

## APPENDIX

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – APPENDIX

DENIAL OF RECONSIDERATION FAR MASSACHUSETTS SJC.....	3a
DENIAL OF FAR MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT.....	4a
DENIAL OF APPEAL MASSACHUSETTS APPEALS COURT.....	5a
OPINION MASSACHUSETTS APPEALS COURT DENYING APPEAL.....	6-8a
JON MYERS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION MIDDLESEX SUPERIOR COURT.....	9-12a
JON MYERS' MOTION FOR A HEARING ON REQUEST TO FILE LAWSUIT.....	13a
2014 AGREEMENT.....	14a

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

FAR -29349

SONDRA MYERS & others

v.

JON MYERS

Middlesex Superior Court No. 1381CV04614

A.C. No. 2022-P-0840

NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY

Please note that on August 4, 2023, the following  
entry was made in the docket of the above referenced  
case:

DENIAL of petition to reconsider denial of FAR  
application.

Francis V. Kenneally, Clerk  
s/Francis V. Kenneally

Dated: August 4, 2023

To:

Michael R. Perry, Esquire  
Jon Myers

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

FAR -29349

SONDRA MYERS & others

v.

JON MYERS

Middlesex Superior Court No. 1381CV04614  
A.C. No. 2022-P-0840

NOTICE OF DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR  
FURTHER APPELLATE REVIEW

Francis V. Kenneally, Clerk  
s/Francis V. Kenneally

Dated: June 29, 2023

To:

Michael R. Perry, Esquire  
Jon Myers

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
APPEALS COURT OF THE COMMONWEALTH  
AT BOSTON

In the case no. 22-P-0840

SONDRA MYERS & others

vs.

JON MYERS

Pending in the Superior Court for the  
County of Middlesex

Ordered, that the following entry be made on the  
docket:

Order date July 7, 2022

Denying request to commence

New lawsuit affirmed.

Order date July 19, 2022

Denying Motion for reconsideration

Affirmed

By the Court, s/Joseph F. Stanton, Clerk

Date: May 3, 2023

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
APPEALS COURT

22-P-840

SONDRA MYERS & others\*

vs.

JON MYERS

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER PURSUANT TO  
RULE 23.0

This is an appeal in one of a series of cases between Jon Myers and various family members, including his father Morey Myers' his mother Sondra Myers; his now-deceased former wife Margaret Carney; and his brother, David Nathan Myers. Jon entered into a 2011 settlement agreement wherein he agreed to "cease and desist from ...filing or threatening to file any and lawsuits on any matter whatsoever against any of his family members." Further on February 11, 2014, Morey, Sondra, and Margaret, entered into an agreement for judgment with Jon, where the parties agreed that Jon would be precluded from filing a new suit against each of them "or against any relative," among others, without first obtaining leave from the Regional Administrative Justice. The 2014 agreement for judgment was entered as an order of the court.

\*Morey Myers and Margaret Carney. Defendant Jon Myers asserts that plaintiff Margaret Carney died in 2016; however, no suggestion of death has been filed.

On June 28, 2022, pursuant to the agreement for judgment, Jon filed a motion seeking approval to file a suit against David. On July 7, 2022, a Superior Court judge denied the motion “because” [Jon] identified[d] no plausible claim, nor any claim not barred by the prior judgment, and fail[ed] to identify what relief [was]s sought.” Jon’s subsequent motion for reconsideration was also denied. This appeal followed, although he does not attempt to explain how the judge erred.

We discern no error. The proposed suit is against a family member, Jon’s brother. The Motions states that the situation at issue stems back to 1988, before the prior suits. The claims are barred by both the prior settlement agreement and the agreement for judgment. See Jaroz v. Palmer, 436 Mass. 526, 536 (2002) (claim preclusion bars relitigation of claim dismissed with prejudice). (While the motion that Jon filed was a request to file suit against David, the motion was filed in a case involving Jon’s parents and his former wife. Jon’s parents filed the appellees’ brief in this appeal).

### CONCLUSION

The order dated July 7, 2022, denying the request to commence a new lawsuit is affirmed. The order dated July 19, 2022, denying the motion for reconsideration is affirmed.

So ordered.

By the Court (Milkey,

Massing and Henry, JJ.)  
s/Joseph F. Stanton, Clerk

Entered: May 3, 2023  
The panelists are listed in order of seniority.



MIDDLESEX SUPERIOR COURT  
1381CV-04614

SONDRA MYERS ET AL

Plaintiff

v.

JON MYERS

Defendant

MOTION TO ALLOW A CIVIL LAWSUIT for  
equitable relief and to establish societal standards of  
evil and insanity.

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Now comes, Jon Myers ("Myers") Defendant in above  
named action and respectfully request  
Reconsideration of the Honorable Judge Christopher  
Barry-Smith's ruling of July 7, 2022 denying the  
request to commence a new lawsuit and for reasons  
states:

1. This is a fundamental misunderstanding of  
the element of emotional abuse. Emotional  
abuse is a thoroughly confusing and deceptive  
entity. The pattern of emotionally abuse  
behavior not only has been going on for over  
thirty years, but it is also continuing through  
today. As an analogy, it would be foolhardy to  
think that any recognized form of abuse,  
sexual, physical, or otherwise, would be  
allowed to continue as most people would find  
it abhorrent. Myers is not making random  
states, he is calling forth intense abuse, and

adding significant societal understandings in the process. Myers is consistently claiming throughout his Motion and Memorandum that he has been victimized, by what he calls the worst case of emotional abuse in history, given the intensity and deceptive nature of the pattern.

2. The previous agreements do not prohibit a new lawsuit. This point was made to Myers, by Attorney Michael R. Perry ("Perry") esteem Counsel for the Plaintiffs. When Myers years back, said he was barred, Perry's response was that he "was not barred; he needed to seek consent;" which is indeed the process Myers is ensuing in this instance. The unraveling of the true source of the pattern of behavior has taken years, and even decades to decipher, given the degree of rage directed at him.
3. This is not even a lawsuit, and thereby strict standards of identifying every level of claim and/or relief are not applicable. This is an individual and for that matter, his children and other family members, being deeply harmed, and Myers is in good faith, bringing this before an appropriate authority. The denial of a request even for a hearing is egregious. If the court is so certain that Myers has no validity, which he does, then hear him out. A person, in Myers is averring a profound level of abuse and harm; the onus, ion on the court to decipher whether is abuse is indeed

occurring. Myers understands that the court could be confused by the repetitive nature of Myers's claims, given the extraordinarily challenging nature of understanding emotional abuse. Still the err, if any must be on the side of the pursuit of truth, rather than the cloaking of abuse. Myers's only reason to bring this forward is for truth and appropriate relief, which need not be fully defined at this stage.

4. Myers does not use lightly, a word such as "evil." Most of us do not want to see evil in any form. Evil entails, not just malice, accompanying that malice is deceit, AND an ongoing nature to keep that process intact. Strains of evil run through society, affecting most of us, who desire a peaceful and respectful society. Failing to appropriately confront evil, puts society at risk, by harming our standards, and accepting reckless, actions. Respectfully, Myers pushes for courts to realign towards principles of fairness and equality which are so needed by common people today.

For these reasons, Myers PRAYS that the Honorable Christopher K. Barry-Smith will RECONSIDER his ruling of July 7, 2022 and allow at least a hearing on the matter.

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ Jon Myers

MIDDLESEX SUPERIOR COURT  
1381CV-04614

SONDRA MYERS ET AL

Plaintiff

v.

JON MYERS

Defendant

MOTION TO ALLOW A CIVIL LAWSUIT for  
equitable relief and to establish societal standards of  
evil and insanity.

REQUEST FOR HEARING

Now comes, Jon Myers ("Myers") Plaintiff in above  
named proceeding and respectfully requests this  
Honorable Court to allow a hearing if there is any  
doubt whatsoever, in the merit of Myers' claims and  
for reasons states:

1. Myers has lived under the horror of emotional  
abuse for thirty years, as have his children,  
and it must be defeated.
2. This is a challenging subject matter that  
requires full assessment.
3. Previous opposition from Defendant(s) has  
uniformly dismissed and/or ridiculed Myers,  
further the capacity for more emotional harm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jon Myers

## 2014 AGREEMENT FOR JUDGMENT

Relevant portion:

1. Specifically, the Parties agree that Jon Myers, shall be permanently enjoined from filing any additional lawsuits in any Massachusetts Superior Court against his mother, Sondra Myers, his father Morey Myers, or his ex-wife Margaret Carney or against any relative, attorney, employee or other agent of Sondra or Morey Myers or Margaret Carney without first obtaining prior approval to do so from the Regional Administrative Justice of the county in which Jon Myers seeks to file such a lawsuit and without providing at least ten days written notice to Plaintiffs/Defendants-in-Counterclaims Counsel Michael R. Perry.