


No. - 2023



IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

**ORIGINAL**

SHARON CAMMILLE RIDDICK,

Petitioner,

v.

BOSTON HOUSING AUTHORITY; VINCENT WRIGHT,  
Residential Custodian; ANGEL SANTOS, Property  
Manager; JAY KOPLOVE, Senior Attorney; COLLEEN  
LEAVER, Employee Relations Coordinator,

Respondents

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

SHARON CAMMILLE RIDDICK

P.O.BOX 240256

DORCHESTER, MA. 02124

857.381.6356

sharon.riddick@gmail.com

November 2023

## Question(s) Presented

The United States District Court of Massachusetts issued an order to dismiss the case of discrimination and retaliation a TITLE VIII, VI, 446 AND THE (ADA) Section 504 AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT 42 U.S.C. §§12101 et seq. on the basis of Rules 8 (a),(2), 9, 12 (f), of the Federal Rules Civil Procedures. The First Circuit dismissed the case for noncompliance with Rule 8, and denied the petition for rehearing, and rehearing en banc. The further stated Appellant's remaining post-judgment motions are all denied. Mandate shall enter forthwith. The questions presented are -

- (1).Whether Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 12 (b) (6) (f), Rule 8 (a) (2), Rule 9 are an Adequate basis Rule to dismiss the Petitioner's Complaint?
  
- (2).Whether not enforcing Fed.R.Civ. P. Rule 70 is a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment due process clause and is suppression & obstruction of justice of the Petitioner's Court filings ?

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED.....	2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
OPINIONS BELOW.....	6
JURISDICTION.....	7
STATUTES & RULES .....	8
STATEMENT.....	10
Procedural history Procedural History	
-Complaint Facts 1:21-cv-11349-NMG-.....	10-14
Factual background (B) Factual background presented in Petitioner's Civil Rights Fair Housing Complaint, Legal Brief, Reply Brief, & Writ of Mandamus.....14-30	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	31-46
I. The First Circuit and the District Court of Massachusetts Ruled Incorrectly to Strike the Petitioner's Complaint on the Basis of Insufficient Defense, Redundant, Immaterial, Impertinent, Scandalous Matter.....31	
II. Evidence Supporting the Petitioner's Motion to grant Writs of Certiorari.....41-46	

**III. In Refusing The Petitioner A Rehearing In En Banc, Has Decided An Important Federal Question In A Way That Conflicts With Relevant Decisions Of This Court.....43**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550U.S. 544 (2007),.....	12
Phelps v. Local 0222, No. 09-11218-JLT, 2010 WL3342031, at *5 (D. Mass. Aug. 20, 2010).....	13
Green v. Commonwealth of Mass., 108 F.R.D. 217,218 (D. Mass. 1985).....	13
Rios-Campbell vs. United States Department of Commerce, No.18-1420 (1st Circuit 2019)....	33
Young v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 717 F.3d 224, 231 (1st Cir. 2013).....	34
Shaulis v. Nordstrom, Inc., 865 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2017). At the pleading stage.....	34
S.E.C. v. Tambone, 597 F.3d 436, 441 (1st Cir. 2010).....	34

United States v. Walker, 490 F.3d.1282, 1297 (11th Cir 2002).....	35
United States v. Cruz-Arroyo, 461 F.3d 69, 731 (1st Cir. 2006).....	35
Hammer v. United States, 265 U.S. at 188.....	37
United States v. Ballistrea, 101 F. 3d 827 (2d Cir.1996) .....	37
United States v. Dean, 55 F. 3d.640, 647 (D.C. Cir.1995).....	37
Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al.,1:11-cv-10613-RGS 2011.....	37
Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al.,11-1577 (2012, 1st Cir.).....	37
Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al. 11-7777 (2012) Supreme Court of the United States....	37
United States v. Leonardo Munguia No 3:19-cr-191-B(03) (N.D. Tex. Mar. 26, 2020 .....	38
Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 508 U.S. 476, 480, 124 L. Ed. 2d 436, 442, 113 S. Ct. 2194, 2197 (1993).....	39
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966 .....	44

## INTRODUCTION

The decision made by the First Circuit to deny the petitioner, Sharon Riddick, Fair Housing discrimination and Retaliation Claims Complaint under Title VI 446 American Disability Act Section 504 was a grave error that stemmed from a misinterpretation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Judicial Misconduct. In particular, the First Circuit incorrectly concluded that the Respondents were entitled to judgment based on Rule 12(b)(6), Rule 8, and Rule 9. This Writ of Certiorari analysis aims to shed light on the flawed reasoning behind the First Circuit's decision and highlight the importance of a fair and accurate application of the federal rules of civil procedure in ensuring justice in housing discrimination cases.

The First Circuit's denial of the Petitioner's Sharon Riddick Fair Housing Discrimination and Retaliation Claims, and their decision to grant judgment in favor of the respondents, is a clear violation of the Petitioner's due process rights. The First Circuit decision also conflicts with the established rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States. By applying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, specifically Rules 12(b)(6) and Rule 8, Rule 9 the First Circuit failed to properly consider the merits of the Petitioner's claims. This decision undermines the fundamental principles of fairness and justice that are essential to our legal system. It was imperative that the First Circuit reevaluates their decision and ensures that the Petitioner's rights are protected in accordance with the Supreme Court's precedents.

## OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the First Circuit is reported as "Dismissal [for noncompliance with Rule 8] is usually reserved for those in which the complaint is so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible that it lacks substance,

if any, is well disguised.” “The district did not abuse its Rule 8 discretion in this case.” “The Amended Complaint is rambling, repetitious, and disorganized, includes irrelevant details about many non- defendants, and at the same time omits facts necessary to make sense of the claims Plaintiff-Attempted to state.

## **JURISDICTION**

The United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit entered its Judgment on June 20, 2023. Petitioner filed a timely petition for En banc which the court denied on October 4, 2023 Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1), and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A

## **APPENDIX (A)**

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit October 4, 2023.....

## **APPENDIX (B)**

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit August 9, 2023.....

## **APPENDIX (C)**

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit August 29, 2023.....

## **APPENDIX (D)**

Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit June 20, 2023.....

## APPENDIX (E)

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals For the  
First Circuit May 4, 2022.....

## APPENDIX (F)

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals For the  
First Circuit May 26, 2022.....

## STATUES AND RULES

The Fair Housing Act 42 U.S.C. 3601.

The Fourteenth Amendment “right to due process”

Federal Rules of Civil Procedures, Judgment for Specific  
Acts; Vesting Title Rule 70, Rule 12(b) (6), Rule 8, Rule  
9, Rule 55, Rule 31(a), Rule 26 (1)

The RICO ACT Sections and Subsections 1962-1968

Deprivation of Honest Services as a Basis for Federal  
Mail and Wire Fraud Convictions Congressional Research  
Service September 16, 2011

- 18 U.S.C. 1512 Tampering With Documents
- 18.U.S.C. 1346 Honest Services of Fraud
- 18 U.S.C. 1341 Wire Fraud
- 18 U.S.C. 18 U.S. Code § 401 - Power of court
- 18 U.S.C. 1956 Racketeering
- 18 U.S.C. 2381 Treason

Bribery, Kickbacks, and Self-Dealings: An Overview of  
Honest Services Fraud and Issues for Congress,  
Congressional Research Service, May 18, 2020

- 18.U.S.C. 1346 Honest Services of Fraud
- 18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy

-18 U.S.C. 1503 Obstruction of Justice  
-18 U.S.C. 2 Aid & Abet  
18 U.S.C. 1001 False Statement  
Overview of Selected Federal Criminal Civil Rights  
Statutes Congressional Research Service December 16,  
2014  
18 U.S.C. 242 Deprivation of Rights Under the Color of  
Law  
42 U.S.C. 3631 Criminal Interference With Right to Fair  
Housing  
18 U.S.C. 241 Conspiracy Against Rights

## **CONSTITUTIONAL & STATUTORY**

### **PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

**Amendment I-** Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

**Amendment XIV-** All persons born naturalized in the United States and subject to jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of any law of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person with its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

**Federal Rules of Civil Procedures- Rule 12 (B) (6)**  
**(F)- Pleading and Motions**

**Federal Rules of Civil Procedures – Rule 8 (A) (2)**  
**Claims of Relief**

**Federal Rules of Civil Procedures -Rule 9**

**Federal Rules of Civil Procedures- Rule 70**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### Procedural History

#### **-Complaint Facts 1:21-cv-11349-NMG-**

August 18, 2021 Petitioner Sharon Riddick filed a Title VI 446 American Disability Act Section 504 Civil Cover Sheet and a Complaint of 139 pages and 642 paragraphs (1:21-cv-11349NMG) along with exhibits consisting of (1,960) on the date of January 13, 2022 at the District Court of Massachusetts.

October 18, 2021 Summons and Complaint issued to Respondents by United States Marshal. November 4, 2021, (5) five Summons executed and returned to District Court of Massachusetts. October 18, 2021 Petitioner filed a Motion to Amend "Statement of Claims" Complaint by supplementing more claims into the text and correcting the format of the document. October 19, 2021 Judge Nathaniel M. Gorton entered an "electronic order" "Allowing" motion to Amend complaint. July 7, 2022 Judge Boal dismissed the Respondent Colleen Leaver citing "she is not listed as a movant in Respondent's motion to strike."

"In any event, the claims against Leaver are dismissible for the same reason set forth in this report and recommendation.

Petitioner's objection to this dismissal stems from the Petitioner's email to the Respondent's Attorney Frye on May 4, 2022 at 10:35 am stating the following " I notice of your motion to dismiss in your heading you did NOT list defendant Colleen Leaver in your motion to dismiss." "Is this done in error?" "Please respond back to me....

Respondent's Attorney Frye responded back to the email on May 6, 2022 at 4:42 pm the following: "Ms. Riddick, This appears to be an oversight in the filing. I will file an updated version that includes all Defendants." Petitioner's Objection to Judge Boal Report and Recommendation to dismiss the civil action on the bases of Rule 8, of the **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Appellant Sharon Riddick has met the burden/requirement of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by stating a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction, unless the court already has jurisdiction and the claim needs no new jurisdictional support;)** Claim for Relief. Petitioner listed "TITLE VII, VI, AND THE (ADA) AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT."

Petitioner also attached a "Statement of Claim containing 139 pages and 642 paragraphs NOT "618 paragraphs" as Judge Boal falsely stated in her Report and Recommendation of the defendant's motion to strike Petitioner's statement of claim to dismiss action. Petitioner's Objection to Judge Jennifer Boal's Report and Recommendation Order of the Respondent's motion to strike plaintiff's statement of claim to dismiss action.

Citing Judge Boal Report and Recommendation to dismiss the Amended Complaint should be look upon as "null and void" as outlined in Judge Boal very own Report and Recommendation page 2, stating **October 19, 2021 Judge Gorton granted Riddick's motion to amend the complaint.** Therefore, how did Judge Boal arrive at her recommendation to Judge Gorton to dismiss the Petitioner's Amend Complaint when the motion to amend from the plaintiff was ALLOWED and filed into the docket on October 19, 2021? This criminal act is 18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy to commit 18 U.S.C. 1503 Obstruction of Justice was manufactured in order to render a favorable ruling for Attorney David Frye and the Respondents. Petitioner Sharon Riddick enters an Objection to Judge Boal statement of Report and Recommendation " Docket No. 25 Riddick's subsequent motions to amend where denied." This statement made by Judge Boal is a false statement. Petitioner's Objection to Judge Boal Report and Recommendation; Judge Boal stated the following; "On December 15, 2021, the Clerk entered a default against the Respondents and Leaver. Docket No. 37. Riddick filed two motions for default judgment and a supporting affidavit. Docket Nos. 46-48. On February 22, 2022, the Respondent and Leaver moved to set aside the default. Docket No. 52 Judge Gorton granted the Respondents and Leaver's motion to set aside the default and denied Riddick's motions for default judgment on April 14, 2022. Docket No. 55. The operative complaint is Riddick's amended Statement of Claim at Docket No. 25 (the "Amended Complaint").

The Amended Complaint is 135 pages long and contains 644 paragraphs, consisting of a stream-of-consciousness narrative of events spanning from 2018 to the present, at times unintelligible, and containing multiple, often unrelated incidents involving individuals having no discernible connection to the Defendants in this case. Petitioner's objection is the Amended Complaints only needs to meets the requirements of the following:

(1) complaint must include “enough facts to show the complaint is plausible, the complaint does not have to include ALL facts relevant to the dispute.

(2) The complaint does not have to include Proof or evidence to demonstrate that the plaintiff will prevail.

(3) The complaint does need to allege enough facts to show the claim is more conceivable but actually plausible. Factual allegations to show that the legal conclusion is plausible. Complaint must show that the pleader is entitled to relief. Petitioner Objection to Judge Jennifer Boal's ANALYSIS of Report and Recommendation is as Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 12(f) , a district court “may strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f). Courts have “considerable discretion” to strike material under Rule 12(f).

Petitioner's objection is that Rule 12(f) is NOT a viable basis to dismiss the plaintiff complaint, considering the Respondents did NOT submit a response within 21 days after being served with the pleading.

Therefore Rule 12 (f) is NOT a concrete defense to claim on the Respondent's motion to dismiss; and should NOT be allowed as a favorable ruling to the defense. As a moving party the Respondents have not met the burden of showing that the allegations should be struck under Rule 12(f). The Court does NOT have “considerable discretion” to strike material under Rule 12(f), Respondent's motions to dismiss are narrow in scope, disfavored in practice, and not calculated readily to invoke the court's discretion.” The Court striking a portion of a pleading is a drastic remedy and is often sought by the Respondents simply as a dilatory or harassing tactic. The Petitioner's Amended Complaint does NOT violate the principles of Rule 8 and should not be struck “within the sound discretion of the court.” The Respondent's motion to strike the Petitioner's (amended) complaint in its entirety under Rule 12(f) for failure to comply with Rule 8 should have been denied in its entirety. Rule 8(a)(2) requires that a pleading contains “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). This requirement is meant to “give the Respondents fair notice of what the Petitioner's claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” The Petitioner has met the requirement to Rule 8 (a) (2). In 2007 the United States Supreme Court clarified Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007),

(1) complaint must include “enough facts to show the complaint is plausible, the complaint does not have to include ALL facts relevant to the dispute. (2) The complaint does not have to include Proof or evidence to demonstrate that the plaintiff will prevail. (3) The complaint does need to allege enough facts to show the claim is more conceivable but actually plausible. Factual allegations to show that the legal conclusion is plausible. Therefore the Petitioner has met this pleading requirement. Petitioner’s Objection to Judge Boal Report and Recommendation citing as “In addition, the Amended Complaint makes lengthy, disjointed, and repetitive allegations regarding incidents and individuals that appear to be wholly unrelated to the named Defendants.” For example, Riddick includes factual allegations regarding a complaint she made against a state judge (Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 229- 234) and about notices from the Internal Revenue Service regarding past due taxes and other matters (id. at ¶¶ 469-498).

**Petitioner’s objection is as follows as a result of my factual allegations surrounding the RICO activity of First Justice James Coffy by utilizing the Dorchester District Court BMC as a RICO criminal enterprise by engaging in a conspiracy with Defendant Vincent Wright to manufacture a fraudulent criminal case against the Plaintiff Sharon Riddick by crimes of human trafficking the Plaintiff into a corrupt legal system.**

**Judge James Coffy was reassigned to the Edwards Brooke Courthouse at 24 New Chardon Street Boston Massachusetts. After my factual allegations reveal the allegations were indeed FACTUAL. Petitioner Sharon Riddick objection to Judge Boal Report and Recommendation is as follows “While the ‘First Circuit holds a pro se litigant to a standard of pleading less stringent than that for lawyers,’ ‘this cannot be taken to mean that pro se complaints are held to no standard at all.’” Phelps v. Local 0222, No. 09-11218-JLT, 2010 WL 3342031, at \*5 (D. Mass. Aug. 20, 2010) (quoting Green v. Commonwealth of Mass., 108 F.R.D. 217, 218 (D. Mass. 1985)).**

Riddick’s Amended Complaint falls into the category of pleadings that are “so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is well disguised.” July 22, 2022 Petitioner filed an appeal, a Legal Brief, with Exhibits on November 1, 2022, a Reply Brief with Addendum of Attachments on February 15, 2023, and a Emergency Petition of Writ of Mandamus, with Attachments on

September 26, 2023 at the First Circuit Court of Appeals at the District of Massachusetts.

**(B) Factual background presented in Petitioner's Civil Rights Fair Housing Complaint, Legal Brief, Reply Brief, & Writ of Mandamus**

Petitioner Sharon Riddick moved into the Boston Housing Authority Peabody Englewood Development on February 22, 2018. On April 13, 2018 Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian (Jamaican born) Vincent Wright came to my Unit with a fraudulent Maintenance Work Order dated April 11, 2018, along with his (a Black male) friend impersonating as an Employee from The ATENA Fire Alarm Company, stating that they were there to inspect the ceilings "Heat Detectors." However this fraudulent Maintenance Work order was a ruse to gain access into my apartment to replace my apartment's "Heat Detectors" with illegally installed "Hidden Cameras" to cyberstalked and spied on the Plaintiff Sharon Riddick, and to record Child Pornography of the Plaintiff's 10 years old granddaughter (Z.O.) grooming habits for a period of 2.5 years.

April 29, 2020 Plaintiff Sharon Riddick installed the locks on her unit's door and did NOT furnish a key to BHA Peabody Englewood Property Manager LaKeshia Englewood.

On May 6, 2020-July 12, 2021 after being notified via email of criminal activities i.e. Breaking and entering in the daytime, Invasion of Privacy, Child Pornography, Federal Stalking, Cyberstalking i.e. internet and cameras, Harassment, Identity Theft at the Peabody Englewood Development located at 1875 Dorchester Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02124. The Boston Housing Authority Legal

Department and the BHA Administration refuse to take the proper legal action to put an end to the criminal activities of BHA Tenant

Timothy Stewart, and unregister Sex Offender Vincent Wright employed as a Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian by granting Vincent Wright safe harbor in his employment and tenancy at Peabody Englewood Development. However the Boston Housing Authority engaged in a methodical earmarked campaign to harassed, and utilized their employees, and members of the LGBTQ Community as co-conspirators to violate Plaintiff (African -American Heterosexual female) Sharon Riddick's Civil Rights on the basis of Sex, Race, National Origin, Sexual Orientation, and Retaliation.

May 07, 2020 at 1:45pm email titled "The Recusal of Jay Koplove" sent to Boston Housing Authority's Legal Department calling for the recusal of BHA Senior Attorney Jay Koplove due to the following reasons. In the email I disclosed that Attorney Jay Koplove, Gail Livingston, Christy Doyle, and Matthew Steele in April 26, 2001 utilized their positions at the Boston Housing Authority and a BHA Attorney to commit several R.I.C.O. violations in a scheme to file fraudulent eviction proceedings against myself and my 8 yrs.old daughter on Housing Court Case No.: 01-SP-01877.

By withholding my rent checks that were mailed to the Boston Housing Authority; to appear as late payments of rent." Attorney Jay Koplove will then "create" a housing court eviction case against you that you are a "Habitual Late Payer of Rent " and manufactured fraudulent rent balance that does NOT exist. Due to the fact that the Plaintiff complained to the BHA that one of its employees committed a breaking and entry in her apartment in the year 2000 at 110 Stratton Street. In 2014 I submitted a request to the BHA Legal Department for an Independent Audit on my 2001 Tenant Accounting file, and the audit revealed that there was an BHA employee named Ron who was withholding my "rent payments" to appear as if they were late when in fact the rent payments were not. This conspiracy was the starting point towards the eviction process. The Independent Audit also concluded that "Ms.Riddick has in possession all of her rent receipts. I further state that Attorney Jay Koplove to investigate my complaint of civil rights violation, and harassment /stalking by BHA Residential Custodian is a conflict of Interest.

May 7, 2020 at 2:00 PM email sent to the BHA Legal Department's General Counsel titled "Fox 25 Boston Investigates Baby daddy comment has housing authority lawyer facing questions." Fox 25 Investigates Boston Housing Authority Senior Attorney Jay Koplove for "offensive language," and "questionable evictions" after a tenant made complaints about not having screens on her windows for fear her autistic child will start climbing. BHA Attorney Koplove is quoted as saying " Do you have a problem with entering into an agreement under which your "baby daddy" agrees not to yell at staff?" "Koplove appears to blame the tenant for the lack of screens on her windows."

“Even though they are required by law.” May 08, 2020 at 7:08 PM received an email from Boston Housing Authority General Counsel Caesar Cardozo regarding my request for the recusal of BHA Attorney

Jay Koplove and Colleen Leaver. BHA General Counsel Cardozo denied my request of the recusal Jay Koplove citing that my claims “were unsubstantiated and otherwise without merit” and allegations

“unfounded,” and “his participation in the investigation will be untainted by conflict of interest.” During this investigation all future communications will be conducted in writing and cc: to the General

Counsel. May 15, 2020 at 3:50 PM email titled “Clarifying” sent to Boston Housing Authority General Counsel Caesar Cardozo requesting Clarification to the email of the “recusal of Jay Koplove.” I am seeking

clarification that all communications between myself and BHA employees, Employees Relations Coordinator, Coleen Leaver, Attorney Jay Koplove will be in the form of emails only.” May 15, 2020 at 4:05

PM email received from BHA General Counsel Caesar Cardozo confirming with a “yes” that all communications between myself and Colleen Leaver, Jay Koplove are to be via email format only, and “this point was reiterated with the BHA Personnel who are involved in the investigation of your complaint.” May 15, 2020 at 4:41 PM email titled “FYI” sent to the Boston Housing Authority General Counsel stating “

Boston Housing Authority Personnel Colleen Leaver called me at 3:42PM today, to ask me questions surrounding my complaint.” I immediately stop her and reference her to an email from the General

Counsel citing all emails between both parties are to be email.” to which Colleen Leaver stated she “was unaware of your request.” I then suggest Colleen Leaver to submit her inquiries via email to me, and I will reply via email as well.” I also pointed out that by no means I did not answer Colleen Leaver questions at all.” On June 3, 2020 7:18 pm email titled “Is this intimidation?” sent to Boston Housing Authority General Counsel Casear Cardozo, stating that someone shot BB-gun pellets into the living room bay window. Plaintiff Sharon Riddick also

stated in the email “To my knowledge I have been residing in this particular unit since the year 2018 and nothing like this has ever taken place before.” “For it is only after I filed a complaint(s) that I am now experiencing this unlawful act of intimidation.” As of April 29, 2020 I had a locksmith install a second lock on my unit door due to the fact I came home in the mid week of April and found large male dirty black smudge fingerprints on my refrigerator door. I also would come

home and find rolls of paper towels, toilet tissue, and bottle water and packages of meat missing. On June 3, 2018 at 7:56 pm email received from Boston Housing Authority General Counsel Caesar Cardozo apologizing for the BB-gun incident and suggesting I report this to Boston Police and BHA Police and BHA Property Manager."

June 4, 2020 at 4:10AM email sent to Boston Housing Authority Legal Department General Counsel Casear Cardozo describing the April 13, 2018 incident of hidden cameras installed in my apartment. Who accompanied Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian Vincent Wright; is a description of the Black male 5"5 slim built with a caribbean accent, wearing regular street clothing and no uniform of the company's logo or identification, impersonating an AETNA Fire Alarm employee. On June 8, 2020 at 11:36 AM email titled "It Happen Again!?" sent to Boston Housing Authority General Counsel Caesar Cardozo stating BHA Security knocked on my door at 7:26 AM asking permission to come inside with Boston Police Officers to inspect my windows it appears there is a Cauasian male who lives across the street at 537 Talbot Ave 3rd floor Apartment, who shot (2) two more bb-gun projectiles into my living room bay window again at approximately 4:30 AM-5:45 AM. On June 9, 2020 at 8:25 AM email titled "Boston Housing Authority is endangering my safety as well as the safety of other tenants." To the Boston Housing Authority's Legal Department, email entails Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian criminal behavior consisting of Child Pornography, Federal Stalking, harassment, Invasion of Privacy, disruption of my quiet enjoyment, breaking and entering in the daytime, unconsented voyeurism. The email also stated that BHA Residential Custodian Vincent Wright is a unregistered sex offender. June 9, 2020 at 9:39 AM Senior Attorney Jay Koplove sent out a group email to BHA employees assigned to investigate my May 6, 2020 complaint instructing them not to open my emails. By stating the following "Everyone don't open these." "They could be spam." June 10, 2020 at 6:51 PM email titled "Present and Past Boston Housing Authority's Notifications of ATHENA Fire Alarm ... .All Eyes on This!" sent to the Boston Housing Authority Legal Department, General Counsel. Plaintiff Sharon Riddick made a Phone call to ATENA Fire Alarm Company to inquire further about the fraudulent April 13, 2018 Maintenance Work Order.

Plaintiff spoke with ATENA Fire Alarm Operations Manager named "Kim" and was informed that "AETNA Fire Alarm did NOT conduct any fire alarm inspection at the Peabody Englewood Development for the entire month of April 2018." "We conducted fire alarm inspections at that Development on March 29, 2018 in the common areas, we did NOT go into the units only the common areas of the Development."

Plaintiff Sharon Riddick also submitted the actual fraudulent Maintenance Work Order drafted up by BHA Property Manager Angel

Santos and his co-conspirator BHA Residential Custodian Vincent Wright, typed in English and Spanish referring to the Heat Detectors as Smoke Detectors, with the hours of work at 8:00am-4:00pm.

Plaintiff also submitted legitimate Maintenance Work Orders, typed in English only, with the hours of 8:00am-3:00pm, the legitimate

Maintenance Work order makes no mention of the comparisons of smoke or heat detectors. for AETNA Fire Alarm testing schedule for June 12, 2020 with ATENA Operations Manager "Kim" who in return stated "Oh no we are NOT testing in the apartments only the common areas of the building." Although the 24 hour Phony AETNA Fire Alarm Testing Notice states as: "If you are not home during this time, the resident custodian will enter with our key to your unit." "He will accompany the worker when he comes to your apartment." June 14, 2020 through August 17, 2020 Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian Vincent Wright received a (60) sixty days suspension of his

employment at Boston Housing Authority, Peabody Englewood Development. June 21, 2020 at 3:16 PM email titled " The Illegal Reentry of Boston Housing Authority Custodian Vincent Wright ....A.k.A. Jason Wright Into the United States Again sent to Boston

Housing Authority Legal Department's General Counsel Caesar Cardozo stating the following: " Boston Housing Authority Custodian

Vincent Wright whose true identity is Jason Wright a deported aggravated felony conviction was deported from the United States after serving five years sentence in the state of New York Department of Corrections, for Sodomy rape in the first degree of a child under the age of 10yrs.old. I also charged Boston Housing Authority with aiding and abetting an unregistered sex offender. June 29, 2020 at 1:14 PM email titled "Manager Agreement" received from Boston Housing Authority Property Manager Angel Santos stating "enclosed you will find the manager agreement we talked about." "Please sign and send it

back to me."

The Boston Housing Authority has no date transcribed on it, although on the last page of the Manager Agreement it states "that it's a legal document upon both parties signature." The Manager Agreement goes on to state that "The Resident Sharon Riddick will cease harassing Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian Vincent Wright by making unfounded accusations of his alleged video taping, photographing, or otherwise interfering with the resident right to quiet enjoyment of her premises. ""The BHA will examine the resident apartment's heat detectors and if defective, BHA will repair them." "If they are found not to be properly functioning, BHA will provide proof to the resident of that and if the resident is still dissatisfied, she retains the right to seek relief from a court or administrative agency with jurisdiction over such matters." "The resident agrees to notify BHA Officials of any problems with her tenancy before contacting law enforcement to see whether the issue, whatever it may be, can be resolved." June 30, 2020 at 10:08 AM email titled "Teachable Moment" sent to Boston Housing Authority Property Manager Angel Santos stating the following " My refusal to sign the Manager's Agreement," Asserting my Constitutional Right of the First Amendment to petition the government to redress your grievances, so therefore I would be calling the law enforcement should any future incidents concerning Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian Vincent Wright arises. I also stated that "I would like to thank you for your acknowledgement of past breaking entries in the daytime on my unit of Boston Housing Authority Custodian Vincent Wright. For YOUR OWN agreement states as :

"Vincent Wright shall not enter the resident's apartment for any reason by himself." Sharon Riddick's Civil Rights of Race, Sex, National Origin, Disability were violated by Boston Housing Authority Custodian Vincent Wright A.K.A. Jason Wright , and Boston Housing Authority for not conducting a thorough vetting process when hiring Vincent Wright, a registered sex offender in the state of New York. "Boston Police Offense/Incident Report No.:202059093 by reporting officer William Bulger dated August 17, 2020 at 11:17 AM for a harassment report Plaintiff "Sharon Riddick is reporting coming home to discover an open condom hanging from my apartment door." "I stated to the officer that BHA Residential Custodian Vincent Wright was the person who did this.

The officer asked me "how do I know it was him?" I stated he was suspended from work since June for putting hidden cameras in my apartment." I stated that he lives in the building on the 6th floor."

September 5, 2020 at 5:34 PM email titled " Refuting the Boston Housing Authority Investigation Findings" sent to Boston Housing Authority Legal Department General Counsel, HUD Office of Public Housing Ellen Bradley Portfolio Management Specialist stating the following: consisting of false statements, inaccuracies, such as the misspelling of my first and last name. Lastly how can you have an "Investigation Findings" and NOT I repeat NOT interview the Victim the Complainant who is filing the complaint, me ...Sharon Riddick.

Throughout Boston Housing Authority's Colleen Leaver Employee Relations Coordinator Investigation Letter there is no indication that she talked to me or emailed, or asked me to refute BHA Custodian

Vincent Wright a.k.a Jason Wright's claims of slander or threats, aggression, argumentative, resentment. Just accusations towards me accusing me (Sharon Riddick) of Civil Rights violations, slander, threats, aggression, Argumentative, resentment, insufficient evidence.

I am under the impression that in order for Investigation findings to take place ALL parties involved have/should be interviewed. Nowhere in Colleen Leaver's In Investigation Findings I am quoted as refuting any of Property Manager Eagle BHA Custodian Vincent Wright claims of wrongdoing. I was NOT interviewed by General Counselor Caesar Cardoza. I was NOT interviewed by Senior Attorney Jay Koplove. I was Not interviewed by Employee Relations Coordinator Colleen

Leaver.

December 23, 2020 Approximately 9:00 AM BHA Residential Custodian Vincent Wright removed an Out of Order elevator from the door and turned it on by placing it back into commission with his building maintenance key, and turning the elevator that is rightful in-use off with his building maintenance key. Myself and a elderly Asian woman both walked on the (unbeknownst to us) broken elevator. Selected our floors and however the elevator passed our selected floors and started to shake violently and wouldn't stop. Myself and the elderly Asian woman were holding on to the handicapped banisters located on the walls of the elevator. The elevator was levitating on the fifth floor, finally the doors to the elevator flew open and I immediately exited the elevator and instructed the elderly Asian lady to get off the

elevator as well. I ran down to the lobby area where the elevator is and there was BHA Residential Custodian Vincent Wright (with his back towards me) placing the out of order sign back on the elevator and turning it off with his key.

At this time he also turns the elevator that is supposed to be utilized back on. I stated "I know that it was you who turned the elevator off and turned the broken elevator on." I stated "I know who you are," "I know all about you," "You're a child molester, your real name is Jason Wright your d.o.b. September 10, 1973 you received a permanent deportation to your country Jamaica; from this country the United States in June 1999, after serving a five year sentence in New York State Department of Corrections in Februaury 15, 1994 for Sodomy in the 1st degree rape of a child under the age of 10 years old date of crime June 21, 1993.

December 23. 2020 at 3:00 PM Harassment Prevention Order Docket No.: 2007ro1368 issued against Sharon Riddick and listing BHA Residential Custodian Vincent Wright as the Plaintiff, stating the following: "I am ordered not to abuse the Plaintiff." "You are ordered to stay 25 yards away from the Plaintiff." "You are order to stay 25 yards from the Plaintiff residence of 1875 Dorchester Ave #609 ``"You are ordered to stay 25 yards from the plaintiff workplace located 52 Chauncy Street Boston."

Order expires January 6, 2021 at 4pm" signed and issued by Judge James Coffee, Next Hearing date January 6, 2021.

### **The Oath Keepers**

December 10, 2021 Appellant files an Objection to the December 8, 2021 Order of Judge Gorton. Appellant "Objection" stating the following: "Docket No. 13-27 filed on various dates in the District Court of Massachusetts case No. 21:-cv-11349.

Appellant objected to Judge Gorton Dismissal of her "Supplemental Pleadings" and that in accordance to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures Rule 15, (d) clearly allows the Appellant to file Supplemental pleadings allow the party to add claims or defenses based on facts that occurred after the original pleading was filed.

Courts have discretion to allow a party to supplement its pleading, and the inquiry is very similar to that in Rule 15(a)(2). For the following foregoing reason(s) the Plaintiff Sharon Riddick Supplemental Pleadings B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, should have been allowed into the Court Docket of 21:-cv-11349 Sharon Cammille Riddick vs. The Boston Housing Authority et.al. immediately. May 26, 2022 Magistrate Judge Jennifer Boal issued a Report and Recommendation stating "This Court recommends that Judge Gorton grant the Defendants motion to strike and dismiss the Amended Complaint. June 8, 2022 Appellant Submitted her "objection" to Judges Boal, Gorton Report and Recommendation and exhibits at District Court of Massachusetts.

July 6, 2022 Judge Nathaniel Groton issued an order ACCEPTING and ADOPTING Report and Recommendations to dismiss 21:-cv-11349.

July 9, 2022 Appellant filed an Notice to Appeal with the District Court of Massachusetts. October 5, 2022 MOTION to supplement the record on appeal filed by Appellant Sharon Cammille Riddick. October 5, 2022 Motion to Increase the Amount of Relief filed by Appellant Sharon Cammille Riddick. October 17, 2022 at 10:33 am email sent to Travelers Insurance company to Nancy Johnson, Central Support, Bond Specialty Insurance Claim, Hartford, CT. Appellant filed claims on "breach of oath" against the following judicial employees, Dorchester District Court Judicial employees, Judge James Coffey or Coffy, Judge Jonthan Tynes, Judge Samir Zaganjori, Assistant Clerks Helen White, John Coughlin, Kelly Murphy, Chief Probation Officer Brad McNicholas, Asst. Chief Probation Officer Sean Norris, Trial Court Officer Goldman. Suffolk County District Attorney Office, Assistant District Attorney Michael Anderson, Assistant District, Benjamin Hui, Housing Court Eastern Department Clerk of the Court Michael Neville, Housing Court Eastern Department Assistant Clerk Jeffery Uber, Housing Court Judge Michael E. Malamut, Office of Transcription Services, Language Access and Court Records, Manager Michael Beaulieu, Director, Language Access and Court Records Department A2 Interpreters, Translators, Trial Transcripts, Administrative, Court Records Sybil A. Martin Ph.D., Director, for their criminal activities

while in office. October 20, 2022 ORDER entered by Jeffrey R. Howard, Appellate Judge: Appellant's Motion to Expand the Record and Motion to Increase the Amount of Relief are denied. October 20, 2022 MOTION to reconsider [6527160-2] filed by Appellant Sharon Cammille Riddick. October 22, 2022 MOTION to supplement the record on appeal filed by Appellant Sharon Cammille Riddick. Complaint, and 21H84SP001850 Boston Housing Authority vs. Sharon Riddick, Case details.

**-Medical Facts-**

June 4, 2021 at 11:15 AM Progress Notes from Atrius Health Harvard Vanguard Dr. Monica Gomez. This is my first introduction with Dr. Monica Gomez as my PCP Primary Care Physician through a walk -in appointment of symptoms of abdominal pain in the lower quadrants for two days. At this appointment I reported to Dr. Monica Gomez "abdominal pain in the lower quadrants."

January 25, 2022 at 2:00pm Progress Notes from Boston Medical Center Dr. Luise Pernar. I had my once an annual routine Boston Medical Center Bariatrics Surgery appointment with General Surgeon Luise I. Pernar, M.D., My initial encounter was with a female Medical Student who was assisting Dr. Pernar "at the time I related to both of them that I was being poisoned by my Landlord, the Boston Housing Authority employees, Tradesmen and members of the LGBTQ Community," "were breaking into my apartment to poison my powder protein shake." I also reported "the poison is centered in the protein shake that I have to consume everyday that is located on top of the fridge." "This is causing my lower abdomen to pain me severely." The Medical Student entered every word I reported to her in my medical records. I asked Dr. Pernar to "order a toxicology blood work on me." I even question the fact that how did they, BHA and its co- conspirators know that I had to consume a protein powder shake everyday, I am a very private person. Dr. Luise I. Pernar "refused to order toxicology blood work on me citing that the hospital does NOT perform this kind of testing to refer me to see my PCP." Dr. Luise Pernar called her team and herself to escort me out of the department although I was not in a threatening or aggressive manner I was just in a lot of pain. Dr. Pernar kept reciting to me to go and see my PCP.

January 28, 2022 at 8:45 am I had an appointment to see Dr. Gomez. In her progress notes she made the false statement of 18 U.S.C. 1001

"We had done extensive labs back in June 2021, all fine." In fact, according to my "Urinalysis Macroscopic W/Reflex MICRO Past Results the " Squamous epithelial cells for June 4, 2021 was a "1+A" and my Protein (U) was "1+A." Dr. Monica Gomez should have known back in June 4, 2021 that I had proteinuria which was triggered by a tradition risk factors, base on numerous studies that have suggested that heavy metals such as Cadmium (Cd), lead (Pb), arsenic (As) Mercury (hg), Uranium and Chromium (Cr) accumulate in the kidneys and that even low levels can induce CKD and proteinuria. On January 28, 2022 at 8:45 am appointment reported to Dr. Monica Gomez that I was being poisoned at my home. the Boston Housing Authority, my landlord and their employees Maintenance Tradesmen were breaking into my apartment and poisoning my protein powder shake when I went out on errands. I stated "I could NOT report this to the Boston Police yet without proof I asked Dr. Monica Gomez for a toxicology test for toxins." February 14, 2022 at 9:30 am appointment at Brigham and Women's Hospital at 75 Francis Street Boston MA, Infectious Disease with Fellow Ellen Ngama and Daniel R. Kuritzkes, M.D.

Infectious Diseases Attending. Dr. Daniel Kuritzkes made the following false statement 18 U.S.C. 1001 in his progress notes into my medical record. "In August 2021 she noticed that about 15 minutes after drinking the shake she would develop throbbing right lower quadrant discomfort that could last for minutes or hours." I reported to

Dr. Nagami and Dr. Kuritzkes that I was being poisoned by my landlord The Boston Housing Authority and its employees Tradesmen; were breaking and entering into my apartment, to poison my powder protein shake and my food and drinks, when I would leave to go on errands. I requested a toxicology test to confirm the poison.

Dr. Nagami stated "**that Brigham and Women did NOT perform toxicology testing" and suggested that I "change the locks to my apartment door and go to the authorities.** March 5, 2022 5:09 am email sent to Dr. Monica Gomez requested a "referral" for me to attend Quest Diagnostics for Urine testing on Heavy Metals immediately. March 8, 2022 at 11:52 am I arrived at Quest Diagnostic after having to seek toxicology testing on my own because Dr. Gomez refused to order any toxicology testing on my behalf.

I message Dr. Gomez through my Chart to request a referral for the testing so that I would not be charged the cost of the testing. Quest Diagnostic toxicology of heavy metals stating the heavy metals testing of Lead Urine, Arsenic Urine, Mercury Random Urine, Cadmium Random Urine, Cobalt Random Urine, Thallium Urine, Creatinine Random Urine. All negative.

May 2, 2022 the Appellant purchased a "Doctor's Data Heavy Metals Toxicity Test (31 Toxins Tested) for \$124.00.

**May 2, 2022 I purchased Burdock root and followed the directions by taking it twice a day, within 2 hours after taking the pain, the pain in my lower abdominal went away completely after taking Burdock Root for (30) thirty days twice a day.**

May 7, 2022 Appellant mail off her specimen to Doctor's Data Labs.

May 8, 2022 1:21pm email sent to Boston Fire Fire Marshal Office, Administrative Assistant Lori Donovan. Appellant requested a copy of the Boston Fire Report dated May 2, 2022 reporting of Carbon monoxide poisoning, being leaked into my apartment from another tenant's apartment or vacated apartment by Boston Housing Authority employees Tradesmen.

May 12, 2022 Doctor's Data Lab received the Appellant's Specimen.

May 13, 2022 at 12:45 pm email from the Appellant to BHA Attorney David Frye stating the following " Someone is Breaking Into my Apartment To Commit Hate Crimes."Appellant also identify a Russian /Ukrainian mercenary contractor counterintelligence white Supremacist federal agent name "CONSTANTINE" and and Freemason black men, and Black Nationalist of Nation of Islam, F.O.I. Fruit of Islam men were aiding and abetting employees BHA Tradesmen with his federal security clearance to commit premeditated first degree murder for hire by "hacking" into my security system Company App Blue by ADT in order to gain access to my passcode to turn off my security camera, the audio and my door sensor; so that BHA employees may gain access into my unit undetected to poison my protein shakes mix, food, drinks. My Xfinity wifi was "hacked" to stop all recordings through my security camera. I also retain in my possession ALL keys to my front door lock to my apartment door even after changing the locks seven times to seven different locks.

ADT monitoring Center call is forward to the silence ring, therefore I will not even see, hear, or know the call does not display in my call logs at all.

I know this because I entered my apartment and forgot to turn off the alarm before entry; and I noticed that the ADT monitoring center did not call; so when I looked at my phone it rang in as a "missed call." Buffalo news article May 26, 2022 titled "**Authorities Investigating If Retired Federal Agent Knew of Buffalo Mass Shooting Plans in Advance.**"

Salon news article May 27, 2022 titled "**Buffalo Shooter May Have Shared Plans with Racist Retired Federal Agent Before Massacre: report.**"

Insider news article May 27, 2022 titled "**Retired Federal Agent May Have Known About Plans for Buffalo Shooting Ahead of the Massacre, report says.**"

MSNBC News article August 15, 2002 titled "**FBI Agent Charged With Hacking**"

NPR news article October 25, 2021 titled "**The Russian Hacker Group Behind the SolarWinds Attack Is At It Again, Microsoft Says**" Department of Justice News March 24, 2022 "Titled "**Four Russian Government Employees Charged In Two Historical Hacking Campaign Targeting Critical Infrastructure Worldwide.**" May 18, 2022 at 5:54 pm Appellant received an email

stating Please find an attached digital copy of your results.

May 18, 2022 Toxicology results reporting heavy metals positive readings of Chromium, Nickel, Tungsten levels 95% percentile.

May 18, 2022 at 9:08 AM email from BHA Attorney David Frye stating the following: "Received."

May 24 2022 8:45 AM Progress Notes of Dr. Monica Gomez I had an appointment with Dr. Monica Gomez I arrived, in hand with the results from Doctor's Data Heavy Metals Toxicity Test (31 Toxins Tested)" stating that I have 95% percentile for the (3) Three heavy metals poisoning of Chromium, Nickel, Tungsten in my system. Dr. Monica Gomez stated the following to me during this appointment "I advised her that I do not have any experience with poisoning or heavy metal exposure, nor do I have any experience

**interpreting heavy metal test results and do not know how to interpret these results she brought today.**

**I was honest about this from the first time she mentioned concerns to me (office visit 1/28/22 with me) about being poisoned.**

June 16, 2022 8:30 AM appointment with Massachusetts General Hospital Pulmonary Virtual Department 55 Fruit St. Boston MA. Dr.

David Christopher Christianti who at the time of my appointment conduct a thorough view of my Doctor's Data Heavy Metals Toxicity Test (31 Toxins Tested)" stating that I have 95% percentile for the (3) Three heavy metals poisoning of Chromium, Nickel, Tungsten in my system; and became very concern with the results and order a 24 hour urine at Massachusetts General Hospital Labs to which I comply fully with the 24 hour urine testing. June 22, 2022 8:55 pm results of my 24 hour urine collection for chromium within the standard range of negative. June 24, 2022 8:12 am results of my 24 hour urine collection for Nickel within the standard range of negative.

June 20, 2022 at 12:58 pm emails for BHA General Counsel outlining "Gangstalking" of Boston Housing Authority Tenants of apartments 307, 308, 321, 322, 403 a relative of Appellee Vincent Wright who resides on the 6th floor gangstalking the Appellant's arrivals and departure and following her.

June 21, 2022 at 2:06pm email to BHA General Counsel Caesar Cardozo. Appellant will report this matter of gangstalking to BHA Site Manager Beatrice Ortega, and BHA Police Zin Jenkins. June 30, 2022 at 1:14 pm email from the Appellant to Boston Housing Authority General Counsel Caesar Cardozo titled "There Is A Hit On My Life"..... In this email the Appellant is describing the following: a break & entry into her apartment, and tampering with her air conditioner causing it to leak FREON, and the placement of an odorless toxic chemical that was causing irritation to the Appellant nose and chest area. It would appear a conspiracy is in place by Boston Housing Authority employees to break into my apartment and tamper with my food and drinks with a chemical power substance (poison). Once after consuming or digesting the drinks / liquids, I will then experience a severe lower abdominal pain in the right side of my abdomen. This is appearing to happen to me whenever I have scheduled court events on 5/18/22, 6/2/22 6/8/22, 6/27/22 and various dates of when I leave to go on errands.

Appellant describe the perpetrators who were attempting premeditated first degree murder on her life by identifying "White Males Supremacist" them through their Massachusetts License plates numbers as follows: BHA employee a painter, bald head White male name "Brian" who drives a **blue Ford MiniVan, Massachusetts License Plate 5817E0** was on the Peabody Englewood premises that morning. **Massachusetts LICENSE plate NUMBER 27543 to Dodge Ram pickup truck**, black or dark blue color, Local 12 union sticker on the back window, driver gray haired with eyeglasses, burly/overweight white male, who is an plumber, likes to wear short pants even winter time. **-Massachusetts License Plate NUMBER 6RK273 Gray four doors Honda Accord** belonging to Boston Housing Authority Site Manager Beatrice Ortega Hispanic White Female overweight, short in height. location 1875 Dorchester Ave Peabody Englewood Development Management Office. Boston Housing Authority floor tile fitter white male name unknown drive **Chevrolet Silverado blue pickup truck Massachusetts Plates 1BAW76** and pony tail hair, -Boston Housing Authority Painter name Brian- white male **Massachusetts Plates 5817E0 or Q to Blue Ford MiniVan**) -(Boston Housing Authority Maintenance Custodian white male name David **Massachusetts License Plate 2ETL27 Gray Cherokee Jeep**) -Boston Housing Authority Drywaller Irishman with an Irish accent drives a red pickup RAM truck with white sticker on the rear window with numbers 534 Boston Local Union Plasterers and Cement Masons) **Massachusetts License Plate Number 2ZHP35 or 2ZHB35**. August 23, 2022 11:45 am appointment video Dr. Gomez with more "gaslighting" me by writing false statements 18 U.S.C. 1001 in her notes /visit summary. I informed Dr. Gomez although the Residential Custodian has now been transferred from my building I no longer want to remain in this environment/ apartment it has now become a trigger to my trauma, considering I have been poisoned and Dr. Gomez is well aware that I have been poisoned. At this Virtual Appointment with Dr. Monica Gomez I informed her that I need my Reasonable Accommodation form to be completed once again by her because the Boston Housing Authority never sent the form over to the Transfer Committee, nor did they send me a letter of determination of November 1, 2021 via email as I requested on May 26, 2021 at 11:44 am stating the transfer reasonable accommodation was denied until a

year later via email July 15, 2022 at 2:43 pm. Statements by Dr. Monica Gomez concerning my health.

I Reported to Dr. Gomez that I would like some type of blood work testing for carbon monoxide poison. I have explained to Dr. Monica Gomez that someone is using a vacate or apartment that is next to my apartment to seep through the heating system to seep carbon monoxide gas into my apartment that is causing my nose to burn, my chest to burn and constrict, and my eyes to water. The gas is odorless. I have called the Boston fire department on (2) two occasions to come out and assess the situation.

Boston Fire states "they do not smell anything." I stated "I did not know you can smell carbon monoxide."

Judge Magistrate Jennifer C. Boal committed 18 U.S.C. 1346 Honest Services Fraud by failing to disclose a "Conflict of Interest" to Defendant Boston Housing Authority Colleen Leaver who is listed as a Defendant in case 1:21-cv-11349 Riddick v. Boston Housing Authority. Judge Magistrate Jennifer Boal took it upon herself to dismiss Boston Housing Authority Defendant Colleen Leaver and ONLY Colleen Leaver from the case.

February 3, 2023 at 9:34 am Extension of a Harassment Prevention Order listing Defendant Boston Housing Authority Maintenance Worker as Plaintiff expiring on March 3, 2023. Although BHA Maintenance Worker Vincent Wright as of July 13, 2021 has moved out of his apartment located at 1875 Dorchester Avenue.

As Appellant Sharon Riddick was able to prove with January 8, 2023 POSITIVE lab results of HSV-1 (HERPES SIMPLEX VIRUS-1) of a bioterrorism attack of utilizing a virus. Considering the Appellant Sharon Riddick has been celibate for the past nine years. Appellant Sharon Riddick was granted an emergency apartment transfer.

However, the Boston Housing Authority claims there are no apartments available and placed me on a waiting list. The Appellant believes this is a pretext on behalf of the BHA. June 28, 2023 Appellant Sharon Riddick filed a Clarification Motion requesting answer as to why the First Circuit has sealed all her court filings, considering the Appellant has a petition on file for a En Banc review & En Banc to the full panel of the court. Appellant argues that the suppression or sealing of her court documents is an infringement of her rights the First Amendment- right to petition the government to redress her grievances, and the Fourteenth Amendment - right to due process.

August 9, 2023 First Circuit Judges Kayatta, Howard, Gelpi entered an Order in the Appellant's favor stating **"Appellant is deemed to have waived any privacy interest in relevant documents, and, with one exception, all filings sealed pursuant to the judgment of June 20, 2023, shall be unsealed."**

However the August 9, 2023 Order from Judges Kayatta, Howard, Gelpi, did NOT include an enforcement date.

August 30, 2023 at 4:25pm duration of incoming call three (3) minutes 617. 748.9885 I received a callback from First Circuit Court of Appeals Case Worker Jennifer Westfa who assure me that "they were in the process of unsealing & uploading my court filings back to the CMEFC." I was under the impression before disconnection of the call all court filings will be restored during the Labor Day week."

September 10, 2023 Appellant files "Appellant's Motion for "Further" Clarification & a "Concrete Timeframe" on the Unsealing of All Appellant's Court Filing at the First Circuit."

September 10, 2023 Appellant files "Appellant's Motion For Contempt of Court of Judge's Kayatta, Howard and Gelpi Order entered on August 9, 2023."

September 18, 2023 Appellant files "Appellant's Notice of Interlocutory Appeal at the Supreme Court of the United States regarding Judge's Kayatta, Howard and Gelpi Order entered on August 9, 2023."

## **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

The 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution is a cornerstone of American democracy, ensuring equal protection and due process for all citizens. While the equal protection clause has received significant attention, it is essential not to overlook the immense significance of due process. Due process, as enshrined in the 14th Amendment, serves as a vital safeguard against arbitrary governmental actions, upholding the principles of justice, fairness, and individual rights. Due process is crucial for a just society, it has a major role in protecting individual's liberties, and its contribution to the overall stability and legitimacy of the legal system.

### **I. The First Circuit and the District Court of Massachusetts Ruled Incorrectly to Strike the Petitioner's Complaint on the Basis of Insufficient Defense, Redundant, Immaterial, Impertinent, Scandalous Matter.**

The Federal Rule of Civil Procedure does not require a claimant to set out in detail the facts upon which she bases her claims and a complaint. Petitioner's Complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the Petitioner can prove no set facts in support of her claim which would not entitle her to relief. In direct contrast to the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure which did not support a dismissal of the petitioner's complaint based on a preponderance of the evidence, it is evident that the petitioner's complaint is well-founded and substantiated. Through a meticulous examination of the evidence presented, it becomes clear that the petitioner's claims are not only valid but also supported by a substantial amount of evidence. The petitioner's complaint outlines a compelling case, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the legal framework and presenting a strong argument that warrants serious consideration. Consequently, it is imperative that the court carefully evaluates the evidence and upholds the petitioner's complaint, acknowledging the weight of the evidence in favor of the petitioner's claims.

The petitioner's complaint should not have been dismissed by the First Circuit based on Fed.R. Civ. P. rule 12 (b), (6), (f), Rule 8 (a), (2), and Rule 9, as these rules do not provide an adequate basis for dismissal. Rule 12 (b) allows a defendant to assert various defenses, such as lack of jurisdiction or failure to state a claim, but it does not automatically warrant dismissal of the

complaint, nor did the Petitioner's complaints meet the threshold for a dismissal. Similarly, Rule 12 (f) permits a court to strike insufficient defenses, but it does not justify dismissing the entire complaint. Rule 8 (a), (2) requires a short and plain statement of the claim, but it does not require a detailed or exhaustive explanation. Lastly, Rule 9 sets forth specific pleading requirements for certain claims, but non-compliance with these requirements does not necessarily warrant dismissal. Dismissing the petitioner's complaint based on these rules would be premature and would not serve the interests of justice.

Wherefore the Supreme Court of the United States has already established past precedent by firmly asserting that a complaint should not be dismissed under Rule 12 (f) which allows a court to strike insufficient defenses. The

Court emphasizes that this rule serves as a crucial tool for the court to eliminate defenses that are clearly inadequate or legally insufficient, thereby promoting efficiency and fairness in the judicial process. The Court further emphasizes that the purpose of Rule 12(f) is not to dismiss an entire complaint, but rather to strike specific defenses that are manifestly deficient. By allowing the court to strike such defenses, the rule ensures that parties are not burdened with baseless or frivolous claims, while also enabling the court to focus on the merits of the case. Ultimately, the Supreme Court's opinion underscores the importance of Rule 12 (f) in maintaining the integrity of the legal system and upholding the principles of justice.

August 18, 2021 Petitioner filed a 139 page civil action Docket No. 1 in the District Court of Massachusetts, and Docket No. 50. 1,960 exhibits. The Respondents were served the complaint and summons and on November 4, 2021 by the Federal Marshal Services. Returned receipt to Respondents received for mail on December 20, 2021. Respondents refuse to respond to Petitioner's complaint, therefore leaving the Petitioner to file Docket No. 47, 48. a "Motion for Default Judgment" on December 28, 2021, and on January 10, 2022 Docket No.49 a "Memorandum of Law In Support for Default Judgment, Docket No. 50. exhibits to Respondents." Only when a Motion for default judgment was filed by the Petitioner then a Notice of Appearance by David Frye on the behalf of the Boston Housing Authority, Jay Koplove, Colleen Leaver, Angel Santos, Vincent Wright.

December 10, 2021 Petitioner filed an “Objection” to Judge Gorton December 8, 2021 Order to dismiss the Petitioner’s motion as an Amended Complaint; in doing so Judge Gorton “erred.” Filings of Docket No. 13-27 are marked in each of the Petitioner’s Supplemental Pleading as Supplements with an alpha letter listed.

Petitioner Sharon Riddick’s objection citing she was well within the scope of the Federal Rules Civil Procedure, Rule 15 (d) Supplemental Pleadings; and Judge Gordon Should not have dismissed the Petitioner’s Supplemental Pleadings. Petitioner looks at this court action by Judge Gorton as a “manufactured favorable ruling” in the Respondent’s favor. Clearly “Rule 15(d) allows parties to add claims or defenses to their original pleading to address facts that have arisen after the date the original complaint was filed. This is the important distinction between amended and supplemental pleadings. Amended pleadings allow the party to add claims, parties, or defenses based on facts that occurred before the original pleading was filed. Supplemental pleadings allow the party to add claims or defenses based on facts that occurred after the original pleading was filed. Courts have discretion to allow a party to supplement its pleading, and the inquiry is very similar to that in Rule 15(a)(2).

June 8, 2022, Docket No. 68. Petitioner submitted an Objection to Judge Jennifer Boal’s Report and Recommendation citing the foregoing reasons as to why Judge Boal “erred” in her Report and Recommendation to dismiss the civil action on the bases of Rule 8, of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff Sharon Riddick has met the burden/requirement of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by stating a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction, unless the court already has jurisdiction and the claim needs no new jurisdictional support; Claim for Relief. Plaintiff listed “TITLE VII, VI, AND THE (ADA) AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT.” Plaintiff also attached a “Statement of Claim containing 135 pages and 642 paragraphs NOT 618 paragraphs as Judge Boal falsely stated in her Report and Recommendation of the defendant’s motion to strike plaintiff’s statement of claim to dismiss action. See, Rios-Campbell vs. United States Department of Commerce, No.18-1420 (1st Circuit 2019)

Although Judge Boal cited Federal Rules and Civil Procedure Rules 8, 9, 12, she does not offer an analysis of Rule 9 that supports her Report and Recommendation to dismiss as to why the Petitioner's Complaint should be dismissed in the first place; under the basis of Rule 9.

Citing Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 (b)(6), the Respondents urge the District court to affirm on the alternative basis that the complaint failed to state a claim for a court to strike a pleading on the basis of insufficient defense, or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.

Petitioner's task is to "first disregard conclusory allegations that merely parrot the relevant legal standard" and "then inquire whether the remaining factual allegations state a plausible, rather than merely possible, assertion of defendants' liability." Young v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 717 F.3d 224, 231 (1st Cir. 2013).

As a federal court sitting in diversity, we look to state law, as articulated by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, for the substantive rules of decision. Shaulis v. Nordstrom, Inc., 865 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2017). At the pleading stage, "Petitioner accepts as true all well-pleaded facts set out in the complaint and indulge all reasonable inferences in favor of the pleader." S.E.C. v. Tambone, 597 F.3d 436, 441 (1st Cir. 2010). So, we need only determine whether the complaint's allegations make it plausible that, on a full factual record, a factfinder of Petitioner's exhibits and Supplements could reasonably regard the Respondent's Motion to strike the Petitioner's

Complaint as desperate remedial tactic that is often sought by the Respondents in other legal venues i.e., the Housing Court Department in case of a "fraudulent housing eviction" case no. 21SP1850, "Boston Housing Authority v. Sharon Riddick;" where the Respondent's Counsel have filed a February 17, 2022 "notice of appearance" and a April 27, 2022 (1) one page

"Opposition to the Defendant's Dispositive Motion." However the Petitioner has filed (26) twenty-six motions, 600 exhibits, an answer, a Counterclaim at the Housing Court to which ALL were denied, yet the Respondent's Attorney David Frye has only filed a "Notice of

Appearance" and one "motion" throughout the entire legal; proceedings from August 13, 2021-October 19, 20232, but somehow received manufactured favorable rulings through 18 U.S.C. 1346 Honest Services Fraud by bribery from his co-conspirator Housing Court Judge Michael E. Malamut. The strikingly similar criminal tactics of the Respondent's Attorney David Frye are again on display at the District Court consisting of filings on a "Notice of Appearance" see. District Court Docket No. 51.

For instance the Respondent's Attorney David Fyre on February 15, 2022, filed a "Motion to set aside a Default," consisting of (4) four pages Docket No. 52. and on May 3, 2021 a filing of a "Motion to Strike the Plaintiff's Statement of Claims, and To Dismiss This Action," see. Docket No. 60. The Appellant's filings in the District Court consisted of a (139) pages complaint, 1,960 exhibits and coincidentally the Defendants received a "manufactured favorable rulings in exchange for 18 U.S.C.1346 Honest Services Fraud by bribery to devise a scheme or artifice to defraud" to deprive the Petitioner of her intangible right of honest services. Petitioner filed an "objection" on December 10, 2021 to the dismissal to Judge Gorton's Order of Petitioner's supplemental pleadings. Docket No. 31. March 6, 2022 Petitioner filed an affidavit Docket No. 53 in support of Docket No. 52. April 14, 2022 Judge Gorton Memorandum and Order granting. Docket No. 52 motion. May 3, 2022 Petitioner files a notice Docket No. 59. May 3, 2022 Respondents files a Motion to Dismiss and Strike Statement of Claim. Docket No.60

May 4, 2022 Judge Gorton refers the case to Magistrate Jennifer Boal. Docket No. 61. With the exception of Judge Gorton's Order allowing the Petitioner's amended complaint. Docket No. 10. Judge Gorton has dismissed Petitioner's Motion for default, supplemental pleadings. Despite the Respondents not filing a response to the allegations or exhibits to the Petitioner's complaint for months and still not filing a response as of today.

The Respondents are granted a manufactured dismissal through 18 U.S.C.1346 honest service of fraud in a scheme of artifice to defraud the Petitioner of her intangible right in exchange for favorable rulings through bribery. see. United States v. Walker, 490 F.3d 1282, 1297 (11th Cir 2002) (Public officials inherently owe a fiduciary duty to the public to make the governmental decision in the public's best interest. If an official instead makes his decision based on his own interests-as when an official accepts a bribe or personally benefits from undisclosed conflict of interest- the official has deprived the public of his honest services") also see. United States v. Cruz-Arroyo, 461 F.3d 69, 731 (1st Cir. 2006) This criminal activity between the Respondents, Attorney David Frye who were engaged in a 18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy with Judges Nathaniel Gorton, Michael Malamut, and now Magistrate Judge Jennifer Boal; to infringe on the Petitioner's intangible rights is very similar to what the Petitioner was experiencing in the Housing Court Eastern Department concerning

Housing Court Case 21H8SP001850. This criminal activity of Judges and attorneys to manufacture Housing Court cases on the docket for favorable rulings in exchange for bribes; prompted the Petitioner to file a 28 U.S.C. 455 Disqualification of Judge, Justice, or Magistrate Motion for Recusal of Housing Court Judge Michael E. Malamut from the Housing Court Case 21H8SP001850.

For instance, utilizing the Housing Court Eastern Department Case Details on docket and the Courtrooms electronic recording of court proceedings; the Petitioner has unveiled a "(60) COUNT to indictment" Judge Michael E. Malamut and his co-conspirators Asst. Clerk Jeffery Urber, First Justice Joseph Kelleher, Respondent's Attorney David Frye, Clerk of the Court Michael Neville, of federal charges consisting of 18 U.S.C. 1346 Honest Services Fraud, 18 U.S.C.1503 Obstruction of Justice, 18 U.S.C. False Statement 1001, 18 U.S.C. 2 aid & abet, 18 U.S.C. 1956 RICO Racketeering, RICO predicates, 18 U.S.C. 1343 Wire Fraud, 18 U.S.C. 1341 Mail Fraud, 18 U.S.C. 242 Deprivation of the Color of Law, 18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy, 18 U.S.C. 2381 Treason.

The Petitioner filed a total of (24) twenty-four motions at the Housing Court Department Eastern Division, including Supplemental Motion for reconsideration of Order" at the Housing Court, identifying the premeditated first degree murder against her life by poisoning of her protein shakes food, drinks, by heavy metals of chromium, nickel, tungsten, with readings of 95% percentile in my body, seeping toxic chemicals, gas into her apartment through the heating system from a occupied or vacate apartment adjacent to her apartment.

Respondent's Attorney David Frye, and Housing Court Judge Michael E. Malamut entered in a 18 U.S.C. 1346 seditious conspiracy by failure to disclose a "conflict of interest" that Judge Michael Malamut was once employed by the Respondent's in the capacity of Assistant Attorney to the General Counsel at the Boston Housing Authority; The Respondents and their Attorney David Frye, Judge Michael Malamut devise a artifice scheme of obstruction of justice to defraud the Petitioner of her intangible rights to honest services fraud by denying the following: Petitioner's counterclaim of \$45,000, the Petitioner's (24) motions filings, the Petitioner's answer to the Respondents summary process, Petitioner's protections of evictions under the VAWA -Violence Against Women's Act "stalking," the Petitioner's discovery interrogatories. Therefore how was the Petitioner to defend herself

when all of the court filings of the Appellant were denied; and as a result all manufactured favorable ruling have steer towards the Respondents and their Attorney David Frye; although Respondent's Attorney has only filed a "notice of appearance" and a (1) one page dispositive motion, throughout the entire Housing Court proceedings, NOR did the Respondent's Attorney David Frye submit any motion in opposition to the Petitioner's (21) motions. see. (Hammer v. United States, 265 U.S. at 188 (it is not necessary that the government shall be subject to property or pecuniary loss by fraud, but only that it's legitimate official action and the purpose shall be defeated by misrepresentation ... .see. United States v. Ballistrea, 101 F. 3d 827 (2d Cir.1996) Also see. United States v. Dean, 55 F. 3d.640, 647 (D.C. Cir 1995) internal citation omitted) The Respondents and their Attorney David Frye, and Housing Court Asst. Clerk Jeffery Uber, Judge Michael E. Malamut, First Justice Joseph Kelleher engaged in an 18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy to 18 U.S.C. 371 Obstruction of Justice to utilize the Edward Brooke Courthouse as a RICO criminal enterprise to manufactured the Petitioner's Housing Court Case 21H8SP001850, through interference of her intangible rights, through 18 U.S.C. 1346 honest services fraud -bribes in exchange for favorable rulings funnel to the Respondents, their Attorney David Frye. Housing Court Clerk of the Court Michael Neville, First Justice Joseph Kelleher, Assistant Clerk Jeffery Uber, Housing Court Judge Michael E. Malamut committed crimes of RICO, criminal enterprise, pattern of racketeering, and wire and mail fraud through fraudulent ORDERS from Housing Court Judges Kelleher, Malamut. A "pattern of racketeering" is commissioned by two or more individuals, To constitute "racketeering activity," the predicate offense need only be committed; there is no requirement that the defendant or anyone else have been convicted of a predicate offense before a RICO prosecution or action may be brought. see. Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al 1:11-cv-10613-RGS (2011) also see. Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al. 11-1577 (2012) (1st Circuit) also see. Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et. al. 11-7777 (2012) U. S. Supreme Court,(Case consist of a group of Attorneys and state and federal Judges, Clerks orchestrating a RICO criminal enterprise through the judicial system through a pattern of RICO racketeering, and the theft of their client settlements money from insurance companies by invoking the predicates of wire, mail fraud, and a money laundering scheme of \$44,000,000 on basis of

bribes and theft of United States Court of Appeals at the First Circuit Judges Sandra Lynch and Jeffery Howard entered in a scheme to cover-up money laundering by burying case no.11-1577 and evidence by denying all of the Petitioner's motions and legal brief, very similar to their scheme to deny motions in case no. 22-1557. Judge Howard and Lynch's October 28, 2022 ORDER to deny the Petitioner's Reconsideration Motion to Expand the Record and to Increase to Amount of Relief.

The Respondents and their Attorney David Frye engaged in a conspiracy of interference of the Petitioner's Right to Fair Housing (Hate Crimes: Criminal Interference with Fair Housing Rights - Section 3631 makes it unlawful for an individual to use force or threaten to use force to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person's housing rights because of that person's race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin. The statute also makes it unlawful to similarly use force or threaten to use force against anyone who is assisting an individual or class of persons in the exercise of their housing rights.) and 18 U.S.C. 245 Federally Protected Activities. see. United States v. Leonardo Munguia No. 3:19-cr-191-B (03) (N.D. Tex. Mar. 26, 2020) through a "murder for hire" scheme with their employees White Supremacist BHA Tradesmen, the Petitioner's White Supremacist Physicians, White Supremacist Firemen of the City of Boston Fire, White Supremacist Police Officers of the City of Boston Police, and a narcissist White Supremacist Russian, Ukrainian Mercenary Counterintelligence Federal Agent hitman by the name of "CONSTANTINE" and covert narcissists who contracted with the federal government entities as FreeMasons, Black Nationalists of Nation of Islam, F.O.I. Fruit of Islam also put a "contract" out on the Petitioner's life. see. (18 U.S.C. 249 Hate Crime Acts) January 2022, May 18, 2022, June 2, 2022, June 8, 2022, June 27, 2022 September 27, 2022.

Petitioner would leave her apartment for errands or various scheduled court events; while exiting the Petitioner would see the BHA Tradesmen in the lobby of her residence or the exterior of the Petitioner's residence entrance in their vehicles waiting for the Petitioner to exit. White Supremacist Boston Housing Authority Tradesmen have been breaking and entering into my apartment commit several counts of a Hate crime of first degree premeditated murder by "posioning" my protein shakes, vitamin supplements, food

and drinks with “heavy metals” posioning and seeping toxic gas, formaldehyde chemicals into my apartment adjacent from a neighboring apartment or vacate apartment. I have equipped my apartment with the installation of ADT BLUE Security Camera and door alarm; as well as seven different door lock changes to my apartment door.

All incidents of a hate crime of first degree premeditated murder against my life occur before & after locks were changed. The Petitioner is the sole person in possession of all (3) three keys to her apartment door, not even management, nor family members, have copies of keys to the Appellant’s apartment. Covert narcissists who contracted with the federal government entities as Freemason black , and Black Nationalists of Nation of Islam, F.O.I. Fruit of Islam Security ,White Nationalist Russian, Ukrainian Mercenary Counterintelligence Federal Agent hitman by the name of “CONSTANTINE” was using his federal security access clearance to “and was hacking ” into my Xfinity wifi account to stop my wifi. This action would pause my ADT security system and cause my security camera to go “off-line and stop recording.”

see. (Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 508 U.S. 476, 480, 124 L. Ed. 2d 436, 442, 113 S. Ct. 2194, 2197 (1993)

White Supremacist Russian, Ukrainian Mercenary Counterintelligence Federal Agent hitman by the name of “CONSTANTINE” and covert narcissists who contracted with federal government entities as Freemason black men, and Black Nationalist of Nation of Islam, F.O.I. Fruit of Islam were also “hacking” into the ADT Security Company’s APP in order to access my Security Alarm passcode to silence the alarm; as well as hacking into Wireless T Mobile account to forwarded the ADT Security Monitoring Center calls to a silence mode or another number; or forwarded to my voicemail so that the Petitioner would not be alerted to the break -ins. This is how BHA Tradesmen were able to go “undetected” by the ADT Security camera in order “NOT to trip the alarm” into sounding off.

Petitioner has reported the break-ins to the Respondent the Boston Housing Authority Legal Counsel General Counsel Ceasar Cardozo, and the Respondent’s Attorney David Frye; who in return both parties put forth no efforts to “cease and desist” their employees criminal activities. Even after receiving the Petitioner’s May 7, 2022 toxicology

report indicating 95% percentile of (3) heavy metals of Chromium, Tungsten, Nickel in the Petitioner's system.

August 30, 2022 at 12:07 pm the Petitioner placed another call to Boston Fire Department, again of a strong chemical or fumes smell seeping into my apartment that was causing my chest area to constrict my throat, and my eyes, nose to burn. Boston Firemen ID No. 067712 White Supremacists David Mahoney, Sean P. Gibbons ID No. 055550 responded to the call at my residence and asked the Petitioner "if I was on medication." as if to gaslight me as if I am crazy. I retrieve a copy of the Boston Fire Incident Reports which fraudulently listed my calls as " false alarm or false call, other" or "service call," "dispatched & canceled" and ALL reports are "BLANK" "NO" documentation of the incident or "NO" the investigative findings listed throughout the reports.

June 9, 2022 I called Boston Police to report a breaking entry into my apartment a white male dress in a Boston Police Officer uniform responded to the call, instructed me to "throw it away" the evidence that had traces of the poison in it. The Boston Police Officer declined to write up a police report on the incident; after I inquired about retrieving a copy at a later date, stating "I am wearing my body camera, it's all recorded." When the Petitioner asked for the Officer's name he gave the name "Mike Farrell or Russell. I handed the Boston Officer my toxicology report that reads the heavy metals poisoning in my body by 95%. The Officer still refuses to write -up the Boston Police Incident Report." September 11, 2022 submitted a Freedom of Information request for the Boston Police Incident report and Body Camera Footage from Boston Police only to be informed there is no "report" or "body camera footage, by the Director of Boston Public Records Body Camera footage Martha Demaio. Michaela Grenham Liaison Agent -Public Service Unit Boston Police Headquarters; and was told "There is no Boston Police Officer by that name in the Boston Police Database." "There is no Boston Police Report with your address for that date. Conspiracy against Rights (18 U.S.C. §241) Under this statute,it is unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, threaten, or intimidate a person who is exercising any right or privilege secured. On Various dates and times the Petitioner went to several different medical facilities: Carney Hospital, ER Dr. Kelli McDouoghn , Boston Medical Center Dr. Luise Pernar, Pernar's Medical Student, Atrius Health Harvard Vanguard Copley Monica

Gomez, Brigham & Women's Hospital Ellen Nagami, Dr. Daniel Kuritzkes. The Petitioner is seeking toxicology testing to identify the poisoning in her body. All (4) four of the medical facilities would NOT ORDER THE TOXICOLOGY REPORT May 2, 2022 I purchased Burdock Root and ingested it orally twice a day for 30 days to remove the toxins from my body; within 2 hours the pain to my lower abdominal went away completely. May 2, 2022 the Petitioner, also purchased a Doctor's Data Heavy Metals Toxicity (31 Toxins Tested) for \$124.00. May 7, 2022 I sent the specimen off to the lab and May 18, 2022 I received the toxicology results reading (3) three heavy metals in my body Chromium, Nickel, Tungsten, 95% percentile. Just like I suspected I was being poisoned.

Finally Petitioner called Massachusetts General Hospital and scheduled an appointment at the Pulmonary Virtual Department, with Dr. David Christopher Christianti appointment scheduled for June 16, 2022. Dr. Christianti viewed my toxicology results and became concerned and ordered a 24 hour urine test at MGH Labs. July 7, 2022 I received the results all NEGATIVE, the 95% percentile heavy metals in my body Chromium, Nickel, Tungsten were gone, prayers to God and the burdock root removed it. Carney Hospital (white female) Dr.

Kelli Mcdouogh, Boston Medical Center (white female) Dr. Luise Pernar, Harvard Vanguard (Hispanic white female) Dr. Monica Gomez, Brigham's & Women's Hospital (white female) Dr. Ellen Nagam, (white male) Dr. Daniel Kuritzkes engaged in conspiracy to kill the Petitioner by not Ordering toxicology testing; in fact ALL knew beforehand that I was being poisoned. Appellant do NOT believe this is these physicians first time engaging in a conspiracy to commit premeditated first degree murder.

## **(II) Evidence Supporting the Petitioner's Motion to grant Writs of Certiorari**

The Petitioner's case is backed by an extensive collection of supporting evidence, comprising over 1900 exhibits, attachments, emails between the Petitioner and Respondents.. These exhibits, attachments and voluminous emails serve to substantiate the facts presented by the Petitioner in a professional and comprehensive manner. The evidence also includes a wide range of documents, "video recordings," "photos," "medical records," "stalking," "pedophilia," "child pornography," "human trafficking," "a fraudulent maintenance work order to gain access into my apartment for the installation of illegal cameras in my apartment, bedroom, bathroom,"

“hacking into my checking account to steal a 2022 American Rescue plan \$1400 stimulus check,” “fraudulent charge of back owed rent in the amount of \$117.00 by drafting a fraudulent tenant ledger,” “video recordings,” “conspiracy to kidnap me by drafting a fraudulent Section 12 to hospitalize the petitioner in a mental hospital; by holding me against my will for up to seven (7) days in an emergency room of Boston Medical Hospital refusing to let me shower for three (3) days unless I accepted the COVID vaccine,” “falsifying a harassment prevention order & a crime against the petitioner in order for a false arrest, for malicious prosecution of three (3) years and presently on going for a crime the petitioner did NOT commit; although all knowing the Petitioner does NOT have criminal or juvenile record beforehand,” “incidents of gangstalking by Boston Housing Authority tenants, and employees,” “denial of my Reasonable Accommodations request for an emergency safety transfer to another development,” “criminal harassment by intentionally flooding my apartment on more than one occasion,” “several breaking & entry into my apartment to commit theft of printing paper, court filings to upcoming scheduled events, and sabotage of my printer,” “psychological mind games of rearranging items around in my apartment,” “hate crimes,” “several attempts of premeditated murder by poisoning my protein powder shake mix & dietary supplements,” “seeping gas and carcinogens chemicals effecting my organs,( lungs kidneys liver) into my apartment at night from the adjacent apartment; to render me unconscious in order to gain entry into my apartment,” “committing bioterrorism” by placing saliva in my food & water containing the virus of Herpes Simplex HSV-1; I have been celibate for 10 yrs. and presently,” “shooting my windows out with a BB gun,” “embedded a patch of Negro pubic hair in my reusable stainless steel straw,” “a fraudulent housing eviction process,” “an illegal lock-out,” “sabotage of housing rental assistance by Boston Housing Authority Site Manager White Nationalist Beatrice Ortega,” “police reports,” “toxicology results reports,” “court filings,” among others. Covert narcissists who contracted with the federal government entities as Freemason black, and Black Nationalists of Nation of Islam, F.O.I. Fruit of Islam Security, and White Nationalists in disguises as “Xfinity repairmen,” “Boston Police Officers” “Boston Fire Firemen” “Amazon Delivery men” “UPS delivery men,” “Boston Housing Authority State of Massachusetts /Housing Inspector,” and “employees of Boston Housing Authority Tradesmen” “identified as bald headed White Nationalists perpetrators by visual and physical descriptions, make, model, & license plate numbers of their vehicles.” Each exhibit has

and organized to ensure its relevance and reliability in supporting the Petitioner's claims.

The sheer volume and quality of the evidence presented underscores the strength of the Petitioner's case and provides a solid foundation for her arguments.

**III. In Refusing The Petitioner A Rehearing In En Banc, Has Decided An Important Federal Question In A Way That Conflicts With Relevant Decisions Of This Court.**

August 9, 2023 the Petitioner received a fraudulent order with no signature or Judges name attached to this order from the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit Clerk of the Court Maria Hamilton, entering 18 U.S.C. 1001 false statements into the record by stating "I submitted my social security number on a document from the Social Security Administration, and a electronic funds transfer (EFT) form that was from an unrelated individual that the Petitioner accidentally submitted, and if I wanted those documents unseal and available to the public, she must file a signed statement so stating within ten (10) days of this Order." "Decision on the unsealing request is reserved until such time as the court has received a statement from the Appellant or the deadline set out above has expired." "Regardless of the content of any statement Appellant might file, the court is highly disinclined to unseal the unrelated EFT form described above."

Rather than just sealing the "electronic funds transfer (EFT) form and the document with the Petitioner's Social Security number, instead the First Circuit uses the documents of the Petitioner's social security number and the (EFT) as a "pretext" for justification to the sealing of my "entire court filings" consisting of over 1900 exhibits as means to silence me due to the fact the evidence was "overwhelming" and "exposing"against the Respondents and their co-conspirators. Of course this pretext of the First Circuit came as no surprise to the Petitioner. The sealing of 3500 the Appellant's Court filings of case 22-1557 Sharon Riddick v. the Boston Housing Authority et.al. share the striking resemblance to the unconstitutional suppression and the "structure disappearance of court filings" surrounding the cases identification

<u>13-2153</u> <u>Riddick v. American Red Cross Blood, et al</u>	09/20/2013	Sharon Cammille Riddick	11/18/2013 16:27:07	0101-1 : <u>1:13-cv-11002-WGY</u> District of Massachusetts, Boston
<u>11-1577</u> <u>Riddick v. Miliotis, et al</u>	05/25/2011	Sharon Cammille Riddick	02/21/2012 16:21:07	0101-1 : <u>1:11-cv-10613-RGS</u> District of Massachusetts, Boston

The two (2) cases listed above are the opening of “Pandora’s box” and the sole reason as to why the First Circuit Court’s recent refusal to hear the Petitioner’s rehearing en banc concerning an important federal question raises concerns as it conflicts with relevant decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. This decision not only undermines the consistency and uniformity of federal law but also disregards the significance of the Supreme Court’s precedent. It also closes the doors on viewing the true mechanisms on how the First Circuit truly functions... “unlawfully” in a (18 U.S.C. 2384) Seditious Conspiracy.

By refusing to grant a rehearing en banc, the First Circuit Court fails to address the potential implications and consequences of their decision, thereby limiting the opportunity for a comprehensive analysis of the legal issues at hand. This refusal undermines the principles of justice and fairness that are essential to the functioning of our legal system. It was imperative that the First Circuit Court reconsiders its stance and grants the Petitioner’s rehearing en banc to ensure the proper interpretation and application of federal law.

The denial of a rehearing in the case of en banc has raised concerns regarding the violation of the Petitioner’s Sharon Riddick due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment in the Petitioner’s Writ of Mandamus. The decision made by the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit conflicts with previous rulings on an important federal question, which further compounds the issue at hand. see. Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966): (In this case, the Supreme Court held that individuals must be informed of their rights against self-incrimination and their right to an attorney before being interrogated by law enforcement. This ruling conflicted with previous practices that allowed coerced confessions to be used in court).

However, it is worth noting that the Supreme Court has consistently emphasized the importance of due process as a fundamental constitutional right. The Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause guarantees that no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Due process requires that individuals receive notice and an opportunity to be heard before being deprived of their rights.

In the context of court proceedings, due process generally requires that parties have access to a fair and impartial tribunal, the opportunity to present their case, and the ability to have their legal rights enforced. While Rule 70 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides a mechanism for enforcing a judgment for the delivery of property, its application and enforcement are subject to the discretion of the court.

If a court were to consistently fail to enforce Rule 70 without justification, it could potentially raise concerns about the denial of due process.

The inconsistency of the First Circuit not only undermines the integrity of the judicial system but also raises questions about the fairness and impartiality of the court's decision-making process. Additionally, the First Circuit's failure to enforce FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 70, which mandates the unsealing of the petitioner's court documents, further exacerbates the violation of the petitioner's rights. This failure to adhere to established rules and procedures not only disregards the principles of transparency and accountability but also undermines the petitioner's ability to access crucial information necessary for their case.

In light of these concerns, it was imperative that the First Circuit reconsiders its decision and grants the petitioner a rehearing. Just as it is imperative that the Supreme Court of the United States reconsiders the First Circuit decision and grants the Petitioner Writ of Certiorari.

In doing so, the court can rectify the violation of the petitioner's due process rights and address the conflict with relevant decisions of this court and the First Circuit. Furthermore, the First Circuit should have fulfilled its duty to enforce FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 70, by ensuring the unsealing of the petitioner's court documents. Now it is up to the Supreme Court of the United States to uphold the principles of fairness and justice but also promote transparency and accountability within the judicial system. It is crucial that this court acts in accordance with established legal principles and

safeguards the rights of all parties involved, thereby restoring confidence in the integrity of the judicial process.

For 18 USC 3114 prohibits the unauthorized disclosure of court records and proceedings. However, when the court fails to enforce FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 70, which governs the unsealing of court documents, inadvertently contributes to the violation of this statute. By denying the petitioner access to their own court documents, the court effectively obstructs justice and undermines the principles of transparency and accountability.

18 USC 1503 pertains to obstruction of justice. By not enforcing FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 70, the court obstructs the petitioner's access to crucial information necessary for their defense or other legal proceedings. This obstruction undermines the integrity of the legal system and violates the petitioner's right to a fair trial. It is essential to recognize that the unsealing of court documents is crucial for ensuring equal protection under the law and maintaining the principles of justice.


#### The Importance of FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 70:

FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 70 is designed to provide a clear framework for unsealing court documents. This rule ensures that the process is fair, transparent, and in line with constitutional principles. By not enforcing this rule, the First Circuit not only disregards its own procedural guidelines but also violates Petitioner's Sharon Riddick constitutional rights.

It is imperative for the Supreme Court of the United States to GRANT the Petitioner, Sharon Camille Riddick, a Writ of Certiorari. The issues raised in this case are of significant importance and have far-reaching and "conflicting" implications for the justice system. The First Circuit decision not only disregards established legal principles but also undermines the fundamental rights of Petitioner Sharon Camille Riddick. By granting Writ of Certiorari, the Supreme Court can rectify the injustices committed by the lower court and provide much-needed clarity on the interpretation and application of the law. This case presents an opportunity for the Supreme Court of the United States to reaffirm its commitment to upholding the principles of due process and fair legal proceedings, ensuring that justice is served for all individuals involved.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.



Respectfully submitted,  
Petitioner:

Sharon Riddick *Pro Se*,

P.O. Box 240256

Dorchester, MA. 02124

857.381.6356

sharon.riddick@gmail.com

November 2023

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I Sharon Riddick, hereby certify that on November 6, 2023 I filed a copy of the "Writ of Certiorari" via said document will be email to the Respondent "The Boston Housing Authority" ATTN: Acting General Counsel Dean Papademetriou, [dean.papademetriou@bostonhousing.org](mailto:dean.papademetriou@bostonhousing.org), to Respondent's Attorney David Frye at [DFRYE@russofryellp.com](mailto:DFRYE@russofryellp.com)