

The Chief Justice - *or* ✓

So's prison not long not intended to
carry over every year

if connect in Barable

Rhodes only to see inter

if -, what v damages

Projector apply c v Whittles

Apply delete under stan

- in vacate

White, J. -

go in SG - fastest way, Rhodes

adopt a stan & remove to C

may be a thin lawsuit
objection stan

Marshall, J. -

no go in state - v. much been

Stevens, J. ✓

we (Kw)

read book

no tuf W stand to this contempt

stan, our SG's objection stan

al & des on delete under stan

Blackmun, J. -

O'Connor, J. *RL*

W state n intended to cover all aspects v
prison reg
W let state say state v must is a factor
tension mi Estelle v Gribble
deliberate indifference standard diff in
other objection state

Scalia, J. *RL*

mi SC & use deliberative indifference
abstract test in trouble mi barter breakdown
+ no one at fault
no answer as to lack of funding by a defense

Kennedy, J. *VR*

mi CJ & AS
trouble is mi 1983 juris
Leyro has b indifferent
non Estelle + deliberate indifference
use

Souter, J. *VR*

mi R
use
ch use deliberate indifference as + state?

6 deliberate indifference
3 mi SC

89-7376

^{-prisoner}
Wilson v Leiter

Coups at an Ohio prison, 1983 actor allegg 8 time needs

50 Ohio ga SS for Ds = respects

C6 + 12.

D Ct erred to attend to relief on script's office to more continued by petrus - us.

But petrus' office, even if it appeared, may be insuff.

Per Rhodes 452/337 all crimes must be evaluated

Alleggs v temp, mentally ill housing, exercising in suff. - the compensation
Whitley v Ables, 475/312/319, it is ordinary, a madman to = + conduct probel

It must ext coups + result v recklessness, & it were negli

Here manager has taken steps. Nothing = punishment or malicious cruelty

Negli at best + too is a enough.

I. was -

Whitley has a def applic or must be cut back upon

I agree with + SC's thoughtful brief.

No reason to require an allegg v a partic state v unind.

Neglect was deprivatio v basic human needs is alleged,

Anywa delib indifference is suff.

C6 erred in requirg a showing v persistent malicious cruelty

1 Jan 91

No. 89-7376, Wilson v. Seiter

Argued: January 7, 1991

1⁴⁰ Mr. Alchamier

4

No state v mind test is rule

If n, delib indep is a suff test

mind plumb 45 4 (#1 qn)

none

1⁵⁶

1⁵⁶ Mr. Bergeron SG

6

No reason + argue into state v mind

leave Whittle & Estelle in place 205

2⁰⁵ Mr. Epler Asst Dir. A.B.

5

rule-y-bl on-Stat 34 Cl. Marshall

5-3 says just rule n approp, tho all r aware vT situ

We plump for a 3-pt test

This a note for ST, n one to dismiss.

2³²

2³² Mr. A.

In Rhodes, no suff v a state-v-mind test.

No cl here by Ds v lack of opinioners

2³⁵