

D. Conn.
21-cv-880
Thompson, J.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 1st day of December, two thousand twenty-three.

Present:

Amalya L. Kearse,
Guido Calabresi,
Alison J. Nathan,
Circuit Judges.

Pradeep B. Gupte,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

23-169

Kimberly Davis, HR-Director, Newington Public Schools, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appellant, pro se, moves for appointment of counsel, damages, reinstatement of his employment, court recordings, deposition documents, "compensation for pro bono attorney," leave to file supplemental papers, relief related to the filings from opposing counsel, and a telephonic conference. 2d Cir. 23-169, docs. 27; 28; 60; 67; 98; 101; 119; 131; 142. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motions are DENIED and the appeal is DISMISSED because it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

FOR THE COURT:
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe


UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

----- x
PRADEEP B. GUPTE, :
: :
Plaintiff, :
: :
v. :
: :
KIMBERLY DAVIS, CLARE SALERNO, : Civil No. 3:21-cv-880 (AWT)
and NEWINGTON BOARD OF :
EDUCATION, :
: :
Defendants. :
: :
----- x

RULING ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMNENT

The pro se plaintiff, Pradeep Gupte, brings suit against defendants Kimberly Davis, Director of Talent Management for Newington Public Schools; Clare Salerno, Assistant Director of Student Services for Newington Public Schools; and the Newington Board of Education. In his Amended Complaint, the plaintiff claims that the defendants demoted him from his previous position as a paraeducator and subsequently terminated his employment because of his national origin in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), as amended 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq.; because of his age in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), 29 U.S.C. § 621, et seq.; and because of his disability in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq. The plaintiff also claims that the defendants discriminated

against him in violation 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1983, and that their conduct violated 18 U.S.C. § 1519.

For the reasons set forth below, the defendants' motion for summary judgment is being granted.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff claims that defendant Kimberly Davis demoted him from a full-time position as a paraeducator with the Newington Public Schools to a part-time position as a daily substitute teacher. He also claims that Davis subsequently wrongfully terminated him from the substitute teacher position. The plaintiff claims that defendant Clare Salerno improperly deleted his name from the online management system for substitute teacher assignments and that defendant Davis engaged in conduct that constituted a "cover up." The plaintiff claims that both of these defendants took these actions against him because of his national origin, age, and disability.

On December 8, 2020, the plaintiff wrote an email to Cindy Campbell, Davis' administrative assistant, with the subject line "substitute teacher." The email stated: "Good morning, I am working as a paraeducator in NPS. Is it possible for you to make me a substitute teacher part[-]time/full[-]time in our school system? Thank you for your consideration." Campbell forwarded that email to Davis, who contacted the plaintiff to arrange to meet with him. Subsequently, the plaintiff received a December

9, 2020 letter from the Assistant Superintendent of Schools stating: "This letter will confirm your transfer from your current Paraeducator position at Newington High School to a daily substitute effective Monday, December 14, 2020. If you have any questions, please contact my office at (860) 665-8630." Defs.' Local Rule 56(a)1 Statement (ECF No. 67-1) Exh. A2 at 10. Thus, the plaintiff has failed to create a genuine issue of material fact as to whether the defendants demoted him from his position as a paraeducator.

On March 22, 2021, the plaintiff initiated a lawsuit against defendant Davis in Connecticut Superior Court. See Pradeep Gupte v. Kimberly Davis, UWF-CV21-5027858-S (Conn. Super. Ct. 2021). The plaintiff stated that he was suing Davis for the following reasons:

I was unjust[ifiably] terminated by Newington Public Schools. Kim Davis (HR-Director) falsified the documents (copy attached). All other information is enclosed[.] I worked in that school system since about Nov 4, 2020. Kim Davis falsified the documents (for coverup) which is in violation of US fed code 18 U.S. Code § 1519.

Defs.' Local Rule 56(a)1 Statement (ECF No. 67-3) Exh. C1 at 3. With respect to the attached copy of "falsified" documents, the plaintiff wrote: "Falsified document by Kim Davis. I did[]not work on Dec 17, 2020. I am a 'per-diem' employee. I don't get vacation-pay either. Clare Salerno deleted my name 3 times from 'Aesop document' [and] that is why Kim Davis falsified the

document [and] paid me for [one] day." Id. at 5.

A trial was held in Superior Court on June 4, 2021, after which the court entered judgment in favor of Davis. In the Order rendering judgment in favor of Davis, the court stated:

The plaintiff asserts that the defendant, Kimberly Davis, wrongfully terminated his employment as a "per diem" employee for the Newington school system, and that the defendant falsified certain documents in violation of 18 U.S.C.[] § 1519. . . . The plaintiff also claims that in terminating his employment, the defendant discriminated against the plaintiff based on his national origin and/or heritage.

Defs.' Local Rule 56(a)1 Statement (ECF No. 67-3) Exh. C2 at 11-12.

The court found that "[a]t the hearing that took place . . . on June 4, 2021, Ms. Davis appeared and testified credibly that she terminated the plaintiff for the reasons set forth in her letter to the plaintiff dated January 12, 2021." Id. at 11.

The court quoted extensively from that letter, as follows:

This letter is a follow up to the phone conversation that we had on Monday, January 11, 2021. [I] explained to you that after you had accepted substitute assignments in three different buildings I was contacted by administration who shared the following:

1. Tuesday, January 5, 2021 - Mr. Gupt[e] accepted a half day assignment (3.5 hours) at John Wallace Middle School. The principal Mr. Dias informed me that upon arrival Mr. Gupte looked disheveled and asked where he could put his lunch. The office tried to explain that there was no lunch time during this short assignment but "he didn't seem to listen." He was assigned to the STEM Teacher Mrs. Brinker's room. Mrs. Brinker told Mr. Dias that Mr. Gupte was a distraction during class as he constantly interrupted her and brought up things that

just did not pertain to the lesson or the students' level of understanding. At one point, he took a 30 minute lunch in one o[f] the conference rooms. Principal Dias explained he did not feel comfortable nor confident about having Mr. Gupt[e] as a building substitute and asked that he be taken off the substitute list for his building.

2. Thursday, January 7, 2021 - Mr. Gupte accepted a full day assignment at Newington High School. Throughout the day there seemed to be a lot of confusion around his assignment that caused frustration among building staff. It was also communicated that Mr. Gupte was not wearing his mask appropriately or completely and had to be reminded throughout the day to adjust it. At the end of the day, the secretary called and asked to remove him from their building substitute list.

3. Friday, January 8, 2021 - Mr. Gupte accepted a full day assignment at Anna Reynolds Elementary School. The principal Mr. Smith informed me that he told Mr. Gupte to go home early because he seemed to be having a hard time understanding the assignment which was to provide coverage for scheduled PPT meetings. Additionally, staff had complained that Mr. Gupte was not wearing his mask appropriately and seemed disheveled. Mr. Smith also informed me that he did not think Mr. Gupte was a good fit at the elementary level and wanted him taken off the substitute list for his building.

Id. at 11-12.

The court found that "Ms. Davis also explained how and why the computer screen shots the plaintiff claims reflect false information are accurate." Id. at 12. The Order concludes:

Based on the testimony and evidence submitted by the parties, the court concludes that the plaintiff failed to sustain his burden of proving that the defendant unlawfully terminated the plaintiff's employment or discriminated against him. The court also concludes that the defendant did not falsify any information in violation of 18 U.S.C.[] § 1519.

Id.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A motion for summary judgment may not be granted unless the court determines that there is no genuine issue of material fact to be tried and that the facts as to which there is no such issue warrant judgment for the moving party as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986); Gallo v. Prudential Residential Servs., 22 F.3d 1219, 1223 (2d Cir. 1994). Rule 56(c) "mandates the entry of summary judgment . . . against a party who fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party's case, and on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial." Celotex Corp., 477 U.S. at 322.

When ruling on a motion for summary judgment, the court must respect the province of the jury. The court, therefore, may not try issues of fact. See, e.g., Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986); Donahue v. Windsor Locks Bd. of Fire Comm'rs, 834 F.2d 54, 58 (2d Cir. 1987); Heyman v. Commerce of Indus. Ins. Co., 524 F.2d 1317, 1319-20 (2d Cir. 1975). It is well-established that "[c]redibility determinations, the weighing of the evidence, and the drawing of legitimate inferences from the facts are jury functions, not those of the judge." Anderson, 477 U.S. at 255. Thus, the trial court's task is "carefully limited to discerning whether there are any

genuine issues of material fact to be tried, not deciding them. Its duty, in short, is confined . . . to issue-finding; it does not extend to issue-resolution." Gallo, 22 F.3d at 1224.

Summary judgment is inappropriate only if the issue to be resolved is both genuine and related to a material fact. Therefore, the mere existence of some alleged factual dispute between the parties will not defeat an otherwise properly supported motion for summary judgment. An issue is "genuine . . . if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." Anderson, 477 U.S. at 248 (internal quotation marks omitted). A material fact is one that would "affect the outcome of the suit under the governing law."

Id.

When reviewing the evidence on a motion for summary judgment, the court must "assess the record in the light most favorable to the non-movant . . . and draw all reasonable inferences in its favor." Weinstock v. Columbia Univ., 224 F.3d 33, 41 (2d Cir. 2000) (quoting Delaware & Hudson Ry. Co. v. Consolidated Rail Corp., 902 F.2d 174, 177 (2d Cir. 1990)).

Because the plaintiff in this case is proceeding pro se, the court must read the plaintiff's pleadings and other documents liberally and construe them in a manner most favorable to the plaintiff. See Burgos v. Hopkins, 14 F.3d 787, 790 (2d Cir. 1994). Moreover, because the process of summary judgment

is "not obvious to a layman," Vital v. Interfaith Medical Ctr., 168 F.3d 615, 620 (2d Cir. 1999), the district court must ensure that a pro se plaintiff understands the nature, consequences, and obligations of summary judgment. See id. at 620-621. Thus, the district court may itself notify the pro se plaintiff as to the nature of summary judgment; the court may find that the opposing party's memoranda in support of summary judgment provide adequate notice; or the court may determine, based on thorough review of the record, that the pro se plaintiff understands the nature, consequences, and obligations of summary judgment. See id.

The court finds that the plaintiff understands the nature, consequences, and obligations of summary judgement. First, the defendants served the plaintiff with the notice to pro se litigants required by Local Rule 56(b). Second, the defendants' memorandum states the nature and consequences of summary judgment. Third, the plaintiff submitted a response to the defendants' motion that included documents that he viewed as proving his claim. Finally, the court held oral argument on the motion for summary judgment on October 21, 2022. During that hearing, the plaintiff specifically addressed the argument in the motion for summary judgment with respect to exhaustion of administrative remedies. He also raised a new argument, i.e. that he did not receive a Loudermill hearing, which was

unavailing because he did not have a protected property interest in his position. Most significantly, however, the court specifically highlighted the issue of res judicata and asked the pro se plaintiff for his position with respect to the defendants' contention that the instant lawsuit is the same one he had brought in Connecticut Superior Court, except for the addition of two defendants. The plaintiff's response, in substance, was that he could not remember whether it was or not.

III. DISCUSSION

As discussed above, the Amended Complaint contains five claims against the defendants. The defendants move for summary judgment on the grounds that (1) the plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies with respect to the Title VII, ADEA, and ADA claims; (2) the plaintiff's claims are barred under the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel; (3) the plaintiff cannot establish a prima facie case with respect to his claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1983; (4) 18 U.S.C. § 1519 does not give rise to a private cause of action; and (5) defendants Kimberly Davis and Clare Salerno cannot be individually liable under Title VII, the ADEA and the ADA.

The court agrees that the plaintiff's discrimination claims are barred under the doctrine of res judicata. The court also agrees that 18 U.S.C. § 1519 does not provide for private cause of action. Consequently, the court does not reach the

defendants' other arguments.

"Res judicata bars re-litigation if '(1) the previous action involved an adjudication on the merits; (2) the previous action involved the plaintiffs or those in privity with them; [and] (3) the claims asserted in the subsequent action were, or could have been, raised in the prior action.'" Soules v. Connecticut Dep't of Emergency Servs. & Pub. Prot., 882 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2018) (quoting Monahan v. N.Y.C. Dep't of Corr., 214 F.3d 275, 285 (2d Cir. 2000)).

As to the first element, the Connecticut Superior Court judgment was an adjudication on the merits for the purposes of res judicata. "Adjudication on the merits has a well settled meaning: a decision finally resolving the parties' claims . . . that is based on the substance of the claim advanced, rather than on a procedural, or other, ground." Sellan v. Kuhlman, 261 F.3d 303, 311 (2d Cir. 2001) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Here, the Connecticut Superior Court entered judgment in favor of Davis after a trial on the merits.

The second element is satisfied because the plaintiff himself filed the prior action in Connecticut Superior Court.

The third element requires that the claims asserted in the present action were, or could have been, raised in the plaintiff's prior action in Connecticut Superior Court.

As to third element, we consider whether the second lawsuit concerns "the same claim - or nucleus of operative facts - as the first suit;" applying three considerations: "(1) whether the underlying facts are related in time, space, origin, or motivation; (2) whether the underlying facts form a convenient trial unit; and (3) whether their treatment as a unit conforms to the parties' expectations."

Soules, 882 F.3d at 55 (quoting Channer v. Dep't of Homeland Sec., 527 F.3d 275, 280 (2d Cir. 2008)). "Res judicata 'is based on the requirement that the plaintiff must bring all claims at once against the same defendant relating to the same transaction or event.'" Soules, 882 F.3d at 55 (quoting N. Assur. Co. of Am. v. Square D Co., 201 F.3d 84, 88 (2d Cir. 2000) (internal citation omitted)).

The underlying facts in the present action and in the Connecticut Superior Court action are related in time, space, origin, and motivation. Both cases arise out of the termination of the plaintiff's employment on January 11, 2021 and the key question in each case is whether the reasons given by Davis in her January 12, 2021 letter were a pretext for discrimination. In the prior action, the plaintiff claimed that those reasons were a pretext for discrimination on the basis of his national origin and/or heritage. In the instant action, the plaintiff contends that those reasons were a pretext for discrimination on the basis of not only his national origin and/or heritage, but also on the basis of age, disability, and race. Thus, the

question of the decisionmakers' motivation in terminating the plaintiff's employment is at the heart of both cases. Although the plaintiff adds Salerno and the Newington Board of Education as defendants in this case, the assessment of Salerno's conduct was a significant part of the litigation in Connecticut Superior Court. In his complaint there, the plaintiff specifically referenced conduct by Salerno, and the Superior Court specifically found, that the plaintiff's contention that the computer screen shots reflect false information lacks merit. The Newington Board of Education also has been added as a defendant in this case; while it was not a defendant in the prior action, Davis was at all times acting as a duly authorized agent of the Newington Board of Education, namely the Director of Talent Management for the Newington Public Schools.

Because the prior action and the present action arise from the same alleged conduct, and the same witnesses and evidence would be involved, the underlying facts would have formed a convenient trial unit. See Waldman v. Village Of Kiryas Joel, 207 F.3d 105 112 (citing Interoceanica Corp. v. Sound Pilots, Inc., 107 F.3d 86, 90 (2d Cir. 1997)). Also, treating this single set of facts as a unit would conform to the parties' expectations. Consequently, the employment discrimination claims in the present action involve the same nucleus of operative facts as those in the plaintiff's prior action in Connecticut

Superior Court, and the plaintiff could have raised all of his claims here in that prior action.

The plaintiff asserted claims pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1519 in the prior action and also does so in this case. "[I]f state preclusion law includes [the] requirement of prior jurisdictional competency, which is generally true, a state judgment will not have claim preclusive effect on a cause of action within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts."

Valley Disposal, Inc. v. Cent. Vt. Solid Waste Mgmt. Dist., 31 F.3d 89, 98 (2d Cir. 1994) (quoting Maresse v. Am. Acad. Of Orthopaedic Surgeons, 470 U.S. 373, 382 (1985)) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Here, 18 U.S.C. § 1519 is a federal criminal statute and therefore does not fall within the subject matter jurisdiction of state courts. See United States v. Balde, 943 F.3d 73, 88 (2d Cir. 2019) ("Congress has granted the district courts jurisdiction over federal criminal prosecutions in 18 U.S.C. § 3231. That statute provides that the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.") (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

Therefore, the plaintiff's claim based on 18 U.S.C. § 1519 is not barred by res judicata. However, the defendants' motion

must nonetheless be granted because 18 U.S.C. § 1519 does not provide for a private cause of action. See Robinson v. Overseas Military Sales Corp., 21 F.3d 502, 511 (2d Cir. 1994) ("To the extent that Appellants assert claims based on the violation of criminal statutes, . . . these claims are not cognizable, as federal criminal statutes do not provide private causes of action.").

Therefore, all of the plaintiff's claims, except the claim based on 18 U.S.C. § 1519, are barred by res judicata. The defendants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law with respect to the claim based on 18 U.S.C. § 1519 because that statute does not provide for a private cause of action.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF no. 65) is hereby GRANTED.

The Clerk shall enter judgment in favor of the defendants on all of the plaintiff's claims and close this case.

It is so ordered.

Dated this 23rd day of January 2023, at Hartford, Connecticut.

/s/AWT
Alvin W. Thompson
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

PRADEEP B. GUPTE,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 3:21-cv-880 (AWT)

v.

**KIMBERLY DAVIS, HR-Director,
Newington public schools,**

NEWINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION,

CLARE SALERNO,

Defendants.

JUDGMENT

This action having come on for consideration of the defendants' motion for summary judgment, before the Honorable Alvin W. Thompson, United States District Judge.

The Court having considered the full record of the case including applicable principles of law, granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment. It is therefore;

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that judgment is hereby entered in favor of the defendants on all of the plaintiff's claims, and this case is closed.

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut, this 27th day of January, 2023.

DINAH MILTON KINNEY, Clerk

By /s/ Linda S. Ferguson
Linda S. Ferguson
Deputy Clerk

Please compare the defendant's next 3 "Aesop" pages.

In the 1st Aesop page.....> (DOC 67-1); Jan 5,6,7,8,11,there are no Blue colors.

In the 2nd Aesop page.....>(DOC 73-1); Jan 5,6,7,8,11.....there are Blue colors.

In the 3rd Aesop page.....> There are pink colors for "Christmas "vacation.

Blue color means I worked for those days. Pink color means "Vacation days".

There are no Pink colors for Christmas Vacation in (67-1) and (73-1) documents.

Please look at the 3rd Aesop page: There are **pink colors for Christmas** Vacation.

This substantiates the fact that the defendant-Respondent has **falsified** the documents which is in violation of **18 USC 1519**.

Why Substitute View → Why this post is handwritten?

Why this post is hand-written?

EXHIBIT A

There are not "7 assignments" here as mentioned in their affidavit.

November 2020												December 2020																																																											
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	26	27	28	29	30	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	26	27	28	29	30												
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	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	26	27	28	29	30	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	26	27	28	29	30		
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	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	26	27	28	29	30	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	26	27	28	29	30

1 jobs

Exhibit A6

Daily Substitute View → "Why this part is hand-written"

VERMAS
PRADEEP GUPTA Absence Management Newington Public Schools

NAVIGATION

- Home
- Available Jobs
- History
- Preferences

November 2020 December 2020 January 2021

SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	

Displaying: 11/18/2020 to 3/18/2021

Select a date range: Last 60 days Last 90 Days This School Year Last School Year Custom

7 Jobs

Date	Time	Duration	Location	Report to	Confirmation
Stewart, Rachel	Grade 8 Science Teacher	Report to	MAIN OFFICE	CONFIRMATION #43127587	
Dec. 12/15/2020	7:45 AM - 3:10 PM	Full Day	John Wallace Middle School		
Sosa, Mesta	Para Educator	Report to Main Office		CONFIRMATION #43154641	
Dec. 12/18/2020	7:14 AM - 2:49 PM	Full Day	Newington High School		
Bolduc, Richard	Para Educator Assistant	Report to: MAIN OFFICE		CONFIRMATION #43274451	
Dec. 23/2021	11:30AM - 3:10 PM	Half Day	John Wallace Middle School		

Frontline © 2021 All rights reserved

There are only 6 jobs here.
Why is it written 7 jobs (assignments)
in defendant's affidavit?

Management

Newington Public Schools

Log in

Logout

Absences

Feedback

Attendance

Library

December 2020

January 2021

1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	
14	15	16	17	18	
21	22	23	24	25	
28	29	30	31		

1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	
14	15	16	17	18	
21	22	23	24	25	
28	29	30	31		

Create Absence

Please select a date

December 2020

0

Scheduled Absences

0

Unscheduled Absences

Signature Required

Res

ection 1519 - Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records in Federal investigations and bankruptcy

38 Analyses of this statute by attorneys

1. SCOTUS limits the “tangible objects” covered by 18 U.S.C. 1519’s evidence destruction prohibition

Wisconsin State Public DefenderFebruary 25, 2015

Yates v. United States, USSC No. 13-7451, 2015 WL 773330 (February 25, 2015); reversing 733 F.3d 1059 (11th Cir. 2013); Scotusblog pageIn a four-one-four decision that is chock-a-block with nautical references and features some sparring about the canons and methods of statutory interpretation, the Supreme Court holds that the “anti-shredding provision” of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, ~~18 U.S.C. § 1519~~, applies only to records, documents, or similar types of “tangible objects” used to record or preserve information. Thus, Yates’s conviction—for destroying fish that were evidence of his alleged violation of federal fishing regulations—must be jettisoned: “A fish is no doubt an object that is tangible; fish can be seen, caught, and handled, and a catch, as this case illustrates, is vulnerable to destruction.

2. July Edition of Notable Cases and Events in E-Discovery

- 1) Please look at defendant's Document 65, (I): Title VII's charge filing requirement is not jurisdictional: *Fort Bend County, TX v Davis* (18-525, Supreme Court). It is discreet and is ordinarily forfeited if not timely asserted. My case was filed in this court as Document # [1]. Defendant raised the issue of Administrative remedies in Document # [20]. There were several documents written between the two (2).
- 2) Please look at defendant's Document 65 (II): If a case is dismissed in a lower court; people have a choice to file the same case in a higher court. In addition, there are 2 more defendants in the amended complaint (Clare Salerno and Newington Board of Education). Therefore, this is not exactly the same case as filed in Waterbury Court.
- 3) How would someone know somebody's age at the time of interview? People can have gray hair at the age of 30 also.
- 4) According to Kim Davis's affidavit, at the time of my termination, she complained that I alleged constantly interrupted her, raised my voice and brought up "previous situations." In other words, Kim Davis failed to provide me with due process in my termination. She did not want to listen to anything I said and therefore violated my civil rights. I did not receive any "Loudermill" hearing.
- 5) Kim Davis did not tell me that Substitute Teachers are paid less than paraeducators.
- 6) *Noffsinger v SSC Niantic Operating Company*: Case # 3:16-cv-01938(JAM). Count 3 of this case was accepted by the Judge allowing the lawsuit to move forward. Please note that the plaintiff eventually won the suit. Count 3 addresses plaintiff's emotional state being amplified by defendant's conduct. My emotional challenges and anxiety have been amplified by the defendant's conduct (please look at the deposition regarding my disability and mental condition). I am a disabled person and on lot of medications for my bipolar disorder and anxiety.
- 7) In her interrogatories, Kim Davis has written that the school doesn't keep track of electronic documents. If it is true, then how defendant has included one "Aesop" document in Summary Judgment (look at exhibit A).
- 8) Why defendant has not included the original Aesop document with blue and pink colors in the summary judgment? Please look at exhibit-A. Defendant sent me the original Aesop document with blue and pink colors in Waterbury court case. This means the document included in summary judgment is falsified.
- 9) Newington Board of Education is also a defendant which means every employee of that school system is a defendant by inference.
- 10) Superintendent, Asst Superintendent, Clare Salerno, Ms Tagno (Principal of that school), all are of one particular race and national origin. I am not of that particular race or national origin. Race is an issue; national origin is an issue.
- 11) One person made a racist remark. I have mentioned that before during the court hearing.
- 12) Please look at 67-1: 32, 33, 34, 35 are totally false. Ms Davis did not show any documents to the Judge. It was a remote hearing. Judge said that he did not have any documents in front of him.
- 13) *Ashcroft v Iqbal* (556 US 662): To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim of relief that is plausible on its face.



NEWINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

131 CEDAR STREET • NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111
TEL: 860.667.2000 • FAX: 860.665.8616 • WWW.NPSCT.ORG

December 9, 2020

Pradeep Gupte
163 Mark Lane Apt. 17
Waterbury, CT 06704

Dear Pradeep:

This letter will confirm your transfer from your current Paraeducator position at Newington High School to a daily substitute effective Monday, December 14, 2020.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at (860) 665-8630.

Sincerely,


Mr. Stephen Foresi
Assistant Superintendent of Schools

cc: Terra Tigno, Principal, Newington High School
Marilena Giulioso, Director of Student Services
Clare Salerno, Assistant Director of Student Services
Business Office - A. DiVorniero, S. Fletcher, K. Cyr

Title VII → Imp

(All names of
one
particular
national
origin)

"National origin"
is an issue → Title VII





March 5, 2021

RE: Pradeep Gupte **D.O.B: 12/12/1955**

To whom it may concern:

Pradeep Gupte is a patient of this office and is currently under my care. We are writing to inform that Pradeep suffers from multiple medical issues including: diabetes, bipolar disorder, and acid reflux, making it difficult and/or impossible to eat at night.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further information. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gloria Nardella, DNP
Genesis Medica, LLC



GENESIS MEDICA
1327 Meriden Road
Wolcott, CT 06716
P: (475) 224-6766
F: (203) 528-3817

GENESIS MEDICA

1327 Meriden Road
Wolcott, CT 06716
P: (475) 224-6766
F: (203) 528-3817

215 Sherman Avenue
Hamden, CT 06518
P: (203) 288-6800
F: (203) 287-1953

1427 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06511
P: (203) 865-3880
F: (203) 624-5609

111 Park Street, Ste 1G
New Haven, CT 06511
P: (203) 865-3880
F: (203) 624-5609

247 Broad Street
Milford, CT 06460
P: (203) 865-3880
F: (203) 624-5609

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Date: July 31, 2023
BNC#: 23BC931J57300
REF: A

PRADEEP B GUPTA
299 ROUTE 87 APT 2C
COLUMBIA CT 06237-1145

You asked us for information from your record. The information that you requested is shown below. If you want anyone else to have this information, you may send them this letter.

Information About Current Social Security Benefits

Beginning December 2022, the full monthly Social Security benefit before any deductions is.....\$ 1835.30

We deduct \$164.90 for medical insurance premiums each month.

The regular monthly Social Security payment is.....\$ 1670.00
(We must round down to the whole dollar.)

Social Security benefits for a given month are paid the following month. (For example, Social Security benefits for March are paid in April.)

Your Social Security benefits are paid on or about the third of each month.

Other Important Information

AN ADDITIONAL [25\$ IS WITHHELD] DUE TO AN OVERPAYMENT.

Medicare Information

You are entitled to hospital insurance under Medicare beginning November 1999.

You are entitled to medical insurance under Medicare beginning July 2006.

Your Medicare number is 8ND4-R39-WT85. You may use this number to get medical services while waiting for your Medicare card.

If you have any questions, please log into Medicare.gov, or call 1-800-MEDICARE (1-800-633-4227).

Type of Social Security Benefit Information

You are entitled to monthly retirement benefits.



MEDICARE HEALTH INSURANCE

Name/Nombre

PRADEEP B GUPTA

Medicare Number/Número de Medicare
2NQ9-TQ9-HF45

Entitled to/Con derecho a

HOSPITAL (PART A)
MEDICAL (PART B)

Coverage starts/Cobertura empieza

11-01-1999
07-01-2006


April 15, 2016

To Whom This May Concern:

I am writing this reference letter at the request of Mr. Pradeep Gupte who has been an adjunct in the Chemistry Department at Western Connecticut State University for two semesters. Dr. Gupte is a pleasant, friendly individual and seems to have a diverse background in chemistry, based on discussions we have had regarding his past positions in the chemical field. He has taught our "Everyday Chemistry" lab (a course for non-science majors), and a General Chemistry I Lab, each for one semester and seems reliable and responsible. He recently took the initiative to apply for, and received funding from university's AAUP resources to attend the 2016 ACS meeting in San Diego, CA. I have not observed his labs other than in passing through during waste pickups, but he seems to be adhering to our safety and waste handling practices.

In short, based on my personal interactions with Mr. Gupte, I feel that he would be a viable candidate for an adjunct position as a laboratory instructor in introductory chemistry courses at your institution.

Yours truly,



Richard P. Molinelli, Ph. D.
Chemistry Technical Specialist
Western Connecticut State University
Danbury, CT 06810

Ph: (203) 837-8321

NCC Professors.

Horoszczak, Anna M

Mon 11/3/2014 12:03 PM

To:mbarber@ncc.commnet.edu <mbarber@ncc.commnet.edu>;

Dear Ms. Barber,

This is my first semester at Norwalk Community College, and I just wanted to inform you that I'm impressed with the professors here. I'm currently taking Chemistry 111 with Professor Pradeep Gupte, and so far it has been a pleasant and rewarding experience (my grade is a solid A). He's a very passionate teacher who wants to see his students do well. It's refreshing to see a professor's eyes light up with joy when he embarks on the arduous journey of explaining a difficult topic to his class. What a blessing indeed.

Sincerely,
Anna Maria Horoszczak

Dr. Selzerr,

I am a student in the Chemistry 110 course, and I have Professor Gupte for lab. I have nothing but kind words to say about him and his class.

First, Professor Gupte is incredibly knowledgeable in Chemistry—this is evident in the way he teaches. While explaining important concepts to the class before labs, he relays the information clearly, often in more than one way to ensure that all students fully grasp the content, and with ample examples and demonstrations. He also makes sure the class understands key points before moving forward, be it to a new point or to allowing the class to begin the experiment. If students are unsure about a concept, he will give them the time and attention they need to get their questions answered, and fully understand the material. He shows a true desire to teach people, and it's incredibly refreshing to feel that energy in his class.

Second, Professor Gupte's grading policy is beyond fair. The guidelines for each assignment is clearly outlined well before the due date, so the class is well aware of what is expected of them. In addition, if there is a question regarding the grading, he will sit down with the student and explain why points were deducted, and is willing to reconsider the grade if it seems, upon a second reading, unfair. Not only does this system allow the student to get indepth feedback, but it allows them to feel as if they received the grade they earned.

Finally, Professor Gupte is both friendly, as easily approachable. I have felt comfortable enough in his class to both fully participate and ask for clarification when need be—as a result, I feel like I have learned a lot in his lab section, and I am very happy to have had him as my lab professor.

Regards,

Rebecca Norton

SUSPECT SOCIAL SECURITY FRAUD?

Please visit <http://oig.ssa.gov/r> or call the Inspector General's Fraud Hotline at 1-800-269-0271 (TTY 1-866-501-2101).

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS

Need more help?

1. Visit www.ssa.gov for fast, simple, and secure online service.
2. Call us at 1-800-772-1213, weekdays from 8:00 am to 7:00 pm. If you are deaf or hard of hearing, call TTY 1-800-325-0778. Please mention this letter when you call.
3. You may also call your local office at 877-405-0488.

SOCIAL SECURITY
STE 19
1320 MAIN ST
WILLIMANTIC, CT 06226

How are we doing? Go to www.ssa.gov/feedback to tell us.

OFFICE MANAGER

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Pradeep B Gupte — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.
Kimberly Davis et al — RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Pradeep Gupte, do swear or declare that on this date,
Dec 9, 2023, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

David Monastersky
100 Great Meadow Rd # 201
Wethersfield, CT 06109

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 9, 2023

PB Gupte
(Signature)