

FILED

2025 MAR 24 AM 10: 25

LYNN FAZZ
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
YUMA, ARIZONA 85364
IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YUMA

In the Matter of:)
PROHIBITING ANANT KUMAR) Administrative Order
TRIPATI FROM FILING ANY) 2025-02
LAWSUIT IN YUMA COUNTY)
WITHOUT OBTAINING PRIOR)
PERMISSION FROM THE COURT)

The Court has considered Defendant Naphcare, et al’s Motion to Designate Anant Kumar Tripati a Vexatious Litigant. Plaintiff Anant Kumar Tripati did not file a timely response to this motion. Rather, Plaintiff Tripati filed a Motion to Strike and a Reply in support of his Motion to Strike. The Court finds that a Motion to Strike was not proper and denies that motion. The Court has, however, read and considered the Motion to Strike and the Reply filed in support of that motion and will treat that as a response to Defendant’s Motion to Designate Plaintiff as a Vexatious Litigant. The Court has also reviewed and considered the numerous attachments filed by Plaintiff and Defendant that relate to this issue.

Factual Background:

Plaintiff Tripati has been incarcerated for over thirty years and is currently an inmate at the Arizona State prison complex, Yuma – Cibola unit. During his time as a prisoner, he has filed numerous unsuccessful lawsuits in a wide variety of jurisdictions. These lawsuits have involved many repetitive claims of conspiracy, medical negligence, and deliberate indifference. Initially, his claims were filed against the Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Re-entry (“ADCRR”). In recent years the focus of his litigation efforts has shifted to healthcare providers who have contracted with the ADCRR to provide inmate healthcare.

1 **Legal Standard:**

2 A.R.S. 12-3201(A) authorizes the presiding judge of a county to designate a pro se
3 litigant as a vexatious litigant in non-criminal proceedings. This may be done at the request
4 of a party or on the court's own motion. The statutory definition of vexatious conduct
5 includes, but is not limited to, repeated filing of court actions solely or primarily for the
6 purpose of harassment, unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings, court actions
7 brought or defendant without substantial justification.

8 **Previous Designations as a Vexatious Litigant:**

9 Plaintiff Tripati has previously been designated as a vexatious litigant by several
10 different courts. He has filed lawsuits in a variety of jurisdictions and has been enjoined in
11 several jurisdictions from filing frivolous and harassing claims. In 1985, the federal District
12 Court for the District of Arizona barred Plaintiff Tripati from filing new complaints or
13 petitions without prior judicial approval. In 1997 Plaintiff Tripati was designated as a
14 vexatious litigant by the Maricopa County Superior Court. Even the United States Supreme
15 Court has admonished Plaintiff for his abusive filings stating "[Plaintiff]" has repeatedly
16 abuse this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in non-
17 criminal matters from Petitioner unless [he complies with Rules 38(a) and 33.1]." In March
18 2006, the Los Angeles Superior Court designated Plaintiff as a vexatious litigant. In 2018 a
19 United States District Court Judge dismissed one of Plaintiff's civil rights claims against the
20 ADCRR, Corizon and other defendants. In that order the court found "Plaintiff continues to
21 attempt to re-litigate claims from closed cases and to justify revisiting those cases by asserting
22 that defendants falsified or concealed evidence, committed a fraud on the court, or by
23 asserting intervening facts that are insufficient to support those claims." In 2022, the court
24 dismissed a lawsuit against Plaintiff Tripati that he filed against the Maricopa County
25 Attorney's Office because he had been deemed to be a vexatious litigant and did not obtain
26 permission from the civil presiding judge before filing the lawsuit.

27 **Filings in Related Litigation**

28 In 2013, the healthcare providing company Corizon entered into a contract with the
ADCRR to provide medical care to inmates. Within two months of the signing of that

1 contract Plaintiff Tripati a filed a lawsuit against them in the Western District of Tennessee
2 alleging violations of his civil rights. Ultimately summary judgement was entered in favor of
3 the defendants. Since that time, during the pendency of that litigation Plaintiff Tripati filed
4 many lawsuits in various Arizona counties and in many different United States District
5 Courts. These lawsuits involved same type of allegations and factual circumstances. Plaintiff
6 has also filed approximately twenty Rule 32 proceedings alleged deficient medical treatment
7 constituted "Cruel and Unusual Punishment." During this time Plaintiff Tripati has also filed
8 lawsuits against attorneys who represent defendants in the lawsuits he has filed.

9 On October 1, 2022, defendant NaphCare became the contracted provider for medical
10 services to the ADCRR. On May 1, 2024, Plaintiff filed a lawsuit in Yuma County Superior
11 Court against Ryan Thornell, the Director of the ADOC, and other defendants. The case was
12 later removed to Federal Court and is still pending. On August 16, 2024, Plaintiff Tripati
13 filed this lawsuit in Yuma County Superior Court. Many of the causes of actions included in
14 this lawsuit have been raised prior litigation.

15 **Findings and Orders:**

16 **THE COURT FINDS** that Plaintiff Tripati is a vexatious litigant. Specifically, the
17 court finds that Plaintiff has engaged in statutorily defined vexatious conduct, including filing
18 frivolous or harassing lawsuits, filing lawsuits all over the country without substantial
19 justification, unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings, and in filing claims that
20 had previously been litigated.

21 **IT IS ORDERED** Plaintiff Tripati may not file any additional pleadings or motions in
22 any of his current lawsuits as a pro say litigant, in any non-criminal case, without first seeking
23 leave from the judge assigned to that lawsuit.

24 **IT IS ORDERED** Plaintiff Tripati may not file any new causes of action in a non-
25 criminal case without leave of the Presiding Judge.

26 **IT IS ORDERED** that any motion for leave to file shall be captioned, "Application
27 Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File." In seeking leave to file, Plaintiff Tripati shall
28 certify under penalty of perjury that the claim or claims he wishes to present are new claims,
that have not been raised and disposed of by any other court, within or outside Yuma County.

1 He shall also certify that the claims are neither frivolous nor made in bad faith. Plaintiff shall
2 also cite to this administrative order in any application seek leave to file.

3 This order does prohibit Plaintiff Tripati from responding to any litigation in which he
4 is a named defendant.

5 **DATED** this 24 of March 2025.

6
7
8 
9
10
11 Honorable David M. Haws
12 Presiding Judge

13 **Original filed with:**

14 Hon. Lynn Fazz, Clerk of the Superior Court

15 **Copies to:**

16 Hon. Mark Wayne Reeves, Div. 1
17 Hon. R. Erin Farrar, Div. 2
18 Hon. Larry Kenworthy, Div. 3
19 Hon. Roger A. Nelson, Div. 5
20 Hon. Nathaniel Sorenson, Div. 6
21 Hon. Darci D. Weede, Div. 7
22 Hon. Levi Gunderson, Comm. 3
23 Hon. Claudia González, Comm. 1
24 Hon. Eliza B. Johnson, Comm. 2
25 Hon. Gregory Stewart, Justice Court Precinct 1
26 Hon. Nohemy Echavarría, Justice Court Precinct 1, Pro Tem
27 Hon. Scarlett Harper, Justice Court Precinct 2
28 Hon. Russ Jones, Justice Court Precinct 3/Wellton Municipal Court
Kathleen M. Schaben, Court Administrator
Martin Mendez, Justice Court Administrator
Imelda Figueroa, Budget Manager
Elizabeth Acosta, Court Human Resources Manager
Dona Miller-Robbins, Caseflow Manager
Isabel Bañuelos, JAU Supervisor

Anant Kumar Tripati, #102081
Arizona State Prison
P.O. Box 8909
San Luis, AZ 85349

Sarah L. Barnes
BROENING OBERG WOODS & WILSON
2800 N. Central, Suite 1600
Phoenix, AZ 85004