

LETTER TO THE COURT REGARDING DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT AND
JUDICIAL COMPETENCY

Marvin Tutt

Pro Se Plaintiff

Case No.: 8:25-cv-02006-TDC

July 15, 2025

The Honorable Theodore D. Chuang

United States District Court

District of Maryland

101 W. Lombard Street

Baltimore, MD 21201

cc: All Maryland Federal Judges

RE: The Troubling Disconnect Between Filing Quality and Procedural Treatment

Dear Judge Chuang and Esteemed Members of the Maryland Federal Judiciary:

I write this letter not merely as a litigant, but as a citizen deeply concerned about the discriminatory treatment I have received from this Court. This letter will become part of the permanent record, documenting for history and potential appellate review the human cost of procedural discrimination.

I. THE QUALITY OF MY WORK SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

This Court's orders reveal a troubling disconnect: my filings demonstrate such legal competency that, if submitted without a signature block, would be indistinguishable from those prepared by experienced counsel. Yet I am subjected to procedures designed for prisoners filing handwritten, frivolous claims.

My initial complaint included:

- 66 pages of detailed factual allegations
- Extensive documentary evidence
- Proper federal jurisdiction statements
- Correctly cited legal standards
- Professional formatting and organization

Any objective review would conclude these filings required either significant legal training or exceptional self-education. **I respectfully submit that if my filings bore a law firm's letterhead instead of "pro se," this Court would never have imposed such extraordinary restrictions.**

II. THE REVERSE DISCRIMINATION REVEALS EVERYTHING

As a free citizen who has never been imprisoned—not one day—the Court's decision to treat me worse than prisoners causes profound personal and professional harm. I served 30 days in county jail years ago, completed all obligations, earned probation before judgment, and have spent years building a life of contribution.

Yet Exception #7 in your Case Management Order exempts "motions in prisoner cases in which the prisoner is not represented by counsel" from restrictions. This means prisoners—individuals currently incarcerated—receive more favorable treatment than I do as a free citizen.

Would this Court treat these individuals worse than current prisoners:

- A CEO who spent 30 days in jail for DUI?
- A doctor with a month for tax evasion?
- A lawyer who did time for contempt?

The answer is obvious. The procedural discrimination appears based on who I am, not what I've filed.

III. THE INNOVATION IRONY

While international institutions study my contributions to evidence integrity through GitForensics, while my work is shared globally for advancing transparency and accountability, this Court subjects me to restrictions that even incarcerated individuals are exempt from.

The psychological impact of being treated worse than prisoners while fighting for my son cannot be overstated. Every restrictive order reminds me that in this Court's hierarchy, I rank below incarcerated individuals—that rehabilitation and innovation cannot overcome institutional prejudice.

IV. THE JUDICIAL COMPETENCY CONCERNS

It is deeply concerning that this Court issued such extraordinary restrictions without apparent consideration of multiple disqualifying factors that should have been immediately evident to any careful jurist:

1. The Timing Blindness

The Court issued sua sponte restrictions merely two weeks after a pro se plaintiff filed substantial civil rights claims, and notably, just days after this Court became a defendant in federal litigation. The failure to recognize how this timing would appear—a defendant judge restricting a corruption plaintiff—demonstrates troubling lack of institutional awareness.

2. The Monetary Interests Tell

Most perplexing is the Court's premature concern with "monetary interests" in a civil rights case where no defendant had even appeared. This suggests either improper ex parte knowledge of potential exposure or such prejudgment that financial concerns override constitutional ones. Either interpretation reveals analytical processes unbefitting federal jurisprudence.

3. The Structural Conflict Oversight

That any federal judge would continue presiding while simultaneously defending against DOJ litigation represents a fundamental failure to grasp basic conflict principles. The inability or unwillingness to recognize this self-evident disqualification raises profound questions about judicial judgment.

4. The Procedural Overreach

Creating unprecedented barriers for documented civil rights claims—restrictions that multiply costs while claiming efficiency—suggests an outcomes-oriented approach that sacrifices analytical rigor for expedient control.

5. The Docket Sequence

The sequence revealed in this Court's own docket raises concerns:

- July 2, 2025: Court issues "Deficiency Notice-Non-Prisoner" (Entry #11)
- July 8, 2025: Judge issues Order with prisoner exceptions (Entry #12)

This sequence suggests the Court may not have fully considered its own prior determination when crafting the Case Management Order.

V. THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT

The combination of these issues creates substantial barriers to justice that merit reconsideration.

VI. THE HUMAN COST

I am not a case number. I am not a prisoner. I am:

- A father fighting fraudulent garnishments that leave me with \$141.37
- An innovator whose work advances justice globally
- A citizen who earned his redemption through education and contribution
- A human being deserving of procedural fairness

Despite earning education, building technology studied globally, and contributing to society, this Court's orders suggest I am viewed as less than a full participant in our justice system.

VII. THE REQUEST

I respectfully request this Court recognize me as I am: a father, innovator, and citizen seeking justice through proper channels, not as the prisoner I have never been.

More fundamentally, I request this Court reconsider whether the current approach to this case best serves the interests of justice and fair access to the courts.

VIII. THE CONTRADICTORY TREATMENT

The contradiction in my treatment is apparent: these restrictive procedures suggest I require special limitations, yet the quality of my filings demonstrates legal competency.

The contradiction is glaring: How am I being told that I'm unable to represent myself properly, yet simultaneously receiving restrictions that prove he believes I'm more than capable? These restrictions aren't given to incompetent litigants.

IX. THE IMPACT OF PROCEDURAL COMPLEXITY

The procedural requirements imposed create unnecessary complexity that contradicts the stated purpose of "efficiency." These additional barriers make litigation more difficult for all parties involved, not just Plaintiff.

X. THE BROADER CONSEQUENCES

The current approach to this litigation risks damaging public confidence in the judicial system and may lead to additional litigation that could have been avoided through fair procedural treatment.

XI. MY PURPOSE

I seek only justice through proper legal channels. I would prefer to focus on my contributions to technology and science rather than navigating unnecessary procedural barriers.

XII. CONCLUSION

The disparate treatment between the quality of my filings and the restrictions imposed raises serious concerns about access to justice for pro se litigants.

I have followed every rule, met every deadline, and maintained professional dignity despite discriminatory treatment. This letter documents not just my experience, but a systemic failure that demands correction.

****Submitted****

/s/ Marvin Tutt

Marvin Tutt

Author, Innovator, Citizen

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 15, 2025, I served this letter on all parties and filed it with the Court as part of the permanent record in Case No. 8:25-cv-02006-TDC.
