

Level 2 - Reviewing Authority Response

Date Forwarded:	03/26/2020	Grievance Disposition:	DENIED
Date Due Back:	04/11/2020	Level 2 Responder:	HARTGROVE, GARY
Date Returned:	04/07/2020	Response sent to offender:	04/07/2020

Your grievance has been reviewed and I find:

Inmate Irving 82431 your grievance IM 200000170 is denied.

I have previously granted your grievance IM 200000050 on your ability to order envelopes from Keefe, that response follows: Your request is not outside of policy. SOP 320, and does not restrict the number of envelopes you may order that are unstamped. Therefore, I have granted your grievance to the extent of my authority.

I do not have direction over Keefe as the supplier of commissary to the inmate population. Further I have no knowledge of the company's inventory nor how much of a product they are willing to supply to an individual. This type of issue would need to be answered by Keefe or the monitor of the Keefe contract.

I now see that you are attempting to assert that Keefe Commissary and staff are conspiring to restrict your access to court as retaliation. There is no evidence to support this accusation.

Offender Appeal

Offender Comments:

The materials and references provided did not received the adequate review: That other offenders matching orders for consecutive weeks were not restricted - where mine was - was not explained. Additional grievances illustrating obstruction were not referenced as requested. This isn't a mail grievance, yet it was treated as such. The responses don't address why Warden Yordy obstructed my ability to grieve staff retaliation on 2-25-20. Furthermore, while Juliet McKay states that I am not being restricted in her response on this grievance, she is either inferring otherwise in the attached communications I now provide, or demonstrating a refusal to provide adequate review of offender concerns altogether - it is now incredibly clear that policies need adjusted, staff need trained, and this grievance needs forwarded to SIU. Sidenote: It's highly unlikely to distribution specialist such as Keefe would not adjust its inventory of a nickel item after experiencing shortages every week for a year. Perhaps it's their ability to perform that needs reconsidered, also.

Level 3 - Appellate Authority Response

Date Appealed:	04/09/2020	Grievance Disposition:	DENIED
Date Forwarded:	04/09/2020	Level 3 Responder:	DAVIS, TYRELL
Date Due Back:	04/25/2020	Response sent to offender:	04/13/2020
Date Returned:	04/13/2020		

Your appeal has been reviewed and I find:

I have reviewed your grievance and find that the level one and level two responses have explained the ordering processes thoroughly. There is no evidence to suggest that this issue is staff retaliating against you.