

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:21 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: □

#1 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST OF CORIZON:

Dear Rudy & Erin,

This begins 11 emails of one MOTION TO COMPEL DEFENDANTS TO ANSWER PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY REQUESTS in my federal civil rights lawsuit against the BEAST of CORIZON HEALTH INC. The 60-pages of EXHIBITS are not included because the Motion is self-explanatory. There is a sequential number in the upper left corner of each email to eliminate confusion. The doctors made absolutely ridiculous responses that they did not understand phrases such as "do diagnostic testing" and "allergic reaction". The CORIZON doctors' answers are a small example of medical fraud they do in serving MAMMON. MATTHEW 6:24.

Regarding #9 of my prior email: The CORIZON NURSE PRACTITIONER just told me a biopsy of growths on my head was diagnosed as a precancerous growth called "acitinic keratoses". I had asked CORIZON since 2008 to biopsy it for which I got sent to the psychologist 4-times for making such request and repeatedly told, "Don't get sun on it". Your help finally got me some results. JAMES 2:18-19. PTL!!! Hopefully, CORIZON will authorize the medication the NP requested to get rid of the growths because they are a precursor to very dangerous squamous cell carcinoma.

Thanks for all the help and Godly Love from the Family of Christ.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff Pro Se, No. 2:16-cv-12931
vs Judge Paul D. Borman
ABDELLATIF, et al, Magistrate Mona K. Majzoub
Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S 2ND MOTION AND BRIEF TO COMPEL
DEFENDANTS
TO PROPERLY ANSWER DISCOVERY REQUESTS;
PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION TO ENJOIN DEFENDANTS;
AND MOTION TO EXTEND ALL CUTOFF DATES

EXHIBITS TO MOTION TO COMPEL

A1 RESPONSE TO FIRST REQUESTS TO ADMIT TO LISA M. ADRAY (19 SEP 2018)(NOT SIGNED BY ADRAY nor under required oath) (On JUN 2012 refusal to make medical record for heatstroke.)

A2 RESPONSE TO FIRST REQUESTS TO ADMIT TO RASHED BASHIR (06 SEP 2018) (Not answered under required oath/certification of 28 USC 1746; he said he "has NEVER HEARD OF a 'CORIZON (f.k.a. PHS) CONTRACTOR'S DISEASE MGMT MANUAL'", #1 & 2; "the PHRASE 'DO DIAGNOSTIC TESTING' IS VAGUE & AMBIGUOUS", #3, 4 & 5)

A3 RESPONSE TO SECOND REQUESTS TO ADMIT TO RASHED BASHIR (10 OCT 2018) (Not answered under required oath/certification of 28 USC 1746; DENIED SAYING, "YOU THINK TOO MUCH")

A4 RESPONSE TO THIRD REQUEST TO ADMIT TO BADAWI K. ABDELLATIF (29 OCT 2018)

A5 RESPONSE TO THIRD REQUEST TO ADMIT TO RASHED BASHIR (29 OCT 2018)

A6 PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUESTS TO ADMIT TO DEFENDANTS KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON (09 NOV 2018)

A7 PLAINTIFF'S SECOND REQUESTS TO ADMIT TO DEFENDANTS KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON (19 NOV 2018)

B 24 JANUARY 2016 MEDICAL RECORD MADE BY DEFENDANT ABDELLATIF WHILE INSIDE MRF HEALTH SERVICE

C REFERENCE TO PHS CONTRACTOR'S DISEASE MANAGEMENT MANUAL BY CHAPMAN ATTORNEY

D1 RESPONSE TO SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO BADAWI K. ABDELLATIF (01 OCT 2018) (Not answered under required oath/certification of 28 USC 1746; ADMITTED BY IMPLICATION TO HAVING CONTRACTOR'S DISEASE MGMT MANUAL that was denied existing by BASHIR, #1 & 2)

D2 FIRST DOCUMENT REQUESTS TO KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON (09 OCT 2018)(not answered by KIRSTEIN or WASHINGTON, only Atty.)

E AMA HOME MEDICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA, "IMMUNOASSAY"

F PAGE OF MDOC/CORIZON (f.k.a. PHS) CONTRACT INDICATING MDOC CCI UNDER CONTROL OF DEFENDANTS KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON HAS REPORTS REQUESTED IN EXHIBIT D2

G LINK TO UTILIZATION REPORT LIKE HELD BY DEFENDANTS KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON

H AFFIDAVIT ON COSTS OF FILING MOTIONS TO COMPEL

I1 RESPONSE TO SECOND INTERROGATORIES TO BADAWI K. ABDELLATIF (10 OCT 2018) (Not answered under required oath/certification of 28 USC 1746; "'DO DIAGNOSTIC TESTING' AND 'DETERMINE CAUSE OF THIS REACTION OR REACTIONS' ARE VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS", #1 & 2; "'REACTION' IS VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS", #3; "'TYPE OF ALLERGIC REACTION' IS VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS", #4)

I2 RESPONSE TO THIRD INTERROGATORIES TO BADAWI K. ABDELLATIF (10 OCT 2018) (ABDELLATIF FALSELY SAID, "DID NOT 'GO TO WORK' ON 24 JANUARY 2016" BUT MADE MEDICAL RECORD AT MRF WHILE AT WORK, #1; OBJECTED THAT "'PATCH TEST' IS VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS", #2 & 3)

I3 FIRST INTERROGATORIES TO KIRSTEIN (09 OCT 2018)(NOT ANSWERED) (

J DIAGNOSTIC TESTING RESULT NOTIFICATION (10 MAY 2018)

K ONGOING MALADIES (15 NOV 2018)

81 GRIEVANCE ON NOT BEING TREATED FOR HEATSTROKE BY ADRAY

133 STEP 1 GRIEVANCE RESPONSE SHOWING WHERE DEFENDANT ADRAY WAS PUT "ON REPORT" WITH RELATED LETTER.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. WHETHER DEFENDANTS ABUSIVELY AND EVASIVELY FAILED TO RESPOND TO DISCOVERY REQUESTS AND SHOULD BE ORDERED TO PROPERLY AND TRUTHFULLY ANSWER THE REQUESTS?

Plaintiff says, "Yes".
Defendants say, "No".

II. WHETHER DEFENDANTS DID NOT SIGN DISCOVERY RESPONSES WITH REQUIRED OATH/DECLARATION FOR WHICH THEY AND COUNSEL SHOULD BE ORDERED TO PROVIDE PROPERLY CERTIFIED DISCOVERY RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF?

Plaintiff says, "Yes".
Defendants say, "No".

III. WHETHER DEFENDANTS, THEIR SUBORDINATES AND ASSOCIATES SHOULD BE ENJOINED FROM COERCIVE ACTIONS AND OBSTRUCTIONS THAT HAVE DIMINISHED PLAINTIFF'S COURT ACCESS, REPRESENTATION AND STANDING IN THIS CASE?

Plaintiff says, "Yes".
Defendants say, "No".

IV. WHETHER EXTENSION OF TIME SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR ALL SCHEDULING ORDER CUTOFF DATES DUE TO OBSTRUCTIONS OF DEFENDANTS AND ASSOCIATES UNDULY DIMINISHING PLAINTIFF'S STANDING AND ABILITY TO REPRESENT THIS CASE?

Plaintiff says, "Yes".
Defendants say, "No".

V. WHETHER DEFENDANTS AND DEFENSE COUNSELS SHOULD BE SANCTIONED FOR THEIR ABUSIVE ACTIONS DONE TO PLAINTIFF?

Plaintiff says, "Yes".
Defendants say, "No".

From: GARY NORTINGTON
Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:23 PM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#2 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff Pro Se, No. 2:16-cv-12931
vs Judge Paul D. Borman
ABDELLATIF, et al, Magistrate Mona K. Majzoub
Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S 2ND MOTION AND BRIEF TO COMPEL
DEFENDANTS
TO PROPERLY ANSWER DISCOVERY REQUESTS;

PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION TO ENJOIN DEFENDANTS;
AND MOTION TO EXTEND ALL CUTOFF DATES

Plaintiff Gary M. Northington Pro Se moves this Honorable Court to ORDER all Defendants to properly answer his second set of accompanying discovery requests made to Defendants (FRCP 26 and 37); to enjoin all Defendants from committing abuses intended to abridge Plaintiff's court access and standing (FRCP 65); and to extend all cutoff dates for 60-days after decision on this motion (FRCP 6(b)(1)), as follows:

A. STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. Plaintiff requested concurrence in this matter but Defendants did not respond.
2. The COMPLAINT (ECF #13 & 100) holds issues of life-threatening : (1) chronic untreated severe digestive food and airborne respiratory allergies, intolerances and/or reactions causing severe dyspnea, edema, hypotension and syncope; (2) permanent Ischemic Heart Disease and other severe Heart and Lung Injury; (3) chronic severe and partial paralysis of left-side appendages caused by chronic untreated infection and stroke; (4) severe memory deficiency, pain and stroke caused by chronic untreated cardiovascular disease; (5) severe retinopathy caused thereby; (6) severe chronic mastoiditis; and (7) other serious injury, all caused by Defendants' long-term refusal to treat and falsification of his medical records (ECF #100, Exhibits A-N).
3. Defendants are so extremely evasive and patently fraudulent in answers to Plaintiff's discovery requests that it is clear they are using discovery to falsely manufacture a FALSE DEFENSE OF alleged INCOMPETENCE to corruptly evade the "deliberate indifference to serious medical need" standard of Sec. 1983 claims of the COMPLAINT. This is deliberate FRAUD ON THE COURT that Defense Counsel Chapman Law Group incited defendants to use in other cases.
4. For example, regarding paragraph 3 herein: In First Motion To Compel (ECF 130, PgID 1345, #23-#25), it is raised that Defendants claim to not understand meaning of the interrogatory asking why they did NOT "DO DIAGNOSTICS FOR CAUSE" of allergic reaction in issue.
5. Further, FRCP Rules 33 and 36 require the responses to interrogatories and requests to admit, and document request responses, to be made under notarized oath or certification of 28 USC, Section 1746 ("I certify under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true").
6. Defendants did NOT sign most discovery responses, addressed in EXHIBITS of ECF #130 or herein, under the certification or oath required by Law and the Rules.
7. Said refusal to answer any discovery request under proper oath or certification is probative that the Defendants have intent to NOT give proper and/or truthful RESPONSES to discovery requests.

8. Medical records altered by Defendants' associates prove medical fraud done on behalf of Defendants to affect this case. Compare the JUNE 2017 deleted "Chronic Problems" list (ECF #105, EXHIBIT P, p. 4) with the JULY 2017 restored "Chronic Problems" list (ECF #105, EXHIBIT Q, page 5); restored upon MDOC grievance response. This fraud was done after this case was filed with malicious intent to affect Plaintiff's standing.

9. The Court effectively and maybe unknowingly allows Defendants to make fraudulent responses when it ruled that, because law prohibits medical fraud, Defendants need not be enjoined from doing fraud within this case (ECF #128, PgID 1317, quoting R & R at 23-24, PgID 1198-1199). Defendants, et al, know the FBI and State Police never investigate fraud done by contractors and employees against prisoners (Plaintiff's personal experience). Reporting such crimes is blocked by dismissed DEFENDANT RICHARD D. RUSSELL of the Supplemental Complaint (ECF #100).

10. Said dismissal of RICHARD RUSSELL, from later actions exhausted after original COMPLAINT (ECF #128, PgID 1318), is because Plaintiff had difficulty presenting facts. Two days before writing original COMPLAINT, Plaintiff was released from hospitalization for the Multiple Heart Attacks and STROKES in issue. He had severely diminished memory and stamina, then Defendants' associates destroyed his typewriter (ECF #63) that held material changes to original COMPLAINT (ECF #1) and transferred him three (3) times during which his documents of this case were repeatedly scrambled and kept from him. Due to his disability, it takes 1 to 3 days for Plaintiff to handwrite a page. The dismissal of RUSSELL, who helps hide Defendant's fraud, is because of factors beyond Plaintiff's control.

11. Wrongful dismissal of MICHAEL A. TROUTEN as Defendant (ECF #128, PgID 1318) for acts occurring in late 2016 and 2017 is for Plaintiff's same disabilities stated in paragraph 10 herein. Plaintiff often cannot comprehend or retain what he attempts to read because of retinopathy (ECF #100, EXHIBIT I), aphasia and memory loss in issue here; symptoms of years of untreated Heart Attacks and Strokes (ECF #100, EXHIBIT F), ignored by Defendants, in issue in this case.

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:19 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments:

#3 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

12. Obstruction by Defendants and associates, affecting Plaintiff's standing, continues in JUNE to NOVEMBER of 2018 with: (1) further deleting of things from Plaintiff's medical records by NP TAMMY J. KELLEY; (2) MDOC Records Technician CONNIE D. LESTER refusing to

give requested and paid for copies of Plaintiff's MAY to NOVEMBER 2018 medical records; and (3) MDOC refusing to deposit funds sent to Plaintiff's account where the Money Order was cashed by MDOC/GTL in AUGUST 2018 according to the sender. The funds are needed for representation of this case. More than 50 cases of such MDOC tactics exist where Magistrate Majzoub dismissed them for failure to meet cutoff dates under similar circumstances (Plaintiff spoke to some such prisoners).

13. Aforesaid is probative Defendants are unduly evasive in answering all discovery requests as addressed herein, and that their only intent is to make discovery a meaningless ritual and deny court access in this case contrary to First and Fifth/Fourteenth Amendments, Federal Law and Court Rules.

14. For reasons stated herein: Defendants, et al, are capriciously making a mockery of this Honorable Court through fraud and other abusive acts contrary to Title 18 USC, Secs. 1001, 1505 and 1512. (This recycled paper is used for aforesaid reasons.)

15. This Court should ORDER: (1) Defendants to properly answer discovery; (2) enjoin Defendants from wrongful behavior such as described herein; (3) extension of all SCHEDULING ORDER (ECF #129) cutoff dates for an added 60-days for reasons stated herein; and (4) reinstate RUSSELL and TROUTEN as Defendants for conditions and false ruling of delay (ECF #128, PgID 1318) beyond Plaintiff's control (FRCP 60(b)).

B. FACTS ON DEFENDANT ABDELLATIF

16. In accompanying Exhibit I1, page 4, #1: Defendant Abdellatif evasively objected "the time period ('JANUARY 2016 to MARCH 2016') is vague" when asked why he did not test for the cause of "hives, urticaria and 'allergic reaction all over his (Plaintiff's) body' ". Defense Counsel and ABDELLATIF have the 18-pages of Plaintiff's JANUARY through MARCH of 2016 medical records, made by ABDELLATIF, that state these symptoms and would take about 5-minutes to study. It defies all logic for one with ABDELLATIF's alleged education to not understand time periods. The time period is clearly defined by date in EXHIBIT I1, p. 5, #3 and #4. There is no excuse for ABDELLATIF's evasiveness and refusal to answer based on time period. ABDELLATIF did not answer the question.

17. Again regarding aforesaid Exhibit I1, page 4, #1: Defendant Abdellatif evasively objected to the phrases "do diagnostic testing" to "determine cause of this [allergic] reaction or reactions" as "vague and ambiguous". "Hives", "urticaria" and "allergic reaction all over his (Plaintiff's) body", used to qualify the question, were ABDELLATIF's own terms spoken in JANUARY 2016 and entered into the medical record on 26 JANUARY 2016 (ECF #100, EXHIBIT H, p.11, PgID 1046?). "Do diagnostic testing" was ABDELLATIF'S phrase when asked about testing for allergen sensitivity.

18. ABDELLATIF also objected to Plaintiff's terms of "reaction" (EXHIBIT I1, p. 5, #3) and "type of allergic reaction" (EXHIBIT I1, p. 5, #4) as "vague and ambiguous" (Responses #3 and #4). Like #1, he also did not answer questions #2, #3 and #4 by said evasive objections.

19. However, said objections to #1, #2, #3 and #4 used similar terms that ABDELLATIF had alleged as "vague" of: (1) "diagnostic test" (Response #1); (2) a time period of "JANUARY 2016 to MARCH 2016" and "allergic reactions" (Responses #2); and "or other type of allergic reaction" (Response #4). ABDELLATIF used the same terms he called "vague and ambiguous" and, thereby, is admitting his responses are non-answers by being evasive (EXHIBIT I1).

20. In EXHIBIT I1, p. 4, Response #1: ABDELLATIF used deceptive language of "there is no specific diagnostic test to diagnose Urticaria" except "by history and physical examination". The interrogatory did not ask how to diagnose the symptom known as urticaria (hives that anyone can diagnosis) but, instead, asked about determination for "CAUSE" of the symptom. The specific test for CAUSE of this is a RAST Test (MERCK MANUAL, "ALLERGIC REACTIONS", "FOOD ALLERGY") but the general test for 30 to 50 different CAUSES in one test is a PATCH TEST (MERCK MANUAL, "DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF SKIN DISORDERS"). ABDELLATIF's said response was another evasive non-answer (see paragraph 21 herein).

21. ABDELLATIF objected to the phrase "patch test" as "vague and ambiguous" (EXHIBIT I2, p. 4, #2). A "patch test" is "a test for allergic sensitivity that is made by applying to the unbroken skin small pads soaked with the allergen to be tested" (MERRIAM-WEBSTER'S MEDICAL DICTIONARY, "Patch test", ISBN 978-0-87779-853-8 (MERRIAM-WEBSTER, Inc. 2006). ABDELLATIF's Response is another evasive non-answer.

22. Regarding EXHIBIT I2, p. 4, #1: Plaintiff asked the MRF Warden to allow Plaintiff to pay \$50 for a patch test. When Plaintiff asked ABDELLATIF to authorize a patch test for allergic sensitivity per the Warden's Response, then ABDELLATIF said, "We do not do diagnostic tests for that"; his words.

23. Defendant ABDELLATIF falsely responded that he "did not go to work on JANUARY 24, 2016" (EXHIBIT I2, p. 4, #2) to personally observe allergy, intolerance and/or reaction to something Plaintiff had eaten. Accompanying EXHIBIT B is the Medical Record (which Defense Counsel holds), made inside MRF Prison by ABDELLATIF on 24 JANUARY 2016, proving ABDELLATIF gave false testimony in this Response (I2, #1).

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:17 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#4 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

24. Other supporting evidence, probative of ABDELLATIF giving false testimony regarding paragraph 23 herein, is ECF #100, EXHIBIT H, pages 6 to 14, PgID 1041-1049, which document the Plaintiff's severe reactions to eating bologna, peanut butter and soy. Relevant

pages of EXHIBIT H to Plaintiff's chronic symptoms when Dr. ABDELLATIF went to work on 24 JANUARY 2016 are: (a) pages 6 and 10, PgID 1041 & 1045 (severe hypotension); (b) pages 7, 13 and 14, PgID 1042, 1048 & 1049 (Plaintiff's diary); (c) page 8, PgID 1043 (processed meat is cause); and (d) page 12, PgID 1047 ("he has allergic reaction all over body").

25. Further evidence proving ABDELLATIF gave false testimony regarding aforesaid paragraph 23 herein are Medical Records made by him and RN Rademaker at MRF Health Service on 24 JANUARY 2016. At about 1000 hours on 24 JANUARY 2016, RN Martha Rademaker told Plaintiff she telephoned Dr. ABDELLATIF and he told her to put Plaintiff on an intravenous saline drip (ECF #100, EXHIBIT H, p. 10, PgID 1045); (accompanying EXHIBIT B, p. 1, "History of Present Illness", "Called ..."). When Plaintiff observed ABDELLATIF arrive in ER #1 of MRF Health Service at 1420 hours on 24 JANUARY 2016, the conversation to which Plaintiff was privy in pertinent part was: (a) ABDELLATIF asked RN Rademaker how the rash compared to "before" (21 JAN 2016) and Rademaker answered, "It's worse"; (b) ABDELLATIF then asked what had happened to which Plaintiff answered, "I ate processed turkey on 19 JANUARY (2016) and today, then had problems like on 01 JUNE 2015 when I passed-out. I gained more than 10-pounds in two days on 21 JANUARY (2016) (EXHIBIT B herein, p. 1), my urine turned dark brown (EXHIBIT B herein, p. 2), and I urinated only one-ounce in 24-hours after drinking 20-glasses of water on 21 JANUARY (2016). When I took a shower today, my wrists swelled so much in 10-minutes that my watchband would not fit back on my wrist and I got out-of-breath. After leaving the shower, I broke out in profuse sweating, then Ms. Rademaker came to my room and measured my blood pressure at 50/20 (mmHg)" (EXHIBIT B herein, pages 1-3). Particularly telling of ABDELLATIF giving false evidence in his Response (EXHIBIT I2, #1) is where he entered medical diagnosis that only a doctor in person can do, and a nurse is prohibited from doing such as the touching of a "Physical Exam", "Neck/Thyroid", and "Abdominal" symptoms and "Assessment/Plan" (EXHIBIT B herein, p. 3).

26. Further proofs Defendant ABDELLATIF testified falsely that supports paragraphs 16 to 25 herein are: ABDELLATIF's Response of EXHIBIT I1, p. 5, #4, falsely says "no one knew at that time ('24 to 26 JANUARY 2016') if it was a chemical, food or other type of allergic reaction". Accompanying Medical Record clearly says Plaintiff and others knew it was a food reaction where ABDELLATIF recorded "about this patient with Low BP (blood pressure), nausea and Tachypnea (increased respiration rate), said all started about 5 days ago when he ate turkey in the chow, he started having a rash at lower legs..." (accompanying EXHIBIT B, p. 5, #4). Five days earlier, RN Draveling had recorded Plaintiff saying it was from "eating processed meats, turkey, bologna" (ECF 100, EXHIBIT H, p. 8, PgID 1043) which is what Plaintiff personally told ABDELLATIF on 24 JANUARY 2016. It was an ANAPHYLACTIC (allergy) reaction to a food or food additive, also with the swelled appendages and likelihood of Death in minutes, requiring immediate hospitalization (MERCK MANUAL, "Allergic Reactions", "Food Allergy"). ABDELLATIF gave said false testimony that he did "not go to work" to hide his "deliberate indifference to serious medical need, Imminent Danger of further severe physical injury and Premature Death" (ECF #13) when he observed Plaintiff on 24 JANUARY 2016.

27. Finally, a proof that ABDELLATIF and his COUNSEL never intended to give truthful

testimony is that in the EXHIBIT I2 INTERROGATORIES at page 5, ABDELLATIF did NOT sign with the certification required by Title 28 USC, Sec. 1746 and FRCP 33(b)(5).

28. ABDELLATIF should be ORDERED to truthfully answer all discovery requests under required oath or certification of 28 USC 1746.

D. FACTS ON DEFENDANT ADRAY

29. Regarding EXHIBIT A1, page 2, answers #1 and #2, of DEFENDANT ADRAY'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS TO ADMIT not answered by ADRAY but DENIED by Counsel: During a 21 OCTOBER 2011 Transfer Evaluation, Plaintiff walked into a room and sat down. DEFENDANT ADRAY immediately asked Plaintiff how much he coughed. Plaintiff calmly answered, "Often at night, for hours". Instantly, ADRAY's eyes got big as she jumped up from her desk and rushed out of the room without saying anything. Plaintiff left the room within 5-minutes of ADRAY not returning. His vital signs were NOT checked. Upon receiving copies of the record for that event, Plaintiff was surprised that vital signs had been entered into his 21 OCTOBER 2011 medical record.

#5 2ND MOTION 2 COMPEL

30. Regarding EXHIBIT A1, page 2, answer #2, not answered by ADRAY: Contrary to the denial of Counsel SIMMONS, "Appears delusional" is entered into the 21 OCTOBER 2011 Medical Record by Defendant ADRAY.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:23 PM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#5 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

31. Regarding EXHIBIT A1, page 2, answers #3 and #4, of DEFENDANT ADRAY'S RESPONSES not answered by ADRAY, contrary to Response of Counsel: In early morning of 30 JUNE 2012, Plaintiff had a heatstroke, was very weak, severely nauseated, vomited, profusely sweating and could barely stand. After sitting on the floor outside his room for an hour, Officer Chester escorted Plaintiff to Health Service. After sitting for one-half-hour in the Health Service hallway, a nurse who Plaintiff recognized as Defendant ADRAY asked, "What's wrong?" Plaintiff said, "I am overheated, weak, nauseated and vomiting", during which Plaintiff had dry heaves. The nurse then got a bedpan, said "Use this pan", then left. An hour later, the nurse returned and said, "There's nothing I can do for you, so go back to your cell. You can take the pan".

32. Regarding paragraph 31 herein: While returning to his Housing Unit, Plaintiff got a bag of ice from the chow hall. He returned to his bed and put the bag of ice on his abdomen, awaking

about 5-hours later. The ice was all that stood between Plaintiff and DEATH.

33. Regarding EXHIBIT A1, page 2, #3 and #4, of DEFENDANT ADRAY'S RESPONSES not answered by ADRAY and contrary to Response of Counsel: When Plaintiff requested to be seen by Health Service later that morning of 30 JUNE 2012, he was told RN ADRAY did not record Plaintiff being at Health Service earlier that morning. Grievances #80, #81 and #83 were on the nurse refusing to treat Plaintiff, and Health Service not giving Plaintiff copies of 30 JUNE 2012 records. RN ERIN PARR-MIRZA said the Housing Unit and Health Service logs made by guards said Plaintiff was at Health Service in morning of 30 JUNE 2012.

34. Regarding EXHIBIT A1, page 2, #5, of ADRAY'S RESPONSES not answered by ADRAY but by Counsel SIMMONS: Accompanying EXHIBIT 133, is STEP 1 Grievance Response wherein RN Erin Parr-Mirza wrote ADRAY was put "on report" and said to Plaintiff a "Quality Assurance Report" was written on ADRAY.

35. Regarding EXHIBIT A1, page 3, #6 and #7, of ADRAY'S RESPONSES not answered by ADRAY but DENIED by Counsel: ECF 100, EXHIBIT H, page12, PgID 1047, is a Medical Record near the 20 to 24 MARCH 2016 time in question where Defendant ADRAY entered ER#1 of MRF Health Service and chastised a nurse who examined Plaintiff and entered similar symptoms in Plaintiff's Record. Plaintiff recognized the voice as ADRAY telling the other nurse to NOT make a record of the rash.

36. ADRAY should be ORDERED to personally and truthfully answer all discovery requests under the required oath or a certification of 28 USC 1746.

E. FACTS ON DEFENDANT BASHIR

37. Regarding EXHIBIT A2, page 4, answers #1 and #2, of Defendant BASHIR'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUESTS TO ADMIT: Plaintiff believes the CORIZON Contract mentions a "Contractor's Disease Management Manual" for Medical Providers to use in deciding medical treatment of patients which was mentioned in the prior case and is relevant to claims here (accompanying EXHIBIT C). Defendant BASHIR is unduly evasive and falsely says he never heard of the manual.

38. Regarding EXHIBIT A2, page 4, answers #3 to #5, of Defendant BASHIR'S RESPONSES: BASHIR uses the same evasive method as ABDELLATIF of paragraphs 4 and 17 to 22 herein by falsely claiming to not know plain language of "do diagnostic testing". See EXHIBITS E, "Immunoassay" (book), and J (medical record) for common use.

39. Said common canned responses of BASHIR and ABDELLATIF, not based in reality or truth, are probative of subornation incited by the common between them, Defense Counsel McQuillan.

40. Regarding EXHIBIT A3, page 4, #1, of Defendant BASHIR'S RESPONSES TO SECOND REQUESTS TO ADMIT: BASHIR denied telling Plaintiff, "You think too much"; BASHIR'S exact words that began a 3-minute tirade of ridicule toward Plaintiff. The witness name is

requested in discovery (Plaintiff's 30 OCT 2018 WITNESS LIST, #19).

41. As of this Writing, Plaintiff has not received Responses to THIRD REQUESTS TO ADMIT to Defendants ABDELLATIF and BASHIR (accompanying EXHIBITS A4 and A5).

42. Again, as with ABDELLATIF and ADRAY, aforesaid Responses of Defendant BASHIR (pghs. 37-40 herein) were not supported by the oath or form of declaration/certification required by 28 USC, Sec. 1746.

43. BASHIR should be ORDERED to personally and truthfully answer all discovery requests under required oath or affirmation/declaration of 28 USC 1746 since, in the present manner, it appears Defense Counsel is coaching ABDELLATIF and BASHIR to evade relevant/material facts in issue to unduly affect Plaintiff's ability to represent the case.

F. FACTS ON DEFENDANTS KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON:

44. Regarding EXHIBIT D2, pages 2 and 3, #1 to #4, of Defendants KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST DOCUMENT REQUESTS: Defense Counsel SIMMONS falsely objected to Plaintiff's Requests for: (a) all monthly Encounter Reports on Defendant ABDELLATIF in 2011 to 2018; (b) Quality Assurance Reports on Defendants ABDELLATIF and ADRAY of 2011 to 2018; (c) MP Utilization Reports on Defendant ABDELLATIF of 2011 to 2018; and. (d) Peer Review Reports on Defendant ABDELLATIF of 2011 to 2018.

45. Defendants KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON'S Objections (pgh. 44 herein) evasively made only conclusory allegations with no supporting facts on how documents were held by a nonparty. The documents are held by the MDOC CCI under control of Chief Medical Officer KIRSTEIN and Director WASHINGTON (accompanying EXHIBIT F, circled).

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:16 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ▫

#6 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

46. Said Defendants' Objections (pgh. 44 herein) further evasively made only conclusory allegations without supporting facts that the documents were "not relevant" to the issues and "overly broad". The documents are relevant to prior consistent acts and character traits of denying treatment with deliberate indifference to serious medical need and Imminent Danger of further severe physical injury and Premature Death under FRE 401 to 404 and 608 to 610. For example, Plaintiff believes ABDELLATIF and ADRAY caused the MAY 2016 DEATHS of Elvis Williams by heart attack and Morris Lee Houston by untreated inguinal hernia causing

gangrene when sent back to their cells to die (Plaintiff attempted to help them get treatment).

47. Said Defendants' Objections (pgh. 44 herein) further evasively made only conclusory allegations without supporting facts that the document production would be "unduly burdensome" and "an infinite number of documents". The response is false. For example: The Utilization Reports on Plaintiff for this period are about 10-pages, from what he saw. Quality Assurance Reports are only 2 to 5 pages each and made quarterly (likely 100 pages at most). The Peer Review Reports are alleged to be a monthly 2-page report, based on information. The Response is clear proof Defendants value a dollar amount over human life and First Amendment Right. It only takes 10-seconds to select category and print icons.

48. Said Defense Objections (pgh. 44 herein) evasively made only conclusory allegations without facts that the MOSTLY STATISTICAL. requested documents "contain sensitive and protected information". Any such information may be redacted as done in statistical reports like PgID 1470 on ABDELLATIF, and done in FOIA responses under 5 USC, Sec. 552.

49. Further, regarding EXHIBIT D2, page 3, #5, of Defendants KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON'S RESPONSES TO FIRST DOCUMENT REQUESTS: Defense Objections evasively and falsely made only conclusory allegations without supporting facts that requested documents are "not relevant to Plaintiff's litigation". The documents, like PgID 1470 on ABDELLATIF, are relevant to prior consistent acts and character of ADRAY as said in paragraph 46 herein.

50. Finally, regarding EXHIBIT D2, page 3, #5, MDOC Defendants objected to production of disciplinary reports on Defendant ADRAY "as it contains protected and sensitive information". As said in paragraphs 48 and 49 herein, such information may be redacted and such reports are publicly available, like PgID 1470 (home address redacted). Reasons for ADRAY being "on report" for Quality Assurance violations, such as ADRAY did to Plaintiff in paragraph 34 herein, cannot be redacted.

51. At this Writing, Plaintiff has not received Responses to FIRST and SECOND REQUESTS TO ADMIT TO DEFENDANTS KIRSTEIN AND WASHINGTON (accompanying EXHIBITS A6 and A7), nor to FIRST INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT KIRSTEIN (accompanying EXHIBIT I3) which likely will not be answered absent a court order.

52. Defendants KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON under required oath or certification/declaration format of 28 USC, Sec. 1746, and Defense Counsel SIMMONS should be ORDERED to non-evasively and truthfully answer all discovery requests.

G. CONCLUSION TO DEFENSE DISCOVERY WRONGS:

53. Contrary to any assertion of Medical Providers not committing fraud because law prohibits such: MDOC and CORIZON DEFENDANTS and COUNSELS have committed fraud(s) on the Court and wrongs in aforesaid actions herein contrary to provisions of TITLE 18 U.S.CODE.

54. Defendants and Defense Counsels have abusively and unduly delayed and turned discovery

procedures of Plaintiff into a meaningless ritual contrary to intent of the First Amendment and discovery rules to narrow down and resolve at least some issues before trial.

55. FYI: Plaintiff is cognitively and physically disabled within scope of TITLE 42 USC, Secs. 12101 et seq. by Multiple HEART ATTACKS and STROKES (per Cardiologist) which began during and affected prior case noted on PgID 1337. He daily has substantial difficulty writing understandable sentences and keeping train of thought from one page or paragraph to the next so it often takes 3 or more attempts and 1 to 3 days to write one page, then more time to make needed copies (e.g. pages 11 and 12 each took 3-days to write a good draft, then more for needed copies). His poor stamina often requires many rest periods after which he must review prior writings to start over. All writing involves substantial pain. The way this is written is a result of his disabilities.

H. STATEMENT OF FACTS ON MOTION TO ENJOIN:

56. All prior paragraphs incorporated by reference herein and are probative of harassment, intimidation, punishment and OBSTRUCTION of court access by DEFENDANTS and COUNSEL done to Plaintiff for his First Amendment exercise in this case.

H(1). FACTS ON 2016 MDOC ABUSES AFFECTING STANDING:

57. In ECF #63, a MOTION TO ENJOIN, it describes retaliatory transfer(s), undue destruction, taking and diversion of about \$1,000 worth of Plaintiff's property (including typewriter) by Defendant WASHINGTON's STAFF to harass, intimidate and punish Plaintiff for exercise of First Amendment Right in filing this case. His typewriter memory held an amended version of the Complaint (ECF #13) with due process, equal protection and retaliation claims. WASHINGTON's subordinates unduly damaged and disposed of Plaintiff's typewriter.

58. In ECF #128, the Court ruled the Complaint (ECF #13) had no viable Equal Protection Claim (PgID 1334). Aforesaid disposition of Plaintiff's typewriter affected his standing where its memory held changes to prevent said dismissal of the claim. Later actions of Defendants' associates described hereafter were born of them being allowed to get away with said prior abuses.

From: GARY NORTINGTON
Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:22 PM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#7 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

H(2). FACTS ON CONTINUED RETALIATION IN 2018:

59. On and about 28 JUNE 2018: When Plaintiff was transferred from JCF to LCF, Defendant WASHINGTON and associates refused to transfer Plaintiff's property stored by MDOC from JCF to the LCF Property Room for storage.

60. This is contrary to MDOC Policy, which says: "When a prisoner transfers between institutions (sic), all of the prisoner's personal property must be packed [and] carried separately by transportation officers. (sic) Any property stored for the prisoner also shall transfer with the prisoner". PD 04.07.112, pgh. W (now pgh. X).

61. During discussion of aforesaid acts (pghs. 59-60): MDOC STAFF said Michigan Assistant Attorney General JAMES E. LONG and KRISTEN SIMMONS had told Defendant WASHINGTON'S subordinates to not forward Plaintiff's property; to deliberately violate Policy. JCF Property Officer JAMES E. SIMS wrote Plaintiff's property "will remain here (at JCF) until the outcome of the case. /s/ c/o James E. Sims 6/29/18", and "Your guitar is here (at JCF) and will remain here pending the outcome of your litigation. /s/ c/o James E. Sims 7/2/18".

62. All aforesaid abuses were and are done with sadistic and malicious intent to financially bankrupt Plaintiff so he cannot represent this case; to diminish his standing contrary to the U.S. Constitution.

H(3). FACTS ON MDOC BLOCKING FUNDS IN AUGUST:

63. Since Defendants and associates could not totally stop Plaintiff's representation of this case in aforesaid roundabout way, they directly blocked funds sent to his account from AUGUST 2018 to present as described hereinafter.

64. From around APRIL into JULY of 2018: Defendant WASHINGTON'S subordinates repeatedly returned Money Orders to the sender that were mailed via U.S.P.S. to GTL Financial Services (hereinafter GTL) (2603 NW 13th Street; P.O.Box #328; Gainesville, FL 32609-2835, (855) 466-2832; Connect Network.com) to be deposited to Plaintiff's prison account. GTL contracts with MDOC to handle deposits of prisoner funds. E.g. GTL finally processed a 20 JUNE 2018 Money Order on 24 JULY 2018, sent repeatedly to GTL by the sender.

65. On 20 AUGUST 2018, \$150 was mailed to GTL for Plaintiff. Information from U.S.P.S. says GTL cashed the Postal Money Order and sent \$150 to be put in Plaintiff's account. MDOC Regional Accounting (3855 Cooper, Jackson, MI 49201) never put the \$150 in Plaintiff's account.

66. Based on investigation, information and past acts: Aforesaid tampering with Plaintiff's funds was ORDERED by MELODY WALLACE (MDOC Office of Legal Affairs) for Defendant WASHINGTON upon request of Michigan Assistant Attorney Generals JAMES E. LONG and KRISTEN SIMMONS (of this case and pgh. 61 herein) coordinating with CHAPMAN LAW GROUP (of this case).

67. Aforesaid Defendants, Defense Counsels, and associates were and are intent on causing

Plaintiff to not be able to make cutoff dates of the SCHEDULING ORDER (ECF # 129). Plaintiff has seen at least 50 cases dismissed by Magistrate Majzoub for failure to meet cutoff dates and he has spoken to relevant prisoners thereof about MDOC actions. Said persons are using these well-known facts to unduly obstruct Plaintiff from obtaining materials for representation to thereby cause dismissal of this case.

68. Aforesaid facts are why Plaintiff is writing this pleading on scrap paper, recycled from prior use.

69. Coercive power of government used to obstruct First Amendment Right is unduly offensive to Constitution and law. STUTSON v UNITED STATES, 116 S Ct 600, 603 (1996).

70. Defendants, Defense Counsels and their associates should be ORDERED to cease and desist from such wrongful acts.

#9 2ND MOTION 2 COMPEL

H(4). FACTS ON REFUSAL TO GIVE MEDICAL RECORDS:

71. On 30 JUNE 2018, during events of paragraphs 63-67, Plaintiff requested his MAY and JUNE 2018 medical records. On 05 SEPTEMBER 2018, upon him filing Grievance #290, LCF RHIT CONNIE D. LESTER sent a form saying the Records would cost \$20.75. Since Plaintiff had no funds, his sister sent a \$20.75 check that LESTER received on 20 SEPTEMBER 2018.

72. On 25 SEPTEMBER 2018, in response to Medical Kites about no records yet, RHIT LESTER called Plaintiff to Health Service and said, "I counted the records and it's \$15.00, not \$20.75, so I'll send the check back". Plaintiff responded, "I'll give you a stamped envelope, or you can take it to the Information Desk for my sister to pick up, tomorrow". LESTER anxiously said, "Oh, no, we can't do that". Plaintiff said, "That's what I've done before". LESTER answered, "Oh, no!" I want to mail it certified".

73. On 17 OCTOBER 2018, Plaintiff again sent Medical Kite asking, "Where is my sister's \$20.75 check?" RHIT LESTER again called Plaintiff to Health Service and said, "I mailed the check to the wrong address", different than on the check. Plaintiff gave the address to LESTER exactly as was on the check. Grievance Coordinator Jane ROHRIG refused to process Grievance #293 on this mishandling.

74. In that 17 OCTOBER 2018 meeting (pgh. 73), Plaintiff told LESTER, "CHAPMAN LAW GROUP ordered thousands of pages at the same time as me and already got them". LESTER said, "We give them precedence over you". Plaintiff explained, "I need those records in court against CHAPMAN". LESTER said, "There's nothing I can do. It takes time to count records (60-pages) you get". Plaintiff said, "It takes 2-minutes maximum to use the page count feature on your computer", then left.

75. It's five (5) months after Plaintiff first requested his MAY and JUNE 2018 Medical

Records, his sister paid for them weeks ago, and Plaintiff still does not have the Records. These Records are material and necessary to answering summary motions and preparing for trial.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:20 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#8 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

76. Plaintiff also requested his JULY and AUGUST 2018 Medical Records on 01 SEPTEMBER 2018 and has heard nothing except RN JENNIFER STILLMAN saying at a 15 NOVEMBER 2018 Grievance interview on these Records, "It takes time" (Gr #295). In 31-years of getting copies of his Medical Records, it has never before taken more than 2 weeks to receive copies.

77. Such undue delay in Plaintiff getting copies of his Medical Records is harassment, intimidation, punishment, and deliberate attempts to obstruct him in representation of this case, to deny him COURT ACCESS contrary to First, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to U.S. Constitution. These actions unduly degrade Plaintiff's standing in this case. These Records have new information on injuries in question.

78. All aforesaid actions by Defendants, Defense Attorneys and their associates were and are ongoing joint effort intended to cause severe irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

79. Defendants, Defense Counsels and their associates should be ORDERED to forthwith provide Plaintiff with copies of his MAY 2018 to NOVEMBER 2018 Medical Records.

I. FACTS ON NEED FOR EXTENSION OF TIMES:

80. All prior paragraphs incorporated herein.

81. As stated in paragraphs 3 through 55 herein with individualized explanation for most evasive and non-responsive discovery "responses" (alleged as such by the Defense), discovery has been made a meaningless ritual by Defendants and Defense Counsel which has denied Plaintiff court access.

82. Said Defense actions regarding discovery procedures require that discovery cutoff dates be extended after proper and truthful answers are given by Defendants and Defense Counsel.

#10 2ND MOTION 2 COMPEL

a. Defendants at the present time have caused Plaintiff to be unable to discover highly relevant

documents and information; and

b. This unduly impairs Plaintiff's ability to prepare for and prosecute claims in the case.

83. As stated in paragraphs 56 through 62 herein: Defendants and associates first unduly destroyed and/or took around \$1,000 worth of Plaintiff's legally owned property, including his typewriter holding correctly amended complaint, to abusively consume his time and funds in defending his property and/or with buying it anew. They then refused to transfer Plaintiff's stored property with him contrary to MDOC Policy. They thereby have:

a. Cost Plaintiff over \$300 in what is otherwise unnecessary spending of funds needed for this case; and

b. Severely degraded Plaintiff's standing with needless obstructions to representation and undue costs.

84. As said in paragraphs 63 through 70 herein: When aforesaid of paragraph 83 did not end Plaintiff continuing to represent this case, Defendants and associates repeatedly obstructed funds being deposited in Plaintiff's account which so far has:

a. Prevented Plaintiff from ability to purchase highly relevant documents and information needed to prepare for and prosecute claims in the case; and

b. Unduly diminished Plaintiff's standing with abusive obstructions to representation.

85. As said in paragraphs 71 through 79 herein: Defendants and associates have since 01 JULY 2018 refused to give Plaintiff his MAY to NOVEMBER 2018 Medical Records which hold previously suppressed critical new evidence on Defendants refusal to treat very serious medical need with deliberate indifference thereto.

a. These Records are probative Defendants' actions in question caused and are causing further severe physical injury and likely Premature Death;

b. And severely impairs: Plaintiff's ability to to prepare for, to prosecute claims, and his standing by lack of said records.

86. Aforesaid actions and omissions of Defendants, Defense Counsels and their associates were and are ultra vires with wanton, sadistic and malicious intent to irreparably injure Plaintiff in the full exercise and enjoyment of his Constitutional and lawful Rights described herein.

87. Since Defendants, et al, have so severely obstructed discovery procedures and other means of obtaining evidence necessary, critical and relevant to claims: Plaintiff believes all cutoff dates of the SCHEDULING ORDER (ECF #129) should be extended with the first date (FINAL WITNESS LIST) being set for 60-days after decision on this motion, and so forth for the following dates.

J. CONCLUSION TO STATEMENT OF FACTS:

88. Cumulative effect of the aforesaid Defense actions unduly and severely injures Plaintiff's standing in this case.

89. DEFENSE COUNSELS are hereby put on notice the Plaintiff intends to file FRCP RULE 11 motion for sanctions at the appropriate time.

90. According to Plaintiff's calculations: (a) Filing First Motion to Compel cost him \$35.70 (ECF # 130 & #133); filing Second Motion to Compel here cost him \$__._ for which he should be reimbursed (EXHIBIT G).

LEGAL ARGUMENT

I. DEFENDANTS ABUSIVELY AND EVASIVELY MADE NONRESPONSES TO DISCOVERY REQUESTS AND SHOULD BE ORDERED TO PROPERLY ANSWER:

"If a party fails to make a disclosure required by Rule 26(a), any other party may move to compel disclosure and for appropriate sanctions", FRCP 37(a)(3)(A and B), and "the requesting party may move to determine the sufficiency of an answer or objection" to a request to admit. FRCP 36(a)(6). "For purposes of this subdivision (a), an evasive or incomplete disclosure, answer, or response MUST be treated as a failure to disclose, answer, or respond". FRCP 37(a)(4).

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:15 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#9 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

As said in paragraphs 4, 16 to 28 (ABDELLATIF), and 37 to 43 (BASHIR) herein: Defendants ABDELLATIF and BASHIR have abusively and evasively failed to answer, disclose or respond to Plaintiff's discovery requests by falsely claiming to not understand the plain language. Under FRCP 36(a)(6) and 37(a)(4), such evasiveness violates discovery rules.

As said in paragraphs 23 to 26 herein: Records and Plaintiff's observations prove ABDELLATIF falsely said he did not work at MRF Health Service on 24 JANUARY 2016.

As said in paragraphs 29 to 36 herein: Counsel for Defendant ADRAY falsely answered Requests to Admit in an evasive move to void discovery procedure.

As said in paragraphs 37 to 52 herein: Defendants KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON evasively and falsely said requested documents are held by another party. The documents are statistical reports under their control and used by them in their employment. Reports on the Plaintiff of his Record (EXHIBIT H) show the type of facts data-linked into the overall Utilization Report. These Utilization Reports describe Defendants' actions with their names and should be given to Plaintiff with patient names redacted (by simple keystroke from printouts) to show relevant consistent behavior and character traits of Defendants applicable under FRE 401 to 404 and 608 to 611. The Reports will show, inter alia, facts on referrals to Specialists for treatment of

serious medical needs of Plaintiff and others or lack thereof.

Defendants ABDELLATIF and BASHIR failed to respond to Plaintiff's THIRD REQUESTS TO ADMIT (EXHIBITS A4 and A5) which are made necessary by BASHIR'S evasive failure to respond on the CONTRACTOR'S DISEASE MANAGEMENT MANUAL (paragraph 37 herein).

Defendants KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON failed to respond to Plaintiff's FIRST AND SECOND REQUESTS TO ADMIT (EXHIBITS A6 and A7) or FIRST INTERROGATORIES TO KIRSTEIN (EXHIBIT I3).

Said requests are for relevant/material evidence to Plaintiff's claims and that may lead to further admissible evidence and involved persons. Plaintiff us irreparably harmed by Defendants' failure to disclose such evidence.

THEREFORE, Defendants ABDELLATIF, ADRAY, BASHIR, KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON should be ORDERED to forthwith NONEVASIVELY and truthfully answer respective discovery requests made to them.

II. DEFENDANTS DID NOT SIGN DISCOVERY RESPONSES UNDER REQUIRED OATH OR DECLARATION FOR WHICH THEY AND COUNSEL SHOULD BE SANCTIONED:

Substantive elements of 28 USC 1746 are that the declarant must: "(1) declare (or certify, verify, or state), (2) under penalty of perjury, that the matter sworn to is true and correct". CORTEZ v LOBO, 722 F3d 483, 488 (2nd Cir. 2013). Section 1746 requires format when executed within the United States to be: "I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date). (Signature)". 28 USC, Sec. 1746 (2). Any deviation from this format is invalid. THREE RIVERS CONFECTIONS v WARMAN, 660 FED APPX 103, 107, n. 10 (3rd Cir. 2016).

Defendants ABDELLATIF (EXHIBIT D1 and I2), ADRAY (EXHIBIT A1), BASHIR (EXHIBIT A2), KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON (EXHIBIT D2) did not "declare" as "true and correct", and some did not sign respective discovery responses in required criteria of Section 1746 (paragraphs 5 to 7, 27, 29 to 36, 42 and 52 herein). The best some did was only "under penalty of perjury". This deviation is inadequate and probative of their intent to escape criminal ramifications of Title 18 USC, Secs. 1001 and 1621.

THEREFORE, Defendants ABDELLATIF, ADRAY, BASHIR, KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON should be ORDERED to answer proper discovery responses in the required format of Section 1746.

III. DEFENDANTS, THEIR SUBORDINATES AND ASSOCIATES SHOULD BE ENJOINED FROM COERCIVE ACTIONS AND OBSTRUCTIONS THAT HAVE DIMINISHED PLAINTIFF'S COURT ACCESS, REPRESENTATION AND STANDING IN

THIS CASE:

"It is sufficient if the plaintiff can show a genuine threat of enforcement of the practice sought to be enjoined, that there exists some cognizable danger of recurrent violation. There must be more than a mere possibility that the misconduct will occur". U.S. v W.T. GRANT CO., 345 US 629, 633 (1953).

It is well-known in the Federal Court for decades that MDOC Administrators have consistent trait of abuses intended to obstruct court access, EX PARTE HULL, 312 US 546 (1941), instigating "prison riots by taking over the prison with the intent of confining the prisoners to their cells indefinitely, and otherwise violating their constitutional rights", IN RE JACKSON LOCKDOWN, 568 F SUPP 869 (ED MI 1983), and that they "abuse their authority". HADIX v JOHNSON, 568 F SUPP 869 (ED MICH. 1983). Plaintiff personally knows this from atrocities committed against him over the last 31-years, including three attempts to murder him for his exercise of court access if which the second was settled in NORTHINGTON v SHERRARD, ET AL, No. 90-71522-DT (ED MI 1990-1994).

As said in paragraphs 1 through 56 herein: The Defendants, their subordinates and associates ultra vires usurped functions of Discovery Rules with their own hedonistic acts with wanton, sadistic and malicious intent. They continued undue taking of Plaintiff's typewriter needed to amend original Complaint (ECF #1) (paragraphs 58-62 herein) with obstructions, then recently blocked funds sent to his prison account (paragraphs 63-70), then refused to give Plaintiff paid for Medical Records highly relevant to claims of this case (paragraphs 72-79). These are not isolated events but are propagated from the office of Defendant Washington through her subordinates.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:18 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ▫

#10 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

Plaintiff obtained five (5) communications from MELODY A.P. WALLACE ((517) 655-4498) of the MDOC Director's Office to MDOC STAFF at various prisons: In 1992, saying to not make photocopies of needed legal exhibits in his criminal appeals; In 2008 and 2011 saying to write false misconducts (later dismissed) on Plaintiff as a tool to obstruct litigation of PgID 1337; to have informants threaten Plaintiff's life; to unduly take Plaintiff's personal property, etc. On 11 FEBRUARY 2017, Defendant RUSSELL of ECF #100 and WALLACE were on the telephone with JCF STAFF while STAFF told Plaintiff that he could not

have his typewriter of ECF 63. Since filing this case, Plaintiff's legal files have been scrambled 13 times, is very time-consuming to correct, and which obstructs court access in this case. Said coercive actions that diminish Plaintiff's standing in this case came through Defendant WASHINGTON'S OFFICE from Defense Counsel(s) (paragraphs 9, 61 and 66 herein).

Plaintiff understands this Court is familiar with coercive traits of MDOC Administrators to harass, intimidate and punish prisoners who file lawsuits, and to unduly obstruct court access thereof. Plaintiff accessed at least 50 similar cases where Magistrate Majzoub had dismissed them for failure to meet cutoff dates and he has spoken to relevant prisoners of some said cases.

Coercive power of government used to obstruct First Amendment representation is unduly offensive to U.S. Constitution and Law. *STUTSON v UNITED STATES*, 116 S Ct 600, 603 (1996).

THEREFORE, Defendants and associates should be ordered to forthwith cease and desist from such actions contrary to TITLE 18 USC, SECS. 1505 and 1512, that are intended to obstruct Plaintiff's court access in this and other cases.

IV. EXTENSION OF TIME SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR ALL SCHEDULING ORDER CUTOFF DATES DUE TO OBSTRUCTIONS OF THE DEFENSE AND ASSOCIATES UNDULY DIMINISHING PLAINTIFF'S STANDING AND ABILITY TO REPRESENT THIS CASE:

"When a litigant is subject to the continuing coercive power of the government in the form of imprisonment, our legal traditions reflect a certain solicitude for his rights, to which the important public interests in judicial efficiency and finality must occasionally be accommodated". *STUTSON v U.S.*, ___ US ___, ___, 116 S Ct 600, 603 (1996). "[T]he State and its officers may not abridge or impair" a prisoner's right of federal court access, *BOUNDS v SMITH*, 430 US 817, 822, 828 (1977), and must insure access "is adequate, effective and meaningful". *BOUNDS*, 430 US at 822, 828. "It is the role of the courts to provide relief to claimants (sic) who have suffered, or will imminently suffer, actual harm". *LEWIS v CASEY*, 116 S Ct 2174, ___ (1996). FRCP, RULE 6(b)(1 and 2), allows extension of times requested before and after cutoff dates.

Plaintiff exercised due diligence with 95% of his time spent in research and writing of this case between 0200 hours to 2200 hours every day. He has been unduly harmed and will imminently further be harmed by aforesaid and further actions of the Defendants, Defense Counsels, their subordinates and associates described in paragraphs 1 to 90 of the Motion and herein. Also, the library was closed about one-third of the last 42-days.

Said persons intended to create substantial barriers to Plaintiff's disabilities that he could not overcome, contrary to the ADA. 42 USC 12101.

Plaintiff has been denied court access. He needs extended time to pursue further discovery after Defendants give proper answers. Defendants will not be unduly harmed by extension of time. The Plaintiff will further be unduly harmed if extension is not granted.

THEREFORE, extension of time should be given for first SCHEDULING ORDER cutoff date to be 60-days after decision on this motion, and remaining cutoff dates be relatively so extended.

V. DEFENDANTS AND DEFENSE COUNSELS SHOULD BE SANCTIONED FOR THEIR ABUSES DONE TO PLAINTIFF:

"A court may assess attorney fees when a party has acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, and for oppressive reasons" that "shows bad faith by delaying or disrupting the litigation or by hampering enforcement of a court order". CHAMBERS v NASCO, 501 US 32, 45-46 (1991).

As aforesaid, Defendants, Defense Counsels, their subordinates and associates have arbitrarily, maliciously and wantonly obstructed and delayed Plaintiff's representation and thereby unduly affected his standing

THEREFORE, Defendants and Defense Counsels should pay Plaintiff's costs and fees in bringing his Motion and any other relief the Court deems necessary and just.

DECLARATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. 28 USC 1746. Executed on 04 DEC 2018 /s/ Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 12/10/2018 9:33:14 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

#11 of POMafia #14; COMBAT WITH THE GENOCIDAL BEAST:

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Gary M. Northington Pro Se requests this Honorable Court to ORDER:

(a) That Defendants ABDELLATIF, ADRAY, BASHIR, KIRSTEIN and WASHINGTON abusively were evasive in their discovery Responses and that they should forthwith reissue new Responses that are non-evasive and truthful;

(b) That said Defendants wrongfully did not answer under the required declaration and/or certification of 28 USC, Sec. 1746, and should reissue new responses properly certified;

(c) That Defendants, Defense Counsel(s), and their subordinates should return Plaintiff's pleadings of this case (held in his typewriter's memory), cease and desist from blocking the \$150 Money Order deposited to GTL for his account, and provide his MAY 2018 to DECEMBER 2018 Medical Records to him forthwith and put a holder on his account for their cost to be taken from the \$150 deposit;

(d) That Defendants and/or Defense Counsels should pay Plaintiff's costs of \$36.70 for the First Motion to Compel (ECF #130) and costs of \$48.40 for this Motion, \$85.10 total;

(e) That SCHEDULING ORDER cutoff dates be extended with the original first date to be 60-days after decision on this Motion and other dates relatively extended thereafter; and

(f) Any other relief deemed necessary and just in the premises.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 07 DEC 2018

/s/ Gary M. Northington

141 First

Coldwater, MI 49036

(517) 378-6842. email @ JPay.com