders eceives the same exact privileges as dis-seg status offenders oes. Nothing more or nothing less.

3) Cruel and Unusual Punishment.:

The Eighth Amendment to the United States onstitution states: "Excessive bail shall not be required, or excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punish- ent inflicted". The Eighth Amendment forbids "cruel nd unusual punishment" and is the most significant Amendment for us as prisoners, and that is outlined n this letter. It has been interpreted to prohibit excessive force and guard brutality, as well as unsanitary angerous, inhumane and overly restrictive conditions.

This Amendment is repetively being violated due to he wanton oppersitive oppresion that the Administrative egregation, Classification and Administrative staff are nflicting upon us as an body. We are being subjected to utrageously extensive administrative and disciplinary segreg- tion time for minor conduct violations. According to 17.370, 217.380 BSD and TS21-11; offenders are not to receive disciplinary segregation time exceeding 0 days" for minor violations, but yet, we are sentenced ontinuously to serve more than what is mandated. We are not being given projected time in/frames on

IX

When we can sensibly entertain the thought, or notion of being released from segregation. We are literally just sitting in segregation waiting on the whims and mercy of the Administrative Heads to let us go.

According to I.S.21-1.2, the Offender Rulebook and Authority 21A.378 B.S.R.: "Administrative segregation is imposed upon offender's for the safety, security and good order of the institution. When an offender is an immediate security risk, or an offender is violent, struggling and creating a sufficient disturbance to indicate he is not in control of himself, or an offender is physically violent, or an offender is in urgent need to be seperated from others."

So, the question is; seeing that our current / present behavior does not constitute / define nor meet such criterias why are we being held past our stipulated time of punishment?

Excessive Use of Force:

We are being subjected to excessive uses of force by prison guards repetively. We are mased, bombed with smoke generated grenades, electricuted with shock sheilds and physically restrained and subdued by the institutions assembled "E.R. Team", as well as placed on property impoundment status for the duration of seven (7) to nine (9) days, for a simple minor conduct violation as such as "creating a disturbance" or "disobeying a order". The tactics are'nt implemented to to restore order or discipline to obtain control of the offenders(s). The tactics are instead utilized to instill fear and to "maliciously and sadistically cause harm".

Guards such as; CO II Michael W. Wendt # E01245564, CO I Christopher Wesley # E01333298, CO III Bee, CO I Dustin Calhoun # E01388175, CO I John et cetera, are so vindictive with malice that abuse our right of protective custody against us, by utilizing the protective custody benches as a form of punishment. These officers violate policy DOP 21-1.2 and leave offenders on the bench for countless hours without feeding them or even issuing them a cell. Or they may offer us the same exact cell that one just pried from multiple times inorder to keep us on the bench for an additional 2-5 hours.

Furthermore, Administrative Heads are using the right to declare protective custody from our cellmates as a form of punishment by giving us additional days in confinement for doing so. Functioning Unit Manager; Troy Wade; CO III Patton; CDS Trista Kinder; Assistant Warden Michelle Buchanan; Major John Motel; Superintendent Terrina Ballinger; and Disciplinary Counsle Sudden are all in cahoots/agreement and are signing off on classification hearing forms approving offenders being sentenced to additional days for declaring our cellmates as enemies.

It is our right under F.S. 21-1.3 to call anyone we are in fear of being physically harmed by, fear of physically harming or simply someone we are not getting along with as an enemy. Staff does not have the authority to say whether or not an offender is or is not another offenders enemy or not. Nor do they have the authority to dictate or call judgement on the reason that an offender may or may not be having in the cell with his cellmate.

This tactic that the administrative heads are practicing is an unmandated rule and is being implemented inorder to deter prisoners from checking out of their cells.

This isnt implemented for the safety, security and good order of the institution. This is practice in an arbitrary and malice manner to make it hard on the prisoners since they (the administrative heads & custody staff) feel like we are making it hard on them by utilizing our right to p.c.

## Lack of Access to Proper Hygeine Products/Sanitation Issues:

Our right to decent and sanitary condition in prison also fall under the "Cruel and Unusual Punishment" clause of the Eighth Amendment. Prisoners are entitled to sanitary toilet facilities, Dispain v. Uphoff, 264, F.3d 965 (10th Cir 2001), proper trash procedures, no roach or rat infestations and basic supplies such as toothpaste, soap, cleaning products etc. Offenders at this institution are only allowed one (1) bar of SOAP soap every other week (as do all of the offenders in Ad-seg), but the distinguishing difference between segregated offenders and general population offenders (as to be expected) we are not allowed to purchase and utilize the variety of canteen options where hygeine (soap) products are concerned.

We are allowed to purchase one (1) 15oz bottle of Suave body wash but, the administrative segregation units are so filthy and unsanitary and infested with vermin and mice that we have to sacrifice the single bar of soap

nat we are issued bi-weekly and the bodywash that we order
onthly, inorder to sanitize and clean our cells. The housing
nits are so infested with mice and vermin, that we are forced
use our bedlinen and state issued clothing to block the bottom
f our cell doors to keep the pest from invading our living
uarters.

A weekly cell clean solution is offered, but the procedure
n which the cell clean routine is conducted and is so unsanitary,
t serves no resolution. We are issued a piece of a towel,
nd toilet brush soaked in disinfected diluted water that a
umerous amount of other offenders have used on their
ions, walls, floors and toilets, inwhich exposing us to
erms not protecting us from them. The SNU soap that
e are issued and the bodywash that we are allowed to order
r not anti-bacterial soap. The bodywash/shampoo
ombination soap that we order does not possess anti-bacteri
l agents in it. Whereas, given the unsanitary and
ndecent conditions and the time spent in between showers
e shall be given the privilege to purchase soap from
anteen, such as; Lever, Dial, Irish Spring, Dove,
tc. Other level 5 prisons or medium/maximum prisons
ave adopted this privilege, e.g., FCI Dublin, FCI Phx,
o there should be no reason we are not allowed to do
e same. We are all equally protected under the Fourteenth
Amendment "equal protection" clause and the "cruel
nd unusual punishment" clause of the Eighth Amendment.

XIII.

## Phase Program / Incentives:

As prisoner's in administrative segregation, we are often looked at / viewed, as worse than other offenders. As stated earlier in this letter, we are severely punished and sanctioned for our conduct violations and mistakes, but are never rewarded with incentives or even acknowledged for modifying our behavior for the good or and safety of the institution. The Administrative staff and personnel insist and/or encourage offenders in Housing Units #1 and #2 to participate and/or enroll in Administrative Segregation classes, such as "Anger Management", Eagle Program, etc. (although they are optional) but with no benefits and unfulfilled promises. We have gone months on end free of conduct violations without recognition, but, the moment we are infringed upon and a conduct is issued, we are set back an additional (30) thirty, sixty (60) or ninety (90) days in segregation. When disciplining offenders, there shall be no double standards. If we are severely, harshly or exceptionally sanctioned, punished or disciplined for violating institutional rules, we shall be graciously rewarded for doing good and modifying our behavior.

Here in H.U.'s #1 and #2, we have offenders that have been free of conduct violations for four (4), five (5) ten (10) and twelve (12) months, but yet, have failed to receive any relief, be released from Ad-Seg or transitions as simplistic as being transferred to H.U. #2.

At other level 5 Maximum / Medium security prisons such as F.C.I. and P.C.I offenders who are forced to endure

long term solitary confinement are given incentives and reasonable privileges for modifying their behavior and going a certain amount of time conduct violation free. For example; at the Jefferson Tu Correctional Center, their institution have a program by the name of "The Step Up Program". Where every month or two, one goes without a conduct violation incentives and privileges are gradually given back to them. Walkmans/C.D players, T.V's and appliances are issued; $10, $15 even $87.50 the maximum spend allowance is allowed for purchase every week or bi-weekly etc.

These methods are issued in order to give offenders something to look forward to. Now, this idea was adopted by the Administrative Heads of this institution (DCDC), however, their ideology of the "Step Up Program" falls flat and bears no penological substance of why or even how it is run. DCDC has implemented two (2) Administrative Segregation programs. One by the name of T.I.U (Transitional Integrational Group and the other, I.P.H (Intermediate Population Housing). The T.I.U program is: "An intermediate transitional unit designed to optimize an offender's transition from administrative segregation to general population, by providing a less restrictive and more beneficially structured environment. This program is considered an administrative segregation assignment, with modified privileges", according to Standard Operating Procedure 21-1.2.

The T.I.U program, which is located in H.U#1 (the administrative segregation unit) is only available for those offenders with major conduct violation and long term A-Seg assignment. The modified privileges that

this SOP speaks of is, one (1) $ in canteen spend on perishable food items every week and one (1) weekly phone call for the duration of the offenders participation in the program.

This SOP further states; "An offender who is released from administrative segregation by the administrative segregation committee will be released to a Intermediate Population Housing (IPH) on the following day of his hearing. If there are no available beds, the offenders name will be placed on the waiting list for release. This list is maintained on the Daily Administrative Segregation Status Report. Offender's will be released from administrative segregation to "general population" alphabetically by date and by ATBN score after all disciplinary segregation releases from the same date. Those offenders who are released from segregation for investigation who did not receive a conduct violation while assigned will go to the top of the waiting list by the date after their hearing."

Now, I first want to focus on the fact that nowhere in this SOP does it clarify, defines nor constitutes IPH as an Administrative segregation program or a program ingeneral, as it does the TIG. But yet, the administrative heads has every offender at this institution under the impression that it is.

Not only are the administrative heads posing this Intermediate Population Housing units as a program that one musts go too, the Administration Segregation Committee are forcing us (offenders) to sign an illegetimate contracts through this "program" inorder to get out of

e segregation units. The Ad-Seg committee chairmembers
ill presents offenders with an classification hearing form that
ll state we are being released to IPH under a 90 day
d-seg review; Meaning that once we are release to IPH
e are assigned for thirty days. If, for some reason we
e to return back to the segregation unit pening any type
violation we are to do ninety (90) days in Ad-Seg. If
e were not to sign the Classification Hearing Form stating this,
e will not get out of the hole and will be returned to our assigned
ell in segregation. Not only does this "contract" prove to
e illegitimate because it's a deliberate implemented unwritten
le, it also constitute as double jeopardy and violates the
uel and Unusual Clause of the Eighth Amendment.

True enough Chapter 217.175 gives the division director
thority to make rules, regulations and orders governing the
nagement of the correctional centers and programs under
eir control. However, this "contract that we are being
ced to sign, is not a rule implemented by the division
irector. It is an "blanket rule" being enforced by the
dministrative heads of this institution. Not anywhere is
is rule written in black and white. It is not documented
the Offender Rulebook, Standard Operating Procedure nor
y Institutional policy. Thus given this source of truth,
If IPH is dostrinated under the Administrative Segregation
mmittees, how is it that this is not stated in the Admi-
strative Segration Standard Operating Procedure 21-1.2 that
as just quoted above?" Furthermore, if this was to
e true, why is that every offender who is locked up from

the IPH unit is placed on TASC (temporary administrative segregation) assignment and not immediately assigned back to Ad:Seg?

The Ad:seg committee chair members has even taken the double double jeopardy infringement a step further. Within the last 5ews weeks, and todays date is 3-19-18, if any offender has a rule # 15 (# 15.1; engaging in sexual acts with another; # 15.2; openly masturbating or touching ones sexual parts; # 15.3; exposing ones sex to staff) within the last 12 months and comes to the segration unit for any other type or rule infraction, we have to be sent back to the IPH unit.

For example; lets say I come to the hole in August of 2017 for a rule # 15.2 and returned to the hole in April of 2018, I am forced to go back to the IPH unit although I did not come back to the hole for a Rule # 15.

In addition to such, they are also victimizing us through the double jeopardy violation by resanctioning us on conduct violations that we have already executed our sanction on. Offenders are assigned to the IPH unit if we have seven (7) or more violations in a year, no matter how long in between we have been violation free. But yet, Offenders with six (6) or less violation in a year doesnt have to endure this treatment and gets released directly to general population. No IPH assignment. This violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. For the administration to punish us after we have served our disciplinary segregation time, completed our ad:seg assignment on violations that we have already executed days, weeks or months prior to our current assignment to administration segregation constitutes as unjust double jeopardy and cruel and unusual

unishment. What differentiates offenders with seven (7) or more violations than offenders with six (6) or less. We are mainly situated and both have caught violation in our past. So, for the administration to give Sonia in either side bears no criminological significance.

## I.P.H v.s. T.I.S.

As stated earlier on, offenders assigned to the T.I.S program gaines the privilege(s) of being able to purchase perishable and items weekly as well as use the phone and receive outdoor recreation. Whereas, offenders assigned to IPH are only allowed some of these privileges after a stipulated frame of time being assigned to the IPH units.

For example; Offenders in IPH are only allowed to utilized telephone privileges when we are two (2) weeks violations free in the program, and can only purchase $10 worth of perishable food items after our thirty (30) days are complete and we are pending bed-space (waiting to be released); and bedspace can take anywhere from an additional ten (10), to twenty (20) to thirty (30) days.

Therefore I ask; how are the offenders assigned to wiseg status that's participating in the T.I.S program allowed more access to incentives and privileges than offenders in (baseline general population) IPH status? The stipulations doesn't equate and I'm going to tell you why.

That's like T.I.U.; When offenders are assigned to IPH we are a certain amounts of time conducts violation free. Whether its is two or three weeks, one, two or three months everyone assigned to IPH is violation free upon their assignments or otherwise we would still be assigned to disciplinary segregation. So, if we have to be rule free to be assigned to either "program", then, why is its that we cannots utilize the phones weekly and purchase perishable canteen items in IPH like those offenders assign to T.I.U.? What differentiates us from them? . . .

Obviously, the administrative segregation committee feels that our behavior has been modified enough to justify our placement in IPH, so why not allow us the same incentives in the same mannerism as T.I.U.?

For example: T.I.U. allow purchase of cd player/walkmans. I.P.H doesn't. Although we can have all of our appliances in I.P.H is, you already own them, We cannot purchase them. We are allowed to purchase thermals but no other other clothing items i.e., sweats pants, pajamas, personal shirts etc.. We are allowed to buy razors, shaving cream but, no after shave. No variety of hygiene items but only certain types of shampoo and conditioner. We can purchase alarm clock radios but no other appliances like, beard trimmers which falls under a hygiene item.

The privileges that we are allowed and are'nt allowed doesn't even parallel to one another nor does its coincide with the good order and safety of the institution.

Offenders assigned to IPH have no access to the law library. We have no law library clerks that do daily rounds nor that possess enough obtainable knowledge about law, procedure and policy to adequately assist us during our time of dire need.

As stated earlier on, IPH is not an "at-risk program" or program in general. IPH is a "baseline general population" housing unit that is being utilized as a tool to control ore bedspace issues here at SCCC. IPH offenders are placed under so much scrutiny that the success rate of making it out of the 30 day housing assignment is maybe at a ten percents (10%) success rate.

I, DeAuntae' Poe Sr. #1176441, the author of this letter has been in and out of this program (IPH) since Nov. 24, 2015, with no relies to general population. Every violation rit one receives restarts your 30 day assignments. Three violations and you are sent back to the hole for another 90 ays. And we are being issued cars for being one or two mins ite getting out of the shower. (Which I received 2 of)

Literally, the same offenders are being victimized by ore implementation of IPH. The same offenders have been in IPH for 7, 8, 10 months to a year.

IS this is supposed to be a thirty day program and you ave multiple no, numerous people that has been in it over ix months, it's obvious that its not the offenders but the IPH unit itself.

A conclusion to these problems will be as simplistic as to give offenders assigned to IPH one weekly

phone call and perishable canteen item spend like T.I.S. Grants prisoners the option of utilizing law library time or recreation three times a week (Monday, Wednesday & Friday) on the days of our appointed gym recreation.

We should only be assigned to IPH as a means to complete our dis-seg or placed in it when it is the imposed sanction for our pending violation(s). If one receives a CDV while assigned to IPH then we shall have the option of getting our spend allowance suspended, restriction of phone calls, property impoundments, living area restriction, activity restriction, like offenders in general population as oppose to starting our entire 30 days over. And last but not least, the 90 day reviews contract must be abolish as it falls under the double jeopardy clause and violates our Eighth Amendment right.

As stated earlier on, the institutions IPH program bears no significance to the prisoners nor the safety and security of the institution when offenders are not allowed to attend schooling, Hi-Set education, anger management, IGVE, restorative justice, NA/AA, substance abuse and other rehabilitating courses for the betterment of offenders available to offenders in general population. SOP 21-1.2 states that "Offenders that has accumulated 6 or more violations are to be released to IPH under a "Program Plan". But yet, there is no programming under this program plan. All that we do is sits in a cell 24 hours a day with the exception of one hour gym recreation three times a week.

XXII.

In this "program" you have prisoners that are striving to obtain their GED, or that was in the Hi-Set program (education) but yet, are forced to be placed back on the waiting list for school or be placed on the back burner do the ~~the~~ hinderance and backwardness of any programming in IPH.

IS we assigned to IPH were allowed to actually attend the programs available to us then the redundance and recidivism of obtaining conduct violations will be greatly reduced because our 30 something odd days in IPH will be spent more productively rather destructively. No words offenders to do better but failing to provide the opportune resources for us to do better holds no legitimate logic.