

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

- - - - -x  
TIMOTHY BOOTH, :  
Petitioner :  
v. : No. 99-1964  
:  
C. O. CHURNER, ET AL. :  
- - - - -x

Washington, D.C.  
Tuesday, March 20, 2001

The above-entitled matter came on for oral  
argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at  
11:15 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

NANCY WINKELMAN, ESQ., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; on  
behalf of the Petitioner.  
GERALD J. PAPPERT, ESQ., First Deputy Attorney General,  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; on behalf of the  
Respondents.  
IRVING L. GORNSTEIN, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor  
General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on  
behalf of the United States, as amicus curiae,  
supporting Respondents.

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	NANCY WINKELMAN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	GERALD J. PAPPERT, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents	22
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	IRVING L. GORNSTEIN, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the United States,	
11	as amicus curiae, supporting	
12	Respondents	40
13	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
14	NANCY WINKELMAN, ESQ.	
15	On behalf of the Petitioner	43
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(11:15 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: We'll hear argument  
next in Number 99-1964, Timothy Booth v. C.O. Churner.

Ms. Winkelman.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF NANCY WINKELMAN

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MS. WINKELMAN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it  
please the Court:

This case involves an excessive force action  
brought by a State prisoner under Section 1983 that was  
dismissed on the grounds that the prisoner had not  
exhausted the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's three-tiered  
prison grievance system. The case turns on an issue of  
statutory construction, whether when first enacting and  
then amending Section 1997e(a), to limit the exhaustion  
provisions to, quote, such administrative remedies as are  
available.

Congress intended to require a prisoner, whose  
remedy is one for monetary damages, to address a past-  
completed constitutional violation to exhaust a prison  
grievance system that cannot provide such a remedy. Of  
course, the backdrop of this case is that there's no  
general exhaustion requirement in Section 1983. But what  
is key here is that when Congress first enacted the

1 Section 1997e exception in 1980 and then when it amended  
2 Section 1997e in 1996, while dramatically strengthening  
3 and changing the exhaustion provision in many respects, it  
4 retained the key words, such administrative remedies as  
5 are available.

6 QUESTION: But they also took out the words  
7 about effective, did they not?

8 MS. WINKELMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.  
9 Congress took out the words plain, speedy and effective in  
10 1996, along with making exhaustion mandatory rather than  
11 discretionary, removing the stay provision and a number of  
12 other changes. The purpose of taking out plain, speedy  
13 and effective, though, those words did not drive the  
14 result that we're seeking here. They didn't drive the  
15 inquiry of whether, in fact, the prison grievance system  
16 could provide the relief. What those words -- what the  
17 work that those words did in the prior statute, and this  
18 is evident from looking at the present statute, which is  
19 reprinted on page 5A of Respondent's brief.

20 QUESTION: In this case the statute says, no  
21 action. It doesn't say particular claim for something.  
22 It says no action shall be brought until such  
23 administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.  
24 Your client, I take it, brought an action and in that  
25 action, he wanted a transfer of records, a bunch of

1 different things, as well as damages. So at least as far  
2 as this case is concerned, why wasn't there for that  
3 action remedies to exhaust, namely all the transfer part,  
4 all the other parts?

5 MS. WINKELMAN: Your Honor, when Mr. Booth  
6 brought his claim, it's true that he sought both what we  
7 know as injunctive relief and money damages and in fact  
8 that was the basis upon which Respondents opposed our  
9 petition for writ of certiorari, that this was a mixed  
10 case. But the question that we presented was a money  
11 damages only case and that's the question that's before  
12 --

13 QUESTION: Just looking at the statute, the  
14 statute, though, and the statute refers to action and this  
15 is a mixed action. And I would think there's a very  
16 strong argument that whatever you think about somebody who  
17 runs into court and files a claim only for money damages,  
18 where a prisoner asks for both, he shouldn't be able to  
19 bring his money claim in court until after he's exhausted  
20 his prison remedies in respect to what there is to exhaust  
21 and there's a lot.

22 MS. WINKELMAN: Actually, Your Honor, the Courts  
23 of Appeals have taken a different approach. The Tenth  
24 Circuit --

25 QUESTION: So that's what I want to know, what's

1 the rationale for allowing a person who has the mixed  
2 claim to go to Federal court at all, if he doesn't first  
3 go and exhaust what he has to exhaust?

4 MS. WINKELMAN: The Courts of Appeals haven't  
5 explained their reasoning in the decisions, but one  
6 possibility would be a practical one, which is if in a  
7 mixed claim situation the prisoner has to go back and  
8 exhaust both the injunctive and the monetary part, it's  
9 likely that their monetary claim -- they would risk  
10 -- face a high risk of forfeiting their money claim  
11 because it would be too late to exhaust that through the  
12 prison grievance system. Pennsylvania's, for example, is  
13 five days. It's 15 days for bringing your initial  
14 grievance. So if Mr. Booth's case had been dismissed, he  
15 would have been out of time, in all likelihood by that  
16 point, to pursue the money claim through the grievance  
17 procedure, which is why I think the Courts of Appeals had  
18 approached the issue and dealt with this problem by  
19 permitting --

20 QUESTION: I don't follow that if he hadn't come  
21 to court at all. If the rule is, if you want more than  
22 one kind of relief, you must go to the administrator  
23 within five days, whatever. So the idea is, I think what  
24 Justice Breyer was suggesting, that is if you have a mixed  
25 claim, this -- what you're trying to present, you said,

1 the question we presented is damages only. You want this  
2 Court to treat this case as though there were never any  
3 claims, anything else other than money damages and I  
4 understand that that's how you would like this case to be  
5 treated, but if we take this very case, I am not following  
6 your argument that there would be any loss of time and a  
7 time bind for the defendant if you must go swiftly to the  
8 prison system and name everything.

9 MS. WINKELMAN: My argument Justice Ginsburg is  
10 that when he brought his -- he brought his mixed action,  
11 that is true. If he had been -- if that action had then  
12 been dismissed, go back and exhaust because there are  
13 injunctive claims in here that need to be exhausted, he  
14 would have been, he would have been time-barred from  
15 pursuing the money damages claim then in Federal court  
16 because he had to bring his grievance, under  
17 Pennsylvania's grievance procedure, within 15 days of the  
18 incident. By the time he brings his action in Federal  
19 court, the Federal court then dismisses. He's too late.

20 QUESTION: But the point is he should never have  
21 come to a Federal court. On the interpretation that  
22 you've got a mixed claim, don't come to Federal court,  
23 exhaust.

24 MS. WINKELMAN: If our interpretation is right on the  
25 money damages point, and I'd like to go there, if that's

1 right then the approach that the Tenth Circuit took in the  
2 Miller case, I think, addresses the concern. The prisoner  
3 brings a mixed claim. The court allows the money damages  
4 aspect of the claim that the Tenth Circuit agrees does not  
5 have to be exhausted to go forward, thereby avoiding this  
6 problem of the prisoner perhaps losing the money damages  
7 claim all together because they could never exhaust the  
8 claim. It's too late.

9 QUESTION: May I ask you about that? Is it your  
10 position, let's say, it was, you were seeking nothing but  
11 money, that it is not required even to take the first  
12 step. Here there were three steps in the grievance  
13 procedure, the first was taken. There was an  
14 administrative complaint filed.

15 MS. WINKELMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

16 QUESTION: But then the prisoner said, I'm not  
17 going to go on to steps two and three. But I take your  
18 argument to be, if you want money, you don't even have to  
19 take step one. You can go directly to court. You don't  
20 have to complain within the prison system at all.

21 MS. WINKELMAN: It's not exactly if you want  
22 money. It's if what you are seeking and the relief that  
23 you're seeking, that the prisoner's seeking in the 1983  
24 action, is not available, cannot be provided --

25 QUESTION: I'm just asking you to answer that



1 question yes or no. On your theory, am I right, is not  
2 available, you don't even have to take step one?

3 MS. WINKELMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

4 QUESTION: I don't understand how you get there  
5 from the statute. I mean, you would have the statute read  
6 until such administrative remedies providing the same  
7 relief are exhausted and it doesn't say that. It says  
8 until such administrative remedies as are available. I  
9 mean, that's a very broad phrase, such administrative  
10 remedies as are available. It could be all sorts of  
11 remedies, damages, injunctions. On what basis do you want  
12 it limited to only those remedies that provide your client  
13 the same relief he wants in the 1997e action. I don't  
14 understand that.

15 MS. WINKELMAN: I think the answer to that  
16 question, Justice Scalia, lies in the whole purpose of  
17 administrative exhaustion. What are we talking about  
18 here? We're talking about, in any context, prisoner  
19 context, or security context, any other context, an  
20 individual going to an administrative agency when that  
21 agency can provide the relief. Here there's no question  
22 --

23 QUESTION: I understand that. That may well be  
24 with respect to those exhaustion requirements that are  
25 devised by the courts without any statutory requirement,

1 but it is entirely conceivable that an exhaustion  
2 requirement would have other purposes as your opponents  
3 claim here, simply making the prisoner go through a  
4 lengthy procedure that may satisfy him even though the  
5 relief is not the same or that may persuade him that the  
6 factual basis for his claims are so insubstantial that  
7 it's no use troubling the Federal courts with them. There  
8 are a lot of other reasons for making him go through these  
9 hoops before he is one of the, what, 45,000 prisoners a  
10 year who run into Federal court right away. That seems to  
11 be a perfect valid purpose and it seems to me that the way  
12 the statute reads.

13 MS. WINKELMAN: Your Honor, if Congress had  
14 intended to require exhaustion in every case, a blanket  
15 exhaustion rule, it would have and could have written such  
16 a statute, but it didn't do that in 1980 and when Congress  
17 had the opportunity in 1996, and I want to go back to the  
18 question about effective because I don't think I answered  
19 that completely.

20 When Congress had the opportunity in 1996 to  
21 create this kind of blanket exhaustion, we want all  
22 prisoner problems to go through the prison grievance  
23 system, it didn't do that, it retained the six words.

24 QUESTION: I don't know what possible language I  
25 would use if I were writing a statute to demand precisely

1     that result, other than the language, until such  
2     administrative remedies as are available are exhausted. I  
3     mean, that seems to me to do precisely what you say  
4     Congress hasn't done.

5                 MS. WINKELMAN: Let me suggest to you what we  
6     -- that the kind of the statute that we would think would  
7     be this blanket exhaustion, exhaustion every case, it's a  
8     good thing for prisons. The statute is at issue in  
9     McNeil, the Federal Tort Claims Act, an action shall not  
10    be instituted under the FTCA unless the claimant shall  
11    have first presented the claim to the appropriate Federal  
12    agency. So this statute could have said Congress could  
13    have, rather than advertently leaving in the words, until  
14    such administrative remedies as are available, Congress  
15    could have written a broad exhaustion statute.

16                QUESTION: Well, I'm not sure that that would  
17    work. It seems to me that the statute that the Congress  
18    has here is better. There may be cases, not just as  
19    Justice Scalia indicated where the claim is insubstantial,  
20    there may be cases where it's very substantial. But the  
21    courts are certainly helped by having a -- suppose they  
22    had a hearing, the guard was disciplined, reprimanded.  
23    They restored whatever disciplinary demerits or they  
24    erased any disciplinary action that was taken against the  
25    Petitioner. That would be very helpful to the court. Now

1       maybe they can't give damages, but that's the next stage.

2                   MS. WINKELMAN:   It might be --

3                   QUESTION:   And you're saying that it's just  
4       irrelevant to the courts, that there are some disciplinary  
5       mechanisms that the prisoner -- that cover this incident.  
6       It's not saying that he has to apply for library  
7       privileges or something.   It is to cover this incident and  
8       help clarify and crystallize the situation.   Then he goes  
9       and asks for damages.

10                  MS. WINKELMAN:   Justice Kennedy, it's not --  
11       this isn't a general prison notification.   There may be  
12       benefits to having prisons know about problems in the  
13       first instance.   We don't dispute that.   We don't dispute  
14       that there are benefits to prison grievance systems, but  
15       the point here and our argument is that Congress kept in  
16       these words.   It didn't create an FTCA type statute and  
17       what's important --

18                  QUESTION:   The FTCA statute doesn't work because  
19       you don't make a claim for damages.   What the Congress is  
20       saying here is there are other benefits besides simply  
21       processing this claim.   We want to have the entire  
22       incident investigated first and you can't make that  
23       parallel between the FTCA and this statute.   This statute  
24       served purposes that are not served by the FTCA example  
25       you put out and this statute is -- it doesn't seem to me

1     that the Congress could have taken the FTCA analogy to  
2     accomplish the result that it wants to accomplish here.

3             MS. WINKELMAN:  If the result is that all prison  
4     complaints and all prison problems are aired through the  
5     prison grievance system first, then I submit that Congress  
6     could have created that type of statute, but Congress  
7     didn't do that.

8             QUESTION:  Well, I would agree with you that  
9     Congress perhaps could have been clearer about it.  But I  
10    want to ask you just a textual question to see whether we  
11    disagree on that.  I will admit that when I first looked  
12    at the statute I thought remedies referred to form of  
13    relief.  But after reading the briefs and reading the  
14    statute a few more times, I came to the conclusion that,  
15    in fact, remedies was an ambiguous word.  It could either  
16    mean form of relief or it could mean administrative  
17    process.

18            And one of the textual clues, it seems to me,  
19    that's in there to indicate that Congress meant  
20    administrative process was its use of the word exhaust.  
21    We don't normally speak of exhausting the relief that you  
22    get.  I mean, like running through the money damages and  
23    having a good time, that's what -- I mean, exhaustion  
24    usually refers to exhausting a particular process.  So  
25    just at kind of step one, the textual point here seemed to

1 me probably to make a better argument or support a better  
2 argument, that what Congress was talking about when it  
3 used relief was administrative process rather than -- a  
4 remedy rather. It was using administrative process rather  
5 than particular relief awarded. Would you comment on  
6 that?

7 MS. WINKELMAN: I agree that there's some  
8 ambiguity in the word remedy and procedure and it's  
9 something certainly that we've struggled with, with the  
10 word remedy in the statute, that sometimes it can mean an  
11 administrative procedure and sometimes it can mean the  
12 right. Where we've come out is that in this statute it's  
13 probably doing double duty in some sense, but when it --

14 QUESTION: Well, if it's doing double duty,  
15 doesn't that nix your case?

16 MS. WINKELMAN: I don't think so, Your Honor,  
17 because it's still an administrative remedy as are  
18 available. It means both procedure and it means something  
19 that can actually give you the right, the relief that you  
20 seek, something that can actually redress the wrong.  
21 That's the meaning of remedy.

22 QUESTION: One of the practical difficulties of  
23 your interpretation is that I gather a prisoner by simply  
24 saying he wants money damages in any case can avoid the  
25 grievance system entirely even though money damages might

1 not be a major part of what he wants.

2 MS. WINKELMAN: Chief Justice Rehnquist, this  
3 problem of bypass, I think, is a little, somewhat  
4 overblown in some of the briefs. It's conjectural. In  
5 fact, the empirical evidence would point to the contrary  
6 that in the Circuits, in the Fifth and the Ninth Circuits,  
7 that have held our way on the money damages point, there  
8 hasn't been this bypass and this explosion of litigation  
9 and that makes sense because if what the prisoner wants,  
10 the prisoner can, in fact, get through the prison  
11 grievance process, then just like the State's amicus brief  
12 points out, numerous grievances are resolved in a  
13 prisoner's favor. They would go there. I need a  
14 different cell. I need to be housed without a smoker.  
15 Why would they give up the injunctive relief that they  
16 want simply to get into Federal court where they have to  
17 today pay a filing fee, at least in installments, where  
18 they risk losing one of their three lifelong strikes if,  
19 in fact, their proceeding IFP and their case is dismissed?  
20 So --

21 QUESTION: Ms. Winkelman, I wanted to get a  
22 clearer handle than I now have on the nature of the claim  
23 you think you have. You were candid in saying before, if  
24 you have this kind of claim, you can go directly to court  
25 with no administrative filing at all. Suppose the

1 administrative process does include some kind of monetary  
2 relief, but it's got a cap, say a thousand dollars capped.  
3 And your client's view is they beat me to a bloody pulp  
4 and a thousand dollars wouldn't begin to compensate me for  
5 my injury. Could such a person, in your view, go directly  
6 to court because there's no available remedy? There's a  
7 monetary remedy but it's capped.

8 MS. WINKELMAN: Your Honor, in that situation,  
9 Justice Ginsburg, the prisoner would have to go through  
10 the prison grievance system because the prison grievance  
11 system, while it couldn't provide the one-to-one  
12 correlation of the relief could provide the category of  
13 relief and certainly our position wouldn't preclude a cap  
14 such as the one that you posit your hypothetical.

15 But in that situation there is a monetary  
16 damages remedy available. It may not be a perfect remedy.  
17 It may not be the one-to-one fit, but the difference  
18 between that case and our case, is that in our case there  
19 was no monetary damages remedy available at all and that's  
20 why Mr. Booth, as a matter of administrative exhaustion,  
21 didn't have to go through that process.

22 Remember, when we're talking about  
23 administrative exhaustion and Congress can be presumed to  
24 have been legislating when it chose and then retained  
25 these words, such available -- such administrative



1 remedies as are available, that there's a long-standing  
2 jurisprudence in the administrative law area about the  
3 futility --

4 QUESTION: I'd like to ask you now, I understand  
5 the nature of the claim you're asserting. Suppose I were  
6 of the view, this statute is nor crystal clear. It could  
7 be read either way. It could be read to say, if there's  
8 administrative process, you have to exhaust it or it could  
9 be read to say, only if the kind of relief you're seeking  
10 is available must you exhaust. Then when the text doesn't  
11 tell me which one of those is right. Why isn't the proper  
12 perspective what Congress was trying to do? One thing we  
13 know Congress was trying to do, is to curtail prisoner  
14 litigation. Why wouldn't it be appropriate for a court to  
15 say well that's going to be how I break the tie? The text  
16 could be read either way, but I know that Congress wanted  
17 to curtail prisoner litigation so I'm going to read it the  
18 way that will keep cases out of court.

19 MS. WINKELMAN: Certainly that was a purpose of  
20 the Prison Litigation Reform Act. We acknowledge that and  
21 there are numerous provisions in the PLRA that go to that  
22 point, the filing fee, the three strikes provision, all  
23 the enhanced mechanisms for a district court's screening  
24 of prisoner complaints. And even this very statute was  
25 amended in significant respects to channel far more

1     grievances and complaints through the grievance system  
2     before they could come to court.

3             It's mandatory rather than discretionary.  
4     There's no more stay.  There's no more Federal oversight  
5     of the adequacy of the State procedures, but Congress fell  
6     short we believe when it retained those words against a  
7     backdrop of administrative law jurisprudence about  
8     futility.  When it retained those words, Congress intended  
9     to preserve that avenue for prisoners and, in fact, there  
10    are other parts --

11            QUESTION:  Ms. Winkelman, when Justice Ginsburg  
12    followed up on her question, I thought she was going to  
13    follow-up by asking what if the damages available in the  
14    prison grievance procedure were only \$50?  I presume your  
15    answer would be the same since there is a damage remedy  
16    available in the administrative procedure you have to  
17    exhaust, which means that, you know, that what you're  
18    proposing to us besides not, in my view, corresponding to  
19    the text of the statute doesn't even have the virtue of  
20    providing fairness it seems to me.  Why should it be if I  
21    can get \$50 I have to go through the prison grievance  
22    procedure when I'm claiming \$10,000 of actual damages?  It  
23    doesn't make any sense.

24            MS. WINKELMAN:  Certainly, Justice Scalia, there  
25    would be some threshold at which the prison grievance

1 system's damages might be so nominal as to not be the kind  
2 of relief that we're talking about. I don't know exactly  
3 where that line is. But the other point in terms of  
4 statutory interpretation is that, if all Congress meant to  
5 do was to say that prisoners have to go through every  
6 prison grievance system, then these words would be  
7 superfluous. What could they mean, such administrative  
8 remedies as are available? Certainly, if there's not a  
9 procedure in existence, Congress wasn't trying to say a  
10 prisoner has to go through that.

11 QUESTION: If you're right, Ms. Winkelman,  
12 Federal judges are going to have to say, does this prison  
13 system allow for damages? And maybe it won't always be  
14 clear whether it does or not. And secondly, what is the  
15 cutoff point in damages, which you say there must be,  
16 between just allowing enough to require exhaustion and not  
17 requiring it and not awarding enough. So, you're putting  
18 more uncertainty into the Act it seems to me.

19 MS. WINKELMAN: I think actually, Chief Justice  
20 Rehnquist, we're putting less uncertainty into the Act  
21 than Respondents' reading is because, even Respondents  
22 don't take the extreme position that such administrative  
23 remedies as are available means any procedure in  
24 existence. Even Respondents acknowledge that the  
25 procedure has to be, the administrative remedy has to be

1 capable of addressing the subject matter of the prisoner's  
2 complaint.

3 And with that in mind that would create more  
4 work on the district courts because instead of just  
5 looking at what the prisoner is seeking, what relief and  
6 then is that available in the grievance system, they're  
7 going to have to parse through the subject matter of the  
8 complaint, parse through whether the grievance system can  
9 actually address that, which I think it would create more  
10 work for the district courts.

11 QUESTION: But, I mean, as is opposed to  
12 applying for a library card, is there really going to be  
13 much doubt about whether a prison system can address a  
14 type of grievance?

15 MS. WINKELMAN: But if that's the case, Your  
16 Honor, then I'd go back to the point then the words are  
17 superfluous, why are they in there if there's no doubt?

18 QUESTION: What words? I don't understand. You  
19 did say that before and I didn't understand what you  
20 meant. What --

21 MS. WINKELMAN: If all Congress meant was, is  
22 there a procedure in existence or does the procedure  
23 address the subject matter, it didn't need to say such  
24 administrative remedies as are available because certainly  
25 it goes without saying that there would have to be a

1 grievance procedure in existence and that that procedure

2 --

3 QUESTION: Why does it have to go without --

4 MS. WINKELMAN: Because Congress couldn't have  
5 been intending to write a statute that would require a  
6 prisoner to exhaust if there was no procedure in existence  
7 to begin with.

8 QUESTION: No, but the argument is -- as are  
9 available, as we'll hear the complaint. I mean, obviously  
10 they'll hear it, but I take it that they're willing to  
11 hear it. He has a complaint about something, guard hit  
12 me, as are exhausted. I mean, do you see the obvious  
13 thing? Am I -- what's the answer to that?

14 MS. WINKELMAN: But available means --

15 QUESTION: Available means they'll hear it. Of  
16 course if they won't hear, you don't have to go there.  
17 Will they hear it in your case or not?

18 MS. WINKELMAN: In that case, again I think it  
19 goes without saying, I think that those words then aren't  
20 necessary. Certainly if the prison grievance system -- if  
21 there's no grievance procedure or if it won't hear this  
22 type of complaint, then nobody's suggesting that the  
23 prisoner would have to go through it. Congress didn't  
24 need to add those six words and retain those six words if  
25 that's all it meant to do. I'd like to reserve the

1 remainder of my time for rebuttal.

2 QUESTION: Very well, Ms. Winkelman.

3 Mr. Pappert, we'll hear from you.

4 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GERALD J. PAPPERT

5 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

6 MR. PAPPERT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it  
7 please the Court:

8 In the PLRA, Congress changed the exhaustion  
9 scheme that it had previously imposed upon prisoners  
10 because it had not worked. It had not controlled the  
11 explosive growth in prisoner litigation. Congress amended  
12 the scheme by deleting the requirements that the  
13 administrative remedies be plain, speedy or effective and  
14 by withdrawing from the courts the discretion to determine  
15 whether or not exhaustion is required.

16 In light of these changes, it is clear that  
17 Congress wants prisoners to exhaust their prison  
18 administrative processes whether or not those processes  
19 can provide the prisoner the relief he or she says they  
20 need.

21 QUESTION: And what does that mean? I mean,  
22 that's the -- I mean, I imagine this is a case, which it  
23 isn't, which is only money damages were at stake. There's  
24 nothing else at stake. What does it mean to exhaust a  
25 process where all you want is money and they can't give

1     you any money, what does that mean?

2                 MR. PAPPERT: Your definition of available, Your  
3     Honor, is ours. If the prison will in any way accept the  
4     prisoner's complaint and address it.

5                 QUESTION: And what does it mean? What does it  
6     mean to accept it and hear it when the prisoner's only  
7     asking for money? What does that mean? Can you give  
8     content? I know I wanted to hear her response, but I'm  
9     still puzzled by my own question.

10                MR. PAPPERT: What it means, Your Honor, is what  
11     Congress wanted and that is that there is a presumption  
12     that underlies, I think, the Petitioner's point and your  
13     initial question, which is that, just because money's not  
14     available there is nothing that this process can do for  
15     the prisoner.

16                QUESTION: Well, his complaint is not money.  
17     His complaint is that a guard whacked him over the head or  
18     something of that sort.

19                MR. PAPPERT: Yes, Your Honor.

20                QUESTION: And the way the statute reads, it  
21     says with respect to prison conditions, no action shall be  
22     brought with respect to prison conditions until such  
23     administrative remedies as are available are exhausted and  
24     I gather the condition here is the fact that guards go  
25     about whacking people over the head and the remedies for

1     that are presumably whatever remedies the prison provides  
2     for when you get whacked over the head, which might  
3     include money damages, but might not.

4             MR. PAPPERT: Well, remedy in this statute means  
5     process, Your Honor. Congress wanted the inmates to  
6     exhaust their administrative process.

7             QUESTION: Even though there's nothing at the  
8     end of it? You mean it's just a process. We, you know,  
9     we're not going to give you anything but we're going to  
10    have a hearing and then an appeal and then a second  
11    appeal. Of course, you can't get any relief. Surely it  
12    doesn't mean that.

13            MR. PAPPERT: No, it doesn't. No, it doesn't,  
14    Your Honor. And where I respectfully differ with your  
15    question is again the presumption that it means nothing.  
16    The process means nothing if there isn't money at the end  
17    of the line and the reason that that is not correct is  
18    that there is an indefinite and almost endless list of  
19    ways that the prison could satisfy the prisoner, short of  
20    money. There is always a possibility that the prison can  
21    satisfy the prisoner short of giving him or her money  
22    because in essence the currency equivalence isn't money.  
23    Money has a value within the prisons, but the currency of  
24    prisons is in-kind relief. And there are many things  
25    within a prison that money can't buy and that are very



1     valuable to the prisoner.

2                 QUESTION:  Well, come on, this is a sort they  
3     likes-to-but-what kind of an argument.  What -- if indeed  
4     what the prison can provide is more attractive to the  
5     prisoner than money presumably you wouldn't need this  
6     statute to make him go through the prison procedure.  He  
7     would use it.

8                 MR. PAPPERT:  You would still need the statute.  
9     Again because Congress wanted as many of these claims  
10    going through the administrative process as possible  
11    because they wanted as few --

12                QUESTION:  Well, that's a different argument.  
13    Don't tell me that you're helping the prisoner because  
14    there a lot of things that he would think even more  
15    valuable than money.  If he would think them even more  
16    valuable than money, he'd use them.  This is forcing the  
17    prisoner to go through the prison procedure, which  
18    presumably he doesn't want to go through.

19                MR. PAPPERT:  He says he doesn't want to go  
20    through it, Your Honor, but again I think we make a  
21    mistake to equate what the prisoner says he wants or needs  
22    when he files a grievance, with what the prisoner says he  
23    wants once he files his civil rights complaint.  And the  
24    entire premise upon which the Petitioner's interpretation  
25    is based is that there's absolutely nothing the process

1 can do for him and that's simply not true.

2 There are many things the process can do for  
3 him, but Your Honor, in your hypothetical if the prisoner  
4 goes through the process, if he doesn't accept any of the  
5 various forms of relief that he's offered, if his  
6 allegations, of course, are found to be true by the  
7 prison, he can still go to court. We have no problem with  
8 that. This is just a mechanism to try to weed as many of  
9 the court claims out as possible.

10 QUESTION: And I assume the statute of  
11 limitations on his money claim or any other claim that he  
12 cannot get in the prison grievance system would not start  
13 running until the exhaustion of the administrative  
14 remedies?

15 MR. PAPPERT: I do not think so, Your Honor. I  
16 believe the statute of limitations claim may start to run  
17 earlier and if it does, that is just something that  
18 Congress took into mind when it imposed no doubt a  
19 dramatic difference in how they wanted prisoner litigation  
20 handled. Such that, you know, as long as he goes through  
21 the process, he conceivably can still file a Federal court  
22 claim. The administrative process will be over with in  
23 most cases before a statute of limitations on an  
24 underlying claim --

25 QUESTION: But if it's not -- you're saying,

1 tough luck. You're saying Congress built a process, which  
2 the prison -- if the prison wants to defeat ultimate  
3 relief in court, could just string it out till the time  
4 limit is up and say, well, too bad, we got you.

5 MR. PAPPERT: Your Honor, I agree with part of  
6 your question and respectfully disagree with the second  
7 part. There may be an instance where there is a harsh  
8 result following the prison process and if the statute of  
9 limitation expires it's for a number of reasons. First of  
10 all being that Congress wanted to leave the setting of the  
11 deadlines to the discretion of the States and the  
12 departments of corrections and the local institutions.  
13 So --

14 QUESTION: I could understand the deadlines for  
15 within the prison process. I don't understand something  
16 that says we give you -- the clock starts ticking when the  
17 event occurs, when the alleged assault occurs. And even  
18 if you're in the twirls of the administrative process, it  
19 continues to tick and if the time is up while you're still  
20 in the administrative process, too bad, you can't get to  
21 court, but that's what you're telling me this statute  
22 does. And I don't see the rationale to that.

23 MR. PAPPERT: Well, the rationale is, Your  
24 Honor, first of all, the second part of your prior  
25 question ties into my answer to this question. That was,

1     you indicated that the prison could in effect drag the  
2     process out. We would not agree with that. And we would  
3     say that if the administrative process is not honored by  
4     the prison, the prisoner will still have a remedy. We are  
5     not saying that courts do not have the discretion under  
6     this statute to determine whether exhaustion has, in fact,  
7     taken place.

8                 QUESTION: Well, if that's so, why doesn't it  
9     --

10                QUESTION: A court might well say that a remedy,  
11     which took a greater length of time than the statute of  
12     limitations, was not available since the idea of  
13     exhaustion of remedies is to get ready to go to court.

14                MR. PAPPERT: Well, the idea of exhaustion of  
15     remedies, Mr. Chief Justice, is to prevent having to go to  
16     court, as Congress wanted this statute to work.

17                QUESTION: Well, at any rate a predicate to  
18     going to court. It contemplates the idea that at the end  
19     of the administrative road, the prisoner may still want to  
20     go to court.

21                MR. PAPPERT: Yes Your Honor.

22                QUESTION: Why do you take the position -- there  
23     may be a very simple answer to this, but I don't know what  
24     it is. Why do you take the position that it, why you  
25     assume that the statute of limitations on the damage

1 action cannot be tolled?

2 MR. PAPPERT: I wouldn't assume that, Your  
3 Honor, and that was the point I was leading to.

4 QUESTION: If you don't assume that then you  
5 don't have the problem that you got into with Justice  
6 Ginsburg.

7 MR. PAPPERT: Right.

8 QUESTION: Could have eliminated the last couple  
9 of minutes of a very difficult discussion.

10 MR. PAPPERT: I was honestly trying to get to  
11 that, Your Honor, and that is, that that's my point behind  
12 the fact that courts do not lose the discretion here to  
13 determine whether exhaustion has taken place, which means  
14 that the prisoner's put in the position that Justice  
15 Ginsburg referred to and for no good reason that the  
16 prison simply dragged out the process. The prisoner can  
17 still --

18 QUESTION: Justice Souter was saying less than  
19 that. Justice Souter was saying, and I confess I don't  
20 know any other situation in which you are compelled to  
21 exhaust and the statute keeps on running while you're  
22 exhausting. That seems to be a very unusual situation.  
23 Justice Souter was suggesting that the statute of  
24 limitations is simply tolled while you're exhausting and  
25 you think that is conceivable too, isn't it?

1                   MR. PAPPERT: We believe that the prisoner could  
2 make an equitable tolling argument at the appropriate  
3 time, yes, Your Honor. But another point here though is  
4 that, under the Petitioner's interpretation, we still have  
5 the problem Justice Ginsburg referred to. If there's a  
6 short deadline for the bringing of the claim to the  
7 administrative process, whether or not there's relief at  
8 the end of the line that the Petitioner wants, they still  
9 may have that very situation. So the Petitioner's  
10 interpretation of the statute doesn't satisfy some of the  
11 problems that could come.

12                  QUESTION: Well, I'm somewhat concerned about  
13 your cautious answer. You said, well he could make  
14 argument that there's equitable tolling. That indicates  
15 to me that the State at some later time is to going take  
16 the position there's no tolling and that's of great  
17 concern. If that's your position, I'd like to know it.

18                  MR. PAPPERT: That was in the context, Your  
19 Honor, of what I thought was Justice Ginsburg's hypo of  
20 the prison unreasonably dragging out the process for the  
21 purposes of blowing the statute of limitations. And what  
22 I was saying in response to that is, that in situations  
23 like that, we would determine that exhaustion -- we would  
24 feel that exhaustion has taken place if, for example, the  
25 prisoner submits his claim, the prison sits on it, they do

1 not honor their deadlines under the exhaustion process.  
2 Exhaustion has taken place under that and what I am saying  
3 is there's no prohibition on a court recognizing that.

4 QUESTION: I am concerned about the fact that  
5 there's no general tolling of the statute of limitations.  
6 Suppose the State in all good faith is behind, and -- how  
7 long is the statute of limitations for filing on the  
8 court.

9 MR. PAPPERT: In Pennsylvania under these facts,  
10 it would be two years, Your Honor.

11 QUESTION: All right. I can see a court, prison  
12 system taking 18, 19 months and you say there's no  
13 tolling.

14 MR. PAPPERT: Well, if the deadlines in this  
15 process are honored by Pennsylvania, the process would  
16 take on average probably under 90 days, Your Honor. If  
17 the deadlines have not been honored and the prison has, in  
18 effect, sat on the grievance, the prisoner would have a  
19 remedy, yes. The Petitioner's interpretation of the  
20 statute I think most importantly would reintroduce the  
21 effectiveness requirement that came out in some prior  
22 questions.

23 And it would also allow the prisoner to bypass  
24 the process simply by manipulating the relief that he  
25 requests. And there's no better example of that, I think

1 in response to a question, we heard that it's not just  
2 money. Money might not be the only issue and we get to  
3 the questions of the caps and that is that next time it  
4 may be that the prisoner wants the prison regulations be  
5 declared unconstitutional.

6 And he says that you can't declare it  
7 unconstitutional, prison, so I have to go the Federal  
8 courts. There will be different ways to evade the process  
9 other than by saying that money is all that the prisoner  
10 really wants and that is a risk here. And that, in fact,  
11 happened in one of the cases cited by the Petitioner in  
12 the Fifth Circuit where the prisoner filed a mixed claim,  
13 as in some of the prior questions, the magistrate  
14 recommended dismissal of the claim based on failure to  
15 exhaust. The prisoner quickly amended his claim and made  
16 it solely a money damages case and the Fifth Circuit  
17 allowed that. I mean, that's a clear example of empirical  
18 evidence of how a prisoner got around the exhaustion  
19 requirement and that we know is contrary to what Congress  
20 wanted in this statute.

21 QUESTION: May I ask you to clarify one other  
22 thing? As I recall, in your brief, you said one of the  
23 virtues of the administrative process is that it can  
24 establish a factual record, but I think part of this,  
25 isn't it part of the Pennsylvania rules that whatever's



1 developed in the grievance system cannot be used in court?

2 MR. PAPPERT: Yes, Your Honor, and that's - it  
3 is. Under the Pennsylvania process it's almost as though  
4 a provision tries to foster use of the grievance process  
5 by putting it into the context of settlement negotiations.  
6 We were not speaking in terms of a factual record as a  
7 lower court would deliver to an appellate court. But what  
8 we meant there was there can still be an investigation.  
9 There can be the gathering and preservation of evidence by  
10 the prison, all of which can narrow the claims that do  
11 make it to court and that's what we meant by the value in  
12 a record sense of exhausting the process.

13 QUESTION: May I just clarify one thing in my  
14 own mind about your position? I understand if the  
15 prisoner files a case in which he just asks for damages  
16 and nothing else, it's accusing a guard of beating him up  
17 on a particular occasion. You'd say he must exhaust and  
18 maybe you can satisfy him by transferring the guard or  
19 moving or something like that, but supposing the guard is  
20 dead and there's nothing that could be done to remedy a  
21 situation except money damage, do you still say he should  
22 exhaust?

23 MR. PAPPERT: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor  
24 because --

25 QUESTION: And why again in that hypothetical?

1                   MR. PAPPERT: In that hypo, even though there  
2                   could be no action taken against the guard, there could  
3                   still be something that the prison could give the prisoner  
4                   that would satisfy him. The problem with the Petitioner's  
5                   interpretation of the statute is, we will never know that.  
6                   We don't know that in this case before the claim gets to  
7                   Federal courts and we will not know that in all the cases  
8                   that are similar to this that follow because we never gave  
9                   the prison the chance to try.

10                  QUESTION: Could you give me an example of this.  
11                  My hypothetical is he sues because he was assaulted by a  
12                  guard who since died and nothing else he wants but money.

13                  MR. PAPPERT: Yes.

14                  QUESTION: What could the prison give him that  
15                  would help him?

16                  MR. PAPPERT: The types of relief that they  
17                  could try to satisfy him with, Your Honor, again, could be  
18                  one of any -- a single -- a better cell assignment, a  
19                  single cell, extra privileges.

20                  QUESTION: Let's add to the mix and say the  
21                  prison transferred the prisoner immediately to another  
22                  prison so there's nothing at all they can do for him  
23                  there.

24                  MR. PAPPERT: Your Honor, there are -- yes, Your  
25                  Honor, and I'll assume under your question that there's

1 absolutely nothing the prison can do for that prisoner.  
2 Congress focused more broadly in this statute and there  
3 still things that can benefit the other inmates who remain  
4 at the prison and the prison itself by putting the prison  
5 on notice of the problem and giving the prison the first  
6 opportunity to correct it. So those are benefits that can  
7 flow generally from exhaustion of the process. Even  
8 though under your question, Your Honor, that particular  
9 prisoner was not satisfied.

10 QUESTION: Do you consider that to be an  
11 administrative remedy, even though it doesn't give any  
12 benefit to the inmate at all. That's pretty tough  
13 statutory construction.

14 MR. PAPPERT: Well, again, our --

15 QUESTION: Until such administrative remedies as  
16 are available are exhausted, I'd be inclined to say that  
17 if the prison can't give me any satisfaction that's going  
18 to do me any good, there is no administrative remedy  
19 available.

20 MR. PAPPERT: Well, we define remedy as process,  
21 Your Honor. Remedy is not relief --

22 QUESTION: Oh, that's nice.

23 MR. PAPPERT: -- under this statute.

24 QUESTION: It doesn't say process though, it  
25 says remedies.

1                   MR. PAPPERT: The words are used interchangeably  
2 in the statute and when we do speak of exhaustion of  
3 remedies we don't, as I believe Justice Souter pointed  
4 out, we don't speak of exhaustion of the money or the  
5 injunctive relief, we speak of exhaustion of the process.  
6 So I would respectfully differ with you there, but again  
7 even in your question --

8                   QUESTION: It means a process that provides  
9 relief.

10                  MR. PAPPERT: Yes.

11                  QUESTION: Then what if your prison system,  
12 describing the procedure, says the following relief can be  
13 given and they give a bunch of examples, but none of them  
14 include the hypothetical you've given me. You're  
15 suggesting there's sort of an undefined category of relief  
16 that might be granted by the warden independently, not as  
17 a result of a particular proceeding as I understand it.

18                  MR. PAPPERT: I'm not sure I understand what  
19 you're referring to, Justice Stevens.

20                  QUESTION: Well, my hypo was the dead guard.

21                  MR. PAPPERT: Yeah, oh, okay.

22                  QUESTION: And you say well they might give him  
23 a different cell or they might give him library privileges  
24 or something like that, but if none of that is prescribed  
25 in the procedure, that is, you know, the prison

1 disciplinary remedy procedure, can you still say that's a  
2 part of the available remedies?

3 MR. PAPPERT: Yes, Your Honor. The procedure  
4 itself does not list in it what a prison can or cannot --

5 QUESTION: Supposing the procedure has a limited  
6 set of remedies that it does authorize.

7 MR. PAPPERT: Okay.

8 QUESTION: And then you're still saying, but  
9 that still would not be exhaustive. Is that what you're  
10 saying?

11 MR. PAPPERT: We are still saying that the  
12 prisoner under your question, Your Honor, would have to  
13 exhaust the process because one, there still may be  
14 something that can satisfy him. Two, even if there isn't,  
15 there may be something that can benefit the prison and the  
16 other inmates and three, that even if all the above fail,  
17 the prisoner can still go to court and that's all Congress  
18 really wanted.

19 QUESTION: But you're not saying that there  
20 would be a satisfaction of the statute in the case in which  
21 the prison literally simply provided a forum for  
22 complaints and said we'll never do anything about them,  
23 but if you want to get them off your chest, sure you can  
24 come in and tell us. You're not claiming that that would  
25 satisfy?

1                   MR. PAPPERT: That would not, Your Honor, and  
2 again that gets to our definition of available. If the  
3 prison will accept and address the complaint, he has an  
4 available remedy. Under your question, the prison --

5                   QUESTION: In other words, if some remedy of  
6 some sort is available, that's what you're saying.

7                   MR. PAPPERT: It doesn't hinge as much on  
8 remedy, Your Honor, as it does on whether the prison will  
9 take the complaint and address it in any way and under  
10 your question --

11                  QUESTION: Okay, but if it -- when you say  
12 address, I assume address with the object of providing  
13 relief if there is merit in the complaint, some kind of  
14 relief.

15                  MR. PAPPERT: No, that would more be the  
16 Petitioner's interpretation of the statue as meaning that  
17 the prisoner has to get what he wants, that would not be  
18 our interpretation --

19                  QUESTION: No, I mean that is the prison's  
20 argument, but I mean, I'm suggesting that perhaps the  
21 prisoner would have a good argument here if the prison  
22 said, we have a system that does not provide relief. We  
23 simply have a system in which you can come up and make  
24 your complaints and feel better for having talked to  
25 somebody. The prisoner would say there surely, in that

1 case, we don't have to go through the -- under the statute  
2 does not require us to go through --

3 MR. PAPPERT: That would not be an available  
4 remedy, Your Honor.

5 QUESTION: Why not? It's a procedure. It's a  
6 procedure and it's available. I thought you say remedy  
7 means procedure. You can't have it both ways.

8 MR. PAPPERT: It is not, Justice Scalia, as I'm  
9 interpreting the question. I'm interpreting the question  
10 --

11 QUESTION: You're saying procedure leading to  
12 some conceivable relief.

13 MR. PAPPERT: No, I'm just saying, will they  
14 address it all? And under your question, Your Honor, the  
15 prison is saying, you can bring us the complaint. We're  
16 not going to do anything about it, but if it makes you  
17 feel better, you can drop it on our doorstep, there is no  
18 available remedy there. That is almost -- that's an  
19 exclusion of the claim.

20 QUESTION: What about a chaplain in the armed  
21 forces, which perhaps sometimes serves that purpose, you  
22 know you go talk to the chaplain, nothing much happens.  
23 Thank you, Mr. Pappert.

24 MR. PAPPERT: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 QUESTION: Mr. Gornstein.

1 ORAL ARGUMENT OF IRVING L. GORNSTEIN  
2 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES  
3 AS AMICUS CURIAE, SUPPORTING THE RESPONDENTS  
4 MR. GORNSTEIN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it  
5 please the Court:

6 The PLRA requires an inmate to exhaust available  
7 administrative remedies without regard to whether they  
8 offer the relief that the inmate seeks in court. So if an  
9 institution responds to legitimate complaints about  
10 excessive force through such means as disciplining the  
11 officer involved --

12 QUESTION: May I just, so I'll be sure I have  
13 time to get your answer. What if the system doesn't  
14 provide any relief at all for the particular grievances in  
15 my example?

16 MR. GORNSTEIN: Then we would say that no  
17 administrative remedies are available.

18 QUESTION: You would. So you would just agree  
19 with the State on that point.

20 MR. GORNSTEIN: On that small point and I don't  
21 think it would come up very much because almost often --  
22 almost in all cases there would be something that the  
23 administrative process could do about the complaint and  
24 here we're talking about a complaint about excessive  
25 force. So the available remedies that have to be in



1 existence is just something that addresses complaints  
2 about excessive force and it could be transferring the  
3 inmate to another area, it could be disciplining the  
4 officer involved and directing the officer not to repeat  
5 that conduct and that would show that administrative  
6 remedies are available and an inmate would have to  
7 exhaust, even if he only wants to seek money in court.

8 Now that conclusion follows when the textual  
9 changes that Congress made in the statute. Before the Act  
10 was amended, exhaustion could only be required when the  
11 available administrative remedies were effective. And  
12 this Court said in McCarthy against Madigan that  
13 administrative remedies are not effective when the inmate  
14 seeks only money and the administrative process does not  
15 offer that specific form of relief.

16 QUESTION: And it was dictum there, of course.

17 MR. GORNSTEIN: Of course, it was dictum, but when  
18 Congress is reviewing a statute and are attempting to  
19 amend it, it's very unlikely that Congress is going to  
20 make fine distinctions about whether this Court had a  
21 holding or an analysis that was necessary to the holding  
22 or that it was dicta. What Congress was faced with was an  
23 interpretation of the term effective and the Court  
24 interpreted it to mean then when administrative remedies  
25 do not offer money and the inmate is seeking money, the

1 administrative available remedies are not effective and in  
2 that context, Congress's elimination of the term effective  
3 shows that Congress intended to require inmates to exhaust  
4 available remedies in all cases, including ones like that  
5 in McCarthy, in which the inmate seeks only money and the  
6 available remedies do not offer money.

7 So what we have, what the statute essentially  
8 says to an inmate, is if you have a complaint about prison  
9 conditions and the administrative process will address it  
10 in some way, you must give the administrative process a  
11 chance to do it to your satisfaction and if they cannot do  
12 that --

13 QUESTION: Your interpretation of the word  
14 remedy is more than process then, it's some relief.

15 MR. GORNSTEIN: I think it's some relief, but  
16 that's what I think is implicit in a grievance procedure.  
17 I would just use the word grievance procedure. A  
18 grievance procedure is something that offers some relief  
19 for the kind of complaint that an inmate is complaining  
20 about.

21 And the reason Congress made the particular  
22 changes that it made here is it wanted to reduce the  
23 enormous burden that these kinds of cases were placing on  
24 Federal district courts and the change that it made  
25 accomplishes that in two important ways. First of all, an

1 inmate may start out wanting nothing other than money and  
2 he may end up being satisfied with something else. And  
3 second of all, you have cases where the inmate receives a  
4 decision on the merits and he decides after seeing that  
5 decision that this is not a claim that's worth pursuing in  
6 court.

7 And finally, it's important to note that very  
8 few State administrative programs offer money for anything  
9 other than personal property loss. So the consequence of  
10 accepting the Petitioner's construction here would be that  
11 an inmate would have the ability in a wide range of case  
12 to avoid the exhaustion requirement simply by formulating  
13 a complaint that seeks only money. If the Court has  
14 nothing further --

15 QUESTION: Thank you, Mr. Gornstein. Ms.  
16 Winkelman, you have three minutes remaining.

17 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF NANCY WINKELMAN  
18 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

19 MS. WINKELMAN: And I have three points, Your  
20 Honor. Number one, there's been a lot of discussion about  
21 the types of remedies, disciplining the guard, apologies  
22 and so forth. I would point out and emphasize that none  
23 of what has been mentioned is a remedy to the prisoner for  
24 the particular wrong. In this case, Mr. Booth was  
25 assaulted by prison guards. The only remedy available to

1 address that wrong to him is money damages.

2 Transferring the prison guard is not going to  
3 provide redress to Mr. Booth for the wrong that was  
4 inflicted upon him. And as counsel for the Respondent  
5 conceded, Mr. Booth has a high risk of forfeiting his  
6 money damages claim under Section 1983 completely for no  
7 reason. The prison grievance system cannot remedy that  
8 wrong. He has everything to lose.

9 QUESTION: How is that a forfeit? How does he  
10 forfeit it?

11 MS. WINKELMAN: Because if he misses one of  
12 these short time frames through the prison grievance  
13 system as is pointed out in McCarthy --

14 QUESTION: That's the part I don't understand.  
15 Suppose it's 15 days, all right he has to file in 15 days,  
16 what's the problem?

17 MS. WINKELMAN: If he -- the prison grievance  
18 system has three levels. If he misses one of those time  
19 frames as this Court pointed out in McCarthy, he has a  
20 high risk of forfeiting his Federal claim all together  
21 because when he --

22 QUESTION: That's true of any claim that he has  
23 to -- I mean, that would be true of every claim --

24 MS. WINKELMAN: That's true, but in the  
25 injunctive context, he has something to gain. Here he has

1 nothing to gain. The second point is, is that in terms of  
2 what about couldn't it just mean that the prison grievance  
3 will hear the complaint. I would return this Court to the  
4 words in First Iowa of 55 years ago. When Congress  
5 intends for a litigant to do something futile, it has to  
6 be explicit about it. Here Congress was far than explicit  
7 about it. Under our view, we think it was said the  
8 opposite. At best it was ambiguous, but certainly  
9 Congress didn't explicitly require a prisoner to do a  
10 futile act.

11 And the final point on the deletion of the word  
12 effective, I would point the Court to the prior statutory  
13 scheme because the words plain, speedy and effective in  
14 that scheme right on the face of the statute went only  
15 towards the procedural aspects of the State grievance  
16 procedure. Did it prevent against reprisals? Could it  
17 deal with things quickly enough? That's what Congress  
18 took out. But what Congress left in was such  
19 administrative remedies as are available, which we believe  
20 have force and in this situation the only remedy available  
21 was to pay damages.

22 QUESTION: Thank you, Ms. Winkelman.

23 MS. WINKELMAN: Thank you.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: The case is submitted.

25 (Whereupon, at 12:11 p.m., the case in the

1                   above-entitled matter was submitted.)  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25