FCI Englewood, Colorado - Informal Resolution Attempt

DATE INFORMAL RESOLUTION PROCESS COMMENCES: 9/11/19

INMATE: KWC, ENC

UNIT: SH/1-B-POD

REG. NO.: 270900/45

DATE OF THE INCIDENT AND THE NATURE OF THAT COMPLAINT: My wife has still not been approved for visit, which is contrary to sometimes of me, my family, and BOP policy 590.01(c), to whom convicted convicts does not preclude visit unless, after, recency of offense. A warrant from 1980 against a non-felony, non-extendable case violation does not in any way present a threat to the security of the institution. It is keeping me from keeping my family close.Along with building my my mind, keeping me in the 512, reducing phone access.

WHAT STEPS DID YOU TAKE TO RESOLVE THIS ISSUE BEFORE BRINGING IT TO THE ATTENTION OF YOUR UNIT TEAM? I have spoken to, written to, U. Humphreys, U. Kelser,

What are you requesting to resolve this issue? I just want my wife to see me, like every other inmate. Not on visiting restrictions. I've had hundreds of visits, never once

INMATE SIGNATURE VERIFYING COMPLAINT: (CONTINUED REVERSE SIDE)
COUNSELOR'S COMMENTS: Due to an incoming letter reviewed by staff indicating the applicant is unwilling to abide by the rules of the institution, any unauthorized contact with the inmate may be considered a violation.

DEPARTMENT HEAD'S COMMENTS: YOUR VISITOR HAS AUTHORIZED A LETTER. SENDING THE REQUEST WILL BE DENIED, BUT I AM WORKING ON TRYING TO ENTER THE INMATE INTO DISRUPT THE USUAL BUSINESS OF THIS INSTITUTION.

DUE TO THIS TYPE OF BEHAVIOR AND IDEOLOGY YOUR VISIT WILL BE DENIED.

I RECOMMEND YOU WRITE LETTERS TO CORRESPOND.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE: [Signature]

UNIT MANAGER'S SIGNATURE: [Signature]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BP-8</th>
<th>BP-8</th>
<th>BP-9</th>
<th>BP-9</th>
<th>BP-9 Rec'd in Admin. Remedy Clerk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Returned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>9/16/19</td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>9/18/19</td>
<td>9/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>16:48 PM</td>
<td>16:47</td>
<td>11:54</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of all sections of this form is required before a BP-229(13) can be issued. This form supersedes all previous forms.
Part A - REASON FOR APPEAL

I am being systematically and arbitrarily denied visits with my direct family, my wife. Despite already having my visit list at 4 BOP institutions, including this one (FCI Englewood), I was returning back to FCI Englewood my unit team and the admin have found reason after reason to reject her. First they told me she was rejected for an alleged letter she sent stating she would try to visit despite her not knowing whether she was on the list. My unit team said this “ideology” could not be allowed. I filed on this and in response, the administration gave a COMPLETELY DIFFERENT reason for blocking her. In the BP-9, the admin states she is blocked because of a previous conviction. This is also categorically false. My wife has never been convicted of any crime. She has a NON-FELONY warrant for a bad check from 15 YEARS AGO. A non-extraditable warrant.

BP-9 policy states that a conviction alone is not reason enough to reject a visitor; that the seriousness of the crime, recency, if it poses a threat to the institution. A non-extraditable, non-felony, non-violent, non-drug related offense is not a threat to any institution.普要考虑到她在 100 多次试图与她发信件被拒绝或取消了。行政的人正在拒绝我与她改变的请求。在我 8-9 反馈。I am seeking restoration of my visiting privileges.

10-22-19

DATE

E.K.

SIGNATURE OF REQUESTER

Part B - RESPONSE

DATE

REGIONAL DIRECTOR

If dissatisfied with this response, you may appeal to the General Counsel. Your appeal must be received in the General Counsel’s Office within 30 calendar days of the date of this response.

ORIGINAL: RETURN TO INMATE

CASE NUMBER: 99-16244-21

Part C - RECEIPT

Return to: 

LAST NAME, FIRST, MIDDLE INITIAL. 

REG. NO. UNIT INSTITUTION

CASE NUMBER:

CASE NUMBER:

SUBJECT:

DATE

SIGNATURE, RECIPIENT OF REGIONAL APPEAL

BP-0301(D) JUNE 2002
ERIC G KING, 27090-045
ENGLEWOOD FCI JAIL QTR: 203-202UDS
9595 WEST QUINCY AVENUE
LITTLETON, CO 80123
Administrative Remedy Number: 991624-R1

This is in response to your Regional Administrative Remedy Appeal received in this office on October 29, 2019, in which you appeal the decision to deny placement of an individual on your approved visiting list. For relief, you request reconsideration.

We have reviewed your appeal and the Warden’s response dated October 15, 2019. Your institution was contacted regarding your proposed visitor. As such, since the filling of your administrative remedy, your proposed visitor has been cleared and was able to visit you.

Based on the above information, your Regional Administrative Remedy Appeal is for informational purposes only.

If you are dissatisfied with this response, you may appeal to the Office of General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, 320 First Street, NW, Washington, DC 20534. Your appeal must be received in the Office of General Counsel within 30 days from the date of this response.

Date

J. E. Krueger, Regional Director
Case 1:19-cr-00257-WJM   Document 40-14   Filed 03/10/20   USDC Colorado   Page 6 of 6

U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons

To: King, Eric G

Reg. No.: 27910-045

Unit: FCI Englewood

Institution:

Part A—Reason for Appeal

Altho the Warden did finally approve my wife for visiting, he did so with a list of demands that are both against policy and a violation of my wife’s constitutional rights. I was told she could only visit if: She agreed not to protest, she didn’t comment on websites about the BOP, if she didn’t wear ‘political clothes’ and if she were ‘nice to staff’. The Warden’s authority does not reach to my wife’s constitutional rights to free speech or peacefully assemble. No other inmates have had special visiting policies placed on them or their families. With regard to the t-shirts, that is up to staff on duty and if there was ever a dress code issue, she would follow policy like everyone else. The Warden gave this back on Dec 14th and never officially told me why she remained banned after the NCIC cleared or why a 15 yr old bad check warrant would suddenly be cause to prevent visits, when she had been approved to this same institution 3 yrs prior. The Warden violated my rights, 8th, 14th, my wife’s rights, 1st, 8th, allowing visits later does not negate what was done and I will be seeking my Bowen’s claim met.

1/16/20

Ek

Date

Signature of Requester

Part B—Response

Received

FEB 04 2020

Administrative Remedy Section
Federal Bureau of Prisons

Date

General Counsel

Case Number:

991624-A1

Case Number:

Return to:

Last Name, First, Middle Initial

Reg. No.

Unit

Institution

Original: Return to Inmate

Part C—Receipt

Signature of Recipient of Central Office Appeal

USP LVN
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