

25-6365

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 25-6365

TIMOTHY ROBERT PROVO,
Petitioner,

v.

GEOFFREY W. TENNEY, et al.,
Respondents.

SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION FOR REHEARING

UNDER RULE 44.2

Petitioner respectfully submits this limited supplement to his pending Petition for Rehearing under Rule 44.2 to advise the Court of additional intervening circumstances of substantial effect arising after this Court's February 23, 2026 denial of certiorari and after Petitioner's March 4, 2026 Rule 44.2 supplement.

This filing does not reargue the petition. It is submitted solely to notify the Court that the precise breakdown in neutral review, transcript access, and ADA-compliant process that Petitioner warned of in his pending rehearing papers has now been confirmed by subsequent state-court action.

In his March 4, 2026 Rule 44.2 supplement, Petitioner advised this Court that he had filed in Wright County a focused motion seeking enforcement and clarification of the existing Supplemental Order for Fee Waiver; production of complete transcripts or a sworn certification of transcript status; enforcement of ADA accommodations for written communication and record access; preservation of transcript-request records and metadata; and protection against additional transcript charges beyond what had already been ordered and paid. Petitioner

further advised this Court that if the state court again ignored or summarily denied that motion, it would confirm that, in practice, there is no functioning mechanism by which a disabled, indigent litigant can obtain the basic record necessary to challenge the void and unconstitutional acts already described in the petition and rehearing papers.

That warning has now been borne out.

I. Rule 377 Review Collapsed Into Self-Review and Then No Review

Petitioner's Motion for Review under Minn. R. Gen. Prac. 377 was filed on November 12, 2025. The matter was assigned to Judge Geoffrey W. Tenney. The register of actions later reflected that on January 27, 2026, Child Support Magistrate Kirsten Simonds—the same judicial officer whose order was supposedly under review—had “taken [the matter] under advisement.”

Then, on February 26, 2026, three days after this Court denied certiorari, Wright County issued a Deficiency Notice stating that Petitioner's November 12, 2025 Motion for Review of Magistrate Order “will not be reviewed by a Judicial Officer.”

That sequence is material. What purported to be judicial review first appeared to be active, then reflected self-review by the same magistrate, and then, after this Court's denial, was converted into a deficiency-based refusal stating that the motion would not be reviewed by any judicial officer at all. This sequence demonstrates that the Rule 377 mechanism, as applied in this case, did not result in review by a neutral judicial officer. It has instead functioned as a closed procedural loop in which review is reassigned, delayed, redirected, or extinguished without any actual adjudication by a neutral judicial officer.

II. March 13, 2026 Notice of Judicial Determination Confirmed Continuing Transcript and ADA Obstruction

On March 5, 2026, Petitioner filed in Minnesota Case No. 86-FA-21-15 a motion seeking enforcement and clarification of the February 5, 2025 Supplemental Order for Fee Waiver; production of complete transcripts or a sworn written certification of transcript status; enforcement of ADA accommodations for record access and written communication; preservation of transcript-request records, audit logs, and related metadata; and protection against further transcript charges beyond what had already been ordered and paid.

Because the court reporter had already demanded a new supplemental fee-waiver submission before preparing the remainder of the December 21, 2021 transcript, Petitioner also filed a narrow supplemental fee-waiver request under protest and without waiving his position that the existing order already entitled him to the needed transcript and that no additional financial condition could lawfully be imposed.

On March 13, 2026, legally recused Judge Geoffrey W. Tenney issued a Notice of Judicial Determination concerning that motion. The determination stated in substance that the prior fee-waiver order covered the November 21, 2024 transcript and only the December 21, 2021 transcript material already in the court file, and that if Petitioner sought the remainder of the December 21, 2021 hearing, he was required to file an updated fee-waiver request identifying the hearing dates sought, estimated cost, and updated income information.

That determination did not adjudicate the broader relief Petitioner sought in the March 5, 2026 motion package. It did not order complete transcript production. It did not require a sworn certification identifying what transcript, audio, or stenographic record exists and why the remainder has not been produced. It did not issue any written ADA determination. It did not address preservation of logs,

metadata, or transcript-request records. It did not address prior transcript payments already made. Instead, it redirected Petitioner into yet another fee-waiver loop.

The determination therefore did not resolve whether a full transcript would be produced, whether the existing order already covered that production, or what complete record actually exists for review.

The March 13, 2026 Notice of Judicial Determination also confirms the limited and non-adjudicative nature of the state court's response. Petitioner's March 5, 2026 filing was submitted as a consolidated packet expressly identifying:

- 1. a motion to enforce and clarify the supplemental fee-waiver order, compel transcript production, and enforce ADA record-access accommodations;**
- 2. an exhibit packet; and**
- 3. a supplemental fee-waiver request.**

Yet the signed determination, entered on that same filing page, addressed only whether Petitioner should submit another updated fee-waiver request for the remainder of the December 21, 2021 hearing transcript, while acknowledging that the transcript already in the file was only partial. It did not separately adjudicate the broader motion relief identified on the face of the filing itself.

This is especially material because the determination was issued by the same state judicial officer whose continuing authority Petitioner has challenged. Instead of addressing the motion package as filed, the response reduced the matter to another fee-waiver question and left the separately requested transcript, certification, ADA, and preservation relief unresolved.

III. These Post-Denial Events Confirm the Exact Rule 44.2 Problem Already Presented

These post-denial events do not expand the grounds already before the Court; they confirm them.

Petitioner has consistently presented the same practical federal problem: no court or reviewing body is meaningfully adjudicating the recusal, jurisdictional, ADA, transcript-access, and record-integrity issues. Instead, those issues are repeatedly displaced into procedural loops, fee-based barriers, administrative silence, unsigned or unexplained dispositions, self-review, or no review altogether.

The February 26, 2026 Deficiency Notice stating that Petitioner's Rule 377 motion "will not be reviewed by a Judicial Officer," together with the March 13, 2026 determination redirecting Petitioner into another fee-waiver process instead of adjudicating the requested transcript, certification, and ADA relief, confirms that the harms described in the petition and rehearing papers are not merely historical. They are continuing in real time.

These developments also confirm that the same state judicial officer whose continuing authority Petitioner has challenged continues to act in the case while the underlying recusal and jurisdictional objections remain unresolved, and that the state court's response to Petitioner's transcript and ADA-related filings remains procedural and obstructive rather than adjudicative.

The consequences are not merely historical. Petitioner remains subject to an active family-court case in which additional motions, including parenting-time enforcement, may require prompt filing. Yet the post-denial events described above demonstrate that the available review structure is not functioning as a neutral judicial forum. Petitioner is thus forced into a procedural void in which even urgent requests for lawful relief are subject to the same pattern of self-review, non-review, and procedural obstruction already presented to this Court.

The original Rule 44.2 filings already showed that, after this Court issued a Call for Response, no respondent filed any brief in opposition or waiver on the docket, while the state Rule 377 process shifted from apparent review to self-review and then to a deficiency-based refusal blocking judicial review altogether. The docket record therefore reinforces the practical point that, while Petitioner attempted to proceed within orderly channels during the pendency of Supreme Court review, the lower-court process did not become more neutral or lawful. It instead hardened into the same closed loop of shifting docket treatment, self-review, and non-review described in the petition and rehearing papers.

In practical terms, Petitioner remains denied:

- **a full and usable record;**
- **an ADA-compliant written determination on record-access requests;**
- **neutral judicial review of his Rule 377 challenge; and**
- **any functioning mechanism by which the federal constitutional and disability-related violations already before this Court can be meaningfully reviewed.**

IV. Relevance Under Rule 44.2

These are intervening circumstances of substantial effect under Rule 44.2. They confirm that, even after this Court's denial of certiorari, the same structural barriers identified in the petition continue to operate: recusal objections are not neutrally resolved, transcript access is conditioned on repeated financial and procedural obstacles, ADA requests remain unresolved, and apparent avenues of review collapse into self-review or no review at all.

Petitioner respectfully does not submit this supplement to relitigate the merits of certiorari. He submits it because the events described above demonstrate that the constitutional and ADA-related barriers identified in the petition and rehearing papers are ongoing and worsening during this Court's rehearing window, and

because those events now confirm the exact contingency previously presented to the Court.

These intervening events demonstrate that the structural barriers identified in the petition continue to operate during the Court's rehearing window and that Petitioner remains without any functioning forum capable of providing neutral review of the federal and disability-related issues presented. Petitioner therefore respectfully submits this supplement so the Court may consider these developments in evaluating the pending Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy Robert Provo

1567 Plum Creek Dr SE

Cambridge, MN 55008

(320) 333-7478

timprovo81@gmail.com

APPENDIX / EXHIBITS

Exhibit A

Register of Actions entries reflecting the January 27, 2026 "taken under advisement" entry and the February 26, 2026 Deficiency Notice stating the Rule 377 motion "will not be reviewed by a Judicial Officer."

Exhibit B

March 13, 2026 Notice of Judicial Determination (Index #332) issued by Judge Geoffrey W. Tenney regarding transcript access and fee-waiver requirements.

Exhibit C

Petitioner's March 5, 2026 Motion seeking:

1. enforcement and clarification of the February 5, 2025 Supplemental Order for Fee Waiver;
2. production of complete transcripts or sworn certification of transcript status;
3. enforcement of ADA accommodations for written communication and record access;
4. preservation of transcript-request records and metadata; and
5. Petitioner's March 5, 2026 supplemental fee-waiver request filed under protest and without waiver of the existing fee-waiver order.

Ex. A

Respondent**PROVO, TIMOTHY ROBERT**

DOB: 09/11/1981

Cambridge, MN 55008

Self-Represented Litigant**Attorneys Inactive**

- HAGE, TRISTAM O
- HOLLY, GREGORY PATRICK
- LEE, FONG ERIC
- LINDSTROM, APRIL ANNE
- THOMPSON, TRAVIS CRAIG
- WALSH, PADRAIC DANIEL
- WASIK, MATTHEW ROBERT

Case Events

01/27/2026	Taken Under Advisement Judicial Officer: Simonds, Kirsten Index #327
12/10/2025	Notice of Filing of Order Index #326
12/03/2025	Order Granting Fee Waiver Party: Respondent PROVO, TIMOTHY ROBERT Index #325
11/25/2025	Notice by Attorney or Party Index #324
11/24/2025	Motion Index #323
11/24/2025	Affidavit to Request Fee Waiver Party: Respondent PROVO, TIMOTHY ROBERT Index #322
11/23/2025	Notice by Attorney or Party Index #321



1 page



3 pages

State of Minnesota
Wright County

District Court
Tenth Judicial District

Ex. A

Court File Number: **86-FA-21-15**

Case Type: Dissolution with Child

Deficiency Notice – Family Case

FILE COPY

In re the Marriage of Emily Anne Provo and TIMOTHY ROBERT PROVO, Wright County, Intervenor

We are Unable to Provide the Requested Service:

On 11/12/2025, Mr. Provo filed a Motion for Review of Magistrate Order A Notice of Deficiency was sent to Mr. Provo on 11/14/2025, requesting that the required Affidavits of Service be filed, evidencing the Motion for Review of Magistrate Order was served upon the other parties.

To date, Affidavits of Service have not been filed with the court. The 11/12/2025 Motion for Review of Magistrate Order and correlated Magistrate Order will not be reviewed by a Judicial Officer.

For future reference, the appropriate forms to request review of a magistrate's order can be found on mncourts.gov.

Thank you

Wright County District Court
3700 Braddock Avenue NE, Room 1100
Buffalo MN 55313

Dated: February 26, 2026

Emily Cooper, Timothy Provo

Monica Tschumper
Court Administrator
Wright County District Court
763-760-6300

Ex. B

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
3/5/2026 11:54 AM

State of Minnesota
District Court – Tenth Judicial District
County of Wright

Case No. 86-FA-21-15

In re the Marriage of:

Emily Anne Provo,
Petitioner,

and

Timothy Robert Provo,
Respondent.

The Courts supplemental order regarding fee waiver request provided that a transcript would be prepared for November 21, 2024 at a cost of \$120.00 and found that there was already a transcript prepared for December 21, 2021 in the court file, it ordered that the Respondent shall be given a copy, that was a partial transcript. The Respondent seeks a transcript for the remainder of the hearing on December 21, 2021. The last supplemental affidavit for fee waiver request was filed in February of 2025, Respondent shall file an updated fee waiver request and be provided the court forms to do so. When Respondent files a supplemental fee waiver request with the Court forms he is provided that includes the request for the hearing dates he is seeking including the remainder of the December 21, 2021 hearing date and the amount of the estimated costs along with his current/ updated income information it will be reviewed.

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
03/11/2026

G.T. Tenney, Geoffrey
(Judge)
2026.03.11
13:13:33 -05'00'

RESPONDENT'S FILING COVER NOTICE

Respondent Timothy R. Provo, appearing pro se, respectfully submits the following documents for filing in this matter:

- 1. Motion to Enforce and Clarify Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver; To Compel Transcript Production; and To Enforce ADA Record-Access Accommodations**
- 2. Exhibit Packet (Exhibits A-E) supporting the above motion**
- 3. Supplemental Request for Fee Waiver for Transcript Preparation**

These documents are submitted together because they address related issues concerning transcript access, record completeness, and enforcement of the Court's February 5, 2025 Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver.

Dated: March 5, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy R. Provo
Respondent, Pro Se
1567 Plum Creek Dr SE
Cambridge, MN 55008

State of Minnesota
District Court – Tenth Judicial District
County of Wright

Case No. 86-FA-21-15

In re the Marriage of:

Emily Anne Provo,
Petitioner,

and

Timothy Robert Provo,
Respondent.

**MOTION TO ENFORCE AND CLARIFY SUPPLEMENTAL IN
FORMA PAUPERIS ORDER; TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF
TRANSCRIPTS OR WRITTEN CERTIFICATION OF
TRANSCRIPT STATUS; AND TO ENFORCE ADA
ACCOMMODATIONS FOR RECORD ACCESS**

Respondent, **Timothy R. Provo** (“Respondent”), appearing pro se, respectfully moves the Court for an order enforcing and clarifying the existing Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver issued on February 5, 2025, compelling production of complete hearing and trial transcripts or written certification of their status, and enforcing Respondent’s previously requested ADA accommodations regarding written communication and record access. In support, Respondent states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

- Respondent is a pro se litigant in this matter and has been granted in forma pauperis status on multiple occasions, including a **Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver dated February 5, 2025** in Case No. 86-FA-21-15. That

- Minnesota statutes assign court reporters duties concerning the stenographic record and the furnishing of transcripts, including the duty to furnish a transcript of the record upon proper request and to comply with transcript-related record requirements. Minn. Stat. § 486.03. Where a fee waiver is granted and the Court finds that a transcript of any part or all of the action is necessary to adequately prepare, present, or decide an issue, the Court must direct payment of the reasonable transcript expenses. **Minn. Stat. § 563.01, subd. 7.** These obligations apply with full force to Respondent's request for **all hearing and trial transcripts**, and the need is most acute for the **trial proceedings**, where the Court's factual findings and credibility determinations are at issue and cannot be meaningfully reviewed from fragments or "portion-only" excerpts. See Minn. R. Gen. Prac. 17 (transcript filing/delivery requirements).
- The Court retains inherent authority to interpret and enforce its own orders, to ensure that indigent and disabled litigants receive the accommodations and record access that have been ordered or are required by law, and to direct Court Administration and court reporters to comply with those obligations.
- Respondent expressly reserves and re-asserts his prior objections to Judge Tenney's authority to act in this case after the January 21, 2025 recusal request. This motion is submitted solely to enforce and clarify an existing order that the Court and its agents have treated as in effect with respect to transcript and fee issues, and to protect Respondent's minimal rights of record access and ADA accommodation.

III. RELIEF REQUESTED

For the reasons stated above, Respondent respectfully requests that the Court enter an order granting the following relief:

1. **Enforcement and Clarification of Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver.**
 - a. Clarify that the February 5, 2025 Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver covers the full transcript(s) of the proceeding(s) for which Respondent was granted transcript relief under that order, including the December 21, 2021 proceeding referenced in Respondent's transcript requests, and that coverage is not limited to portions "already prepared and in the court file." If the official court reporter contends that any requested transcript cannot be

produced, the reporter shall file and serve a sworn written certification identifying the specific reason it cannot be produced, whether an audio or stenographic record exists, and the status of any transcript preparation associated with that proceeding.

b. Direct that Respondent shall not be required to pay additional transcript fees for those hearing(s) beyond what has already been ordered under the Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver and beyond amounts already paid by Respondent for transcript preparation.

2. Compulsion of Transcript Production or Written Certification of Status.

a. Order the official court reporter and Court Administration to produce to Respondent, within fourteen (14) days of the Court's order, complete and certified transcripts of the hearing(s) covered by the Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver—including the full December 21, 2021 proceeding and any other hearing or trial dates for which Respondent has transcript coverage under IFP and/or for which Respondent has paid transcript fees—and to provide any portions not previously produced. **Partial excerpts, “on-record statements,” and “already prepared” fragments shall not be deemed compliance with this order, especially where the proceeding involves disputed facts, credibility determinations, or findings adverse to Respondent; or**

b. In the alternative, if any such transcript is not prepared or not available, order the official court reporter and/or Court Administration to file and serve on Respondent, within 14 days, a sworn written certification stating:

- i. Whether an audio or stenographic record of the proceeding exists;
- ii. Whether a transcript has ever been ordered or prepared;
- iii. Whether Respondent's prior payment(s) have been applied to transcript preparation and, if not, why not;
- iv. The specific reason why a complete transcript has not been produced; and
- v. Whether any restriction, hold, or directive has been placed on preparation or release of the transcript, and by whom.

3. Enforcement of ADA Accommodations for Record Access.

a. Recognize Respondent's previously asserted disability and ADA accommodation requests, including written-only communication to the extent practicable, timely electronic notice, and access to complete transcripts needed to understand and challenge orders.

b. Direct Court Administration to issue a written ADA determination within 14 days, addressing Respondent's November 6, 2025 ADA request (Exhibit A) and identifying the designated ADA coordinator, the accommodations granted or denied, and the reasons for any denial.

c. Direct that all future correspondence regarding transcript status and production be provided to Respondent in writing (by mail and, where available, by email or eFS), to ensure effective communication.

4. Preservation of Audit Logs and Record-Access Evidence.

Order Court Administration and the official court reporter to preserve all audit logs, metadata, and internal records related to:

a. Respondent's transcript requests;

b. any IFP/supplemental IFP orders concerning transcripts;

c. any preparation, partial preparation, or withholding of transcripts in this case; and

d. any payment(s) made by Respondent toward transcript costs, including how those payments were applied or held;

including records maintained in **Tyler eFile & eServe (eFS), MNCIS/MCRO, CourtView or equivalent case-management systems, the court reporter's transcript production system, email systems, and any internal ticketing or request logs.**

5. Additional Transcript-Fee and Payment Protections.

a. Direct that any transcript produced pursuant to this order be provided to Respondent without additional cost.

b. Direct that any prior payments tendered by Respondent toward transcript preparation in this case shall be credited to any transcript preparation necessary to comply with this order, and that Respondent shall not be charged twice for the same transcript work.

6. Any further relief the Court deems just and equitable to ensure Respondent has meaningful access to the record and to court proceedings consistent with the Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver, Respondent's payments, and the ADA, and without waiver of Respondent's recusal and jurisdictional objections.

Ex. C3

produced, the reporter shall file and serve a sworn written certification identifying the specific reason it cannot be produced, whether an audio or stenographic record exists, and the status of any transcript preparation associated with that proceeding.

b. Direct that Respondent shall not be required to pay additional transcript fees for those hearing(s) beyond what has already been ordered under the Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver and beyond amounts already paid by Respondent for transcript preparation.

2. Compulsion of Transcript Production or Written Certification of Status.

a. Order the official court reporter and Court Administration to produce to Respondent, within fourteen (14) days of the Court's order, complete and certified transcripts of the hearing(s) covered by the Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver—including the full December 21, 2021 proceeding and any other hearing or trial dates for which Respondent has transcript coverage under IFP and/or for which Respondent has paid transcript fees—and to provide any portions not previously produced. **Partial excerpts, “on-record statements,” and “already prepared” fragments shall not be deemed compliance with this order, especially where the proceeding involves disputed facts, credibility determinations, or findings adverse to Respondent; or**

b. In the alternative, if any such transcript is not prepared or not available, order the official court reporter and/or Court Administration to file and serve on Respondent, within 14 days, a sworn written certification stating:

- i. Whether an audio or stenographic record of the proceeding exists;
- ii. Whether a transcript has ever been ordered or prepared;
- iii. Whether Respondent's prior payment(s) have been applied to transcript preparation and, if not, why not;
- iv. The specific reason why a complete transcript has not been produced; and
- v. Whether any restriction, hold, or directive has been placed on preparation or release of the transcript, and by whom.

3. Enforcement of ADA Accommodations for Record Access.

a. Recognize Respondent's previously asserted disability and ADA accommodation requests, including written-only communication to the extent practicable, timely electronic notice, and access to complete transcripts needed to understand and challenge orders.

- b. Direct Court Administration to issue a written ADA determination within 14 days, addressing Respondent's November 6, 2025 ADA request (Exhibit A) and identifying the designated ADA coordinator, the accommodations granted or denied, and the reasons for any denial.
 - c. Direct that all future correspondence regarding transcript status and production be provided to Respondent in writing (by mail and, where available, by email or eFS), to ensure effective communication.
- 4. **Preservation of Audit Logs and Record-Access Evidence.**

Order Court Administration and the official court reporter to preserve all audit logs, metadata, and internal records related to:

 - a. Respondent's transcript requests;
 - b. any IFP/supplemental IFP orders concerning transcripts;
 - c. any preparation, partial preparation, or withholding of transcripts in this case; and
 - d. any payment(s) made by Respondent toward transcript costs, including how those payments were applied or held;

including records maintained in Tyler eFile & eServe (eFS), MNCIS/MCRO, CourtView or equivalent case-management systems, the court reporter's transcript production system, email systems, and any internal ticketing or request logs.
- 5. **Additional Transcript-Fee and Payment Protections.**
 - a. Direct that any transcript produced pursuant to this order be provided to Respondent without additional cost.
 - b. Direct that any prior payments tendered by Respondent toward transcript preparation in this case shall be credited to any transcript preparation necessary to comply with this order, and that Respondent shall not be charged twice for the same transcript work.
- 6. Any further relief the Court deems just and equitable to ensure Respondent has meaningful access to the record and to court proceedings consistent with the Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver, Respondent's payments, and the ADA, and without waiver of Respondent's recusal and jurisdictional objections.

State of Minnesota
District Court – Tenth Judicial District
County of Wright

Case No. 86-FA-21-15

In re the Marriage of:

Emily Anne Provo,
Petitioner,

and

Timothy Robert Provo,
Respondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER FOR TRANSCRIPT PREPARATION

Respondent, Timothy R. Provo, appearing pro se, respectfully submits this Supplemental Request for Fee Waiver for transcript preparation.

Respondent has previously been granted **in forma pauperis status**, including a **Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver dated February 5, 2025**, which addressed transcript costs for specified proceedings in this case.

Despite that order, Respondent has **already paid transcript costs in this matter**, including payments related to trial transcript preparation, while acting pro se and attempting to preserve the record for review.

On or about **May 28, 2025**, the official court reporter informed Respondent that preparation of the **full transcript of the court proceedings**, including the **December 21, 2021 trial**, would not begin unless Respondent submitted a **new supplemental IFP request in the amount of \$488.00**.

Respondent submits this supplemental request **under protest and solely to remove the administrative barrier imposed by the court reporter**, so that

preparation of the complete transcript(s) necessary to review and understand the proceedings in this case may proceed.

Respondent **does not waive and expressly preserves** his position that the **February 5, 2025 Supplemental Order For Fee Waiver already entitles him to the requested transcript(s)** and that additional financial conditions should not be imposed.

Respondent respectfully requests that the Court approve this supplemental request and direct that the **complete transcript(s) of all hearings and trial proceedings necessary to complete the record in this case**, including the **December 21, 2021 proceeding**, be prepared and provided pursuant to the existing fee waiver and this supplemental request.

Dated: March 5, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy R. Provo
Respondent, Pro Se
1567 Plum Creek Dr SE
Cambridge, MN 55008