

24-5199

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE

**Supreme Court of the United States**

SHARON CAMMILLE RIDICK,

Petitioner,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
VINCENT WRIGHT, BMC DORCHESTER JUDGES  
JAMES COFFEY, JONATHAN TYNES, SUFFOLK  
COUNTY ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEYS  
CHARLES MARSHAL, DAVID D. MCGOWAN, ERIN D.  
KNIGHT, MASSACHUSETTS APPEALS COURT, JUDGE  
JOHN ENGLANDER, MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME  
JUDICIAL COURT CLERKS, MAURA LOONEY, MAURA  
DOYLE, FRANCIS KENNEALLY,

Respondents

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the

Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**


Sharon Riddick

P.O.Box 220517

Boston, MA. 02122

sharon.riddick@gmail.com

May 23, 2024



## **Question(s) Presented**

The questions presented are -

(1).Whether S.J.C. Rule 2:21 (2), as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001) is an adequate basis to dismiss the Petitioner's Complaint, and not a violation of the Petitioner's First Amendment right to petition the government to redress grievances clause, as well as the Fifth Amendment the right to self incrimination and due process clauses?

(2).Whether dismissing and not enforcing Petitioner's M.G.L., CH2, SEC.11, SEC.5 Interlocutory Appeal Into Single Justice, is an act of obstruction of justice by suppression of the Petitioner's Court filings, a violation of the Petitioner's Fourteenth Amendment due process clause?

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTION PRESENTED.....	2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	4-5
OPINIONS BELOW.....	6
JURISDICTION.....	6
STATUTES & RULES .....	7-9
STATEMENT.....	10-11

CASE FACTS 2007cr3256 .....11-24

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION...24-39

**I. The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts & Massachusetts Appeals Court Ruled Incorrectly to Deny the Petitioner's Complaint on the Basis of False Procedural Requirements of Jurisdiction, & Submission of a Legal Brief and Not a Memorandum.....25-26**

**A. Reason On Why There Is An Existing District Attorney Brady's List .....26-35**

**II. Judicial Clerks (18 U.S.C. 27) Aiding & Abetting to Commit Constitutional Amendments Violations on Fraudulent Judgments.....35-40**

CONCLUSION.....40

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....40

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Rios-Campbell vs. United States Department of Commerce, No 18-1420 (1st Circuit 2019).....31

Shaulis v. Nordstrom, Inc., 865 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2017).At the pleading stage.....31

S.E.C. v. Tambone, 597 F.3d,436, 441 (1st Cir. 2010).....31

United States v. Walker, 490 F.3d.1282, 1297 (11th Cir. 2002).....	33
United States v. Cruz-Arroyo, 461 F3d 69, 731 (1st Cir. 2006).....	33
Hammer v. United States, 265 U.S. at 188.....	33
United States v. Ballistrea, 101 F.3d 827 (2d. Cir 1996).....	34
United States v. Dean, 55 F. 3d.640.647 (D.C. Cir 1995).....	34
Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al.,1:11-cv-10613-RGS 2011.....	35-37
Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al.,11-157 (2012, 1st Cir.).....	35-37
Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al. 11-7777 (2012) Supreme Court of the United States....	35-37
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966) .....	37

## **INTRODUCTION**

The decision made by the Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts to deny the petitioner, Sharon Riddick, Motion Interlocutory Appeal under failure to comply with S.J.C. Rule 2:21, citing it presents

A further reason not to disturb the judgment of the single justice; was indeed a grave error that stemmed from a misinterpretation of the Massachusetts Rules of Criminal Procedure, M.R.C.P., and the SJC Rules, and exposes Judicial Misconduct. In particular, the Massachusetts Appeals Court, and the Supreme Judicial

Court of Massachusetts incorrectly concluded that the Respondents were entitled to judgment based on SJC Rule 2:21. This Writ of Certiorari analysis aims to shed light on the flawed reasoning behind the Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts decision and highlight the importance of a fair and accurate application of the Massachusetts Rules of Criminal Procedure in ensuring justice in the Fourteenth Amendment concerning “Due Process.”

The Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts denial of the Petitioner's Sharon Riddick Motion of Interlocutory Appeal and their decision to grant judgment in favor of the respondents, is a clear violation of the Petitioner's due process rights. The Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts decision also conflicts with the established rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States.

By applying the SJC, specifically Rules 2:21 the Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts failed to properly consider the merits and the law 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 Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts 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 Supreme Judicial is reported as “Dismissal [for noncompliance with SJC Rule 2:21] is failure to comply with S.J.C. Rule 2:21 presents a further reason not to disturb the judgment of the single justice. Single justice neither erred nor abused his discretion by denying extraordinary relief.

## **JURISDICTION**

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Appeals Court entered its Judgment on October 5, 2023. Petitioner filed a timely petition at the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, the court denied on February 23, 2024. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1), and a copy of the orders denying, Appendix A,B.

### **APPENDIX (A)**

Opinion of the Massachusetts Appeals Court,

October 5, 2023

### **APPENDIX (B)**

Opinion of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts,  
February 23, 2024

## **STATUES AND RULES**

**-Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure -**

Rule 15 (b)(c)

Rule 15(b) allows for a single justice to hear and determine petitions for interlocutory relief, among other matters.

- Rule 15(c) addresses the filing and service of responses to such petitions.

**Supreme Judicial Court Rule 2:21: Appeal from single justice denial of relief on interlocutory ruling**

**Rule 2:21**

- (1) When a single justice denies relief from a challenged interlocutory ruling in the trial court and does not report the denial of relief to the full court, the party denied relief may appeal the single justice's ruling to the full court.

**RICO Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organized Criminal Activity**

The RICO ACT Sections and Subsections 1962-1968.

Federal Predicates of Mail and Wire Fraud Convictions  
Congressional Research Service September 16, 2011

**RICO Pattern Racketeering Activity**

- 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 RICO 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.

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 V**

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; **nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;** nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

**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.**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### Procedural History

At the heart of this Petition lies a critical question of law that has significant ramifications for the fair and just resolution of the case.

**[To reverse lower court BMC Dorchester First Justice Jonathan Tynes Order to deny. In accordance with the principles, and Law of Void Judgments and Decisions of the United States Supreme Court Decisions on Void Orders, a judgment may NOT be rendered in violation of constitutional protections]**

The Lower Court is NOT in clear correlation to the principle that ensures the rights and liberties guaranteed by the constitution are upheld and that no judgment or decision is made that infringes upon these rights.

The Supreme Court has made several decisions emphasizing the importance of constitutional protections and the invalidity of judgments that violate them.

**The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts issued a Judgment to deny the Legal Brief M.G.L., CH2, SEC.11, SEC 3.5. Interlocutory Appeal Into Single Justice Case; and Before The Full Court At The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court.**

The Massachusetts Court of Appeals & The Supreme Judicial Court dismissed the Petitioner's case, citing S.J.C. Rule 2:21 (2), as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001) "Petitioner did not file the required memorandum but simply filed a brief, in which she scarcely mentioned the existence of an alternative remedy; and it is clear on the record before us that the "defendant cannot make the required showing, as the challenged pretrial rulings can be addressed on appeal from a final judgment if the defendant is convicted." The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts further stated "the Petitioner has an adequate remedy in the ordinary appellate process, the Court single justice lacks jurisdiction over interlocutory criminal matters."

October 5, 2023 Petitioner Sharon Riddick filed an Interlocutory Appeal under Massachusetts General Law G. L. c. 211, § 3. at the Massachusetts Appeals Court, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

The decision made by the Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts to deny the petitioner, Sharon Riddick, Motion Interlocutory Appeal under failure to comply with S.J.C. Rule 2:21, citing it presents  
A further reason not to disturb the judgment of the single justice.

**-Case Facts 2007cr3256-**

**I Introduction of Factual Evidence**

1. For 22 yrs and still presiding on the bench Judge James Coffey has been impersonating a Massachusetts State Court Judge and human trafficking innocent Massachusetts citizens through the criminal justice system and has NOT undergone an “Oath To Office.”
2. Judge Coffey’s failure to properly undergo the oath of office until now has raised questions about the validity of the judge's actions and decisions concerning the lower court case no. 2007cr3256 Commonwealth vs. Sharon Riddick; and has called into question his qualifications and authority to preside over a case. That has now violated a defendant's right to a fair and impartial hearing.
3. December 23, 2023 Boston Housing Authority Residential Custodian Vincent Wright a.k.a. Jason Wright, Jamaican Nationalist illegal immigrant, an unregistered sex offender in the state of Massachusetts, however a registered sex offender in the state of New York under the name a.k.a of Jason Wright, and Chester Hall; engaged in a conspiracy with BMC Dorchester Judge James Coffey to file and issue a fraudulent Harassment Prevention Order against the Petitioner Sharon Riddick, by stating the following (18 USC 1001) False Statements in BMC Dorchester Court:  
4. Page 4 of the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts  
Presiding Judge Coffey

5. (Judge Coffey)It's a very long paperwork I was given. I am trying to work my way through it as we -- as we go here. Pages 6, 7, the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts Presiding Judge Coffey
6. THE COURT: Okay. And -- and you feel you need an order for what reason, to -- why do you feel you need the order? I know she's causing problems."Page 5 of the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts Presiding Judge Coffey
7. (Judge Coffey)THE COURT: -- and she's apparently made other claims, according to the police report, against other people in the building, too?
8. Page 8 of the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts Presiding Judge Coffey
9. -(Judge Coffey)THE COURT: Okay. I am going to allow the order. It's a temporary order. It's good until January 6th. I read through it. There's a lot of police reports here. On 1/6 you can ask the judge to extend it for a full year. I read through it. There's a lot of police reports here.
10. First Justice Jonathan Tynes refused to render a decision by stating "defense's motions (to obtain evidence to defend herself at trial) are frivolous and he will NOT entertain them"the Petitioner Evidentiary Motion, **see. Pages 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court event presiding Judge Jonathan Tynes.**
11. Judge Tynes allowed the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office to enter in a (18 U.S.C.1001) False Statement in order to mislead the court stating:**Page 5 of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court event presiding Judge Jonathan Tynes.**
12. MR. MARSHALL: -- "Brandon Diabola(phonetic), did look into the two -- two of the officers involved in this case to see if there was any kind of exculpatory information regarding those officers that was relevant. After doing his due diligence, checking in with our Appellate

**Unit, looking in with BPD legal, we were unable to find any exculpatory information with regards to the officers involved**

**in this case. I do have a notice of discovery for Ms. Riddick with regards to that point, as well as the Court, if I may approach that?"**

13. August 10, 2023 Appellant Sharon Riddick submitted to the BMC Dorchester Court a "Motion of Clarification of Schedule Court Event On July 28, 2023 Before Judge Jonathan Tynes." The Appellant was seeking clarification regarding the following motions:

14. -Defendant's Evidentiary Hearing Motion filed on June 5, 2023

15. -Defendant's Supplement Emergency Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Exclude, filed on June 6, 2023.

16. -Defendant's Supplemental to Emergency Motion For Production of BHA Video Footage, filed on June 16, 2023.

17. The Court's Docket Date July 28, 2023 there is "**NO Order of DENIED or ALLOWED**" entered on the date of Defendant's Scheduled Court Event or Judge's decision regarding the Defendant's file Motions as mentioned in the above captions.

18. July 28, 2023 Judge Jonathan Tynes statement made into the BMC Electronic Court Transcripts

19. "We haven't gone to trial because you filed many frivolous things; and at this point, I am not entertaining that." So we're picking a trial date." Pages 15, 16, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts BMC Dorchester Courtroom Session 6 on July 28, 2023

20. On September 7, 2023 lower court BMC Dorchester Court Judge Jonathan Tynes responded to the Appellant's Motion for Clarification

by issuing an order to "DENIED Without An Hearing"

21. BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes violated 18 U.S.C. 1503 obstruction of justice by judicial misconduct to suppress the Appellant Sharon Riddick's argument through court filings involving the intentional interference with the administration of justice with the aim

of obstructing the truth and their co-conspirators criminal activity from being exposed as identified in the Appellant's court filings recorded as "exhibits, attachments; and preventing a fair resolution.

22. Judge Jonthan Tynes, violated the 18 U.S.C. Honest Services of Fraud by accepting bribes to suppress the Appellant Sharon Riddick's argument through court filings by refusing to render a decision on Appellant's motions of court filings.

23. BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes refusal to render a decision on the Appellant's motions and grant subpoenas, "does constitute as a violation of (18 U.S.C. 1341) Wire Fraud by uploading the September 7, 2023 fraudulent order to "deny without a hearing." Stating into the BMC Dorchester Electronic Courtroom Session (6) six on July 28, 2023 the (18 U.S.C.1001) False Statement "defense's motions (to obtain evidence to defend herself at trial) are frivolous and he will NOT entertain them." BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes, "criminalizes fraudulent schemes or artifices conducted over interstate or foreign wires." His scheme provided a legal framework to be prosecuted as public officials who utilized electronic communication, such as EM-CMF online filings, phone calls, emails, or electronic funds transfers, to engage in fraudulent activities. **see. Pages 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court event presiding**

**Judge Jonathan Tynes**

24. BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes, devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud or obtain money or property by false pretenses, representations, or promises; by conjuring a scheme NOT to comply with subpoenas on June 26, 2023 court orders from Judge Maureen Flaherty instructing the defendant to request additional subpoenas on July 28, 2023, by not rendering a decision of the Appellant's Motions through misleading false statements. See. **Pages 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court**

**event presiding Judge Jonathan Tynes, and June 26, 2023**

**Transcripts pages 1-13**

25. BMC Judge Judge Jonathan Tynes, acted with the intent to defraud the Appellant Sharon Riddick and the United States. This means Judge Tynes intentionally engaged in deceptive conduct and made false statements to deceive Appellant Sharon Riddick, and the Court.

26. BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes is in violation of Mass. Rule & Criminal Procedure Rule 43-Failure to Record Proceedings:

27. Judge Jonathan Tynes and Suffolk County Assistant District Attorney Charles Marshal interfered with the proper functioning of a government body or agency. This interference has been documented through various instances entered on the Court's electronic record where they have exerted undue influence, manipulated proceedings, and disregarded established protocols. By not divulging, and turning over an updated copy of Brady's List to the defense. " By verbally denying the existence of Brady's List and yelling at and overtalking the Appellant at the time of her argument. **See. Page 5 of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court event presiding**

**Judge Jonathan Tynes**

28. Bmc Judge Jonathan Tynes was Bias or Impropriety by using his influence as a Judge to Intimidate the defendant with unbecoming behavior as a judge and threaten the defense with jail time, for asking for a ruling on her motions. Making the statement "this is why you should not represent yourself." **see. pages 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court event presiding Judge Jonathan Tynes.**

29. BMC Judge Jonathan Tynes refusal to provide Appellant Sharon Riddick the right of access to judicial proceedings and records; after the July 28, 2023, and September 7, 2023 Judge's Order "rendering a decision and NOT issuing subpoenas of documents.

29. BMC Judge Jonathan Tynes refusal to hear the Appellant's Motion on July 28, 2023 follow by the denial of the of Appellant's filings at the BMC Dorchester on September 7, 2023 is still an infringement of the Appellant's First Amendment Right - "right to petition the government to redress grievances."

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

By not issuing subpoenas to obtain additional video footage. BMC Judge Jonathan Tynes & Suffolk County District Attorney Assistant District Attorney Charles Marshal entered into a conspiracy to infringed on the Petitioner's fourteenth Amendment right to "due process" by violating the following federal / State laws

- 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. 1956 RICO 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

-18 U.S.C. 241 Conspiracy Against Rights.

30. BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes stated the following false statement "Providing false or misleading information to the Court's record and docket, stating "defense motions are frivolous and he will NOT entertain them." **Pages 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 schedule court event.**

31. July 28, 2023, Suffolk County Assistant District Attorney Charles Marshal made the following false statement into BMC Dorchester Electronic record **Page 5 of the transcripts to July 28, 2023 scheduled court event presiding Judge Jonathan Tynes.**

32. MR. MARSHALL: -- "Brandon Diabola(phonetic), did look into the two -- two of the officers involved in this case to see if there was any kind of exculpatory information regarding those officers that was relevant.

33. After doing his due diligence, checking in with our Appellate Unit, looking in with BPD legal, we were unable to find any exculpatory information with regards to the officers involved in this case.

I do have a notice of discovery for Ms. Riddick with regards to that point, as well as the Court, if I may approach that?

35. THE COURT: Please.

36. MS. RIDDICK: Can I say something?

37. THE COURT: Sure.

38. MS. RIDDICK: He's lying, I sent him over –

39. THE COURT: Please don't say he's lying.

40. MS. RIDDICK: Well, that's the only --

41. THE COURT: If you don't -- if you don't -- if you don't agree with it, that's fine. You're not going to accuse the prosecutor of lying without evidence. So go ahead.

42. MS. RIDDICK: I'm about to present the evidence.

That's why I'm saying he's lying."

43. **Page 4 of the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester**

**Transcripts Presiding Judge Coffey,**

44. (Judge Coffey)It's a very long paperwork I was given.

I am trying to work my way through it as we -- as we go here.

45. **Pages 6, 7, the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts**

**Presiding Judge Coffey**

46. THE COURT: Okay. And -- and you feel you need an order for what reason, to -- why do you feel you need the order? I know she's causing problems."

47. **Page 5 of the December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts Presiding**

**Judge Coffey**

-(Judge Coffey)THE COURT: -- and she's apparently made other claims, according to the police report, against other people in the building, too? December 23, 2020 BMC Dorchester Transcripts

**Presiding Judge Coffey**

48.-(Judge Coffey)THE COURT: Okay. I am going to allow the order. It's a temporary order. It's good until January 6th. I read through it. There's a lot of police reports here. On 1/6 you can ask the judge to extend it for a full year. I read through it. There's a lot of police reports here.

BMC Dorchester Judges James Coffey, Jonathan Tynes, Maureen Flaherty, Suffolk County Assistant District Attorney Charles Marshall knew beforehand that their statements were false and that their

orders would NOT be executed, as an intentional provision of a “favorable ruling” to aid & abet the Commonwealth.

January 8, 2024 Letter with the letterhead Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office WITH NO SIGNATURE from the District Attorney Kevin R. Hayden, addressed the SJC Clerk for the Commonwealth 1 Pemberton Square, Boston MA, 02108, stating the following: the Commonwealth received the defendant’s brief in the Supreme Judicial Court matter of No. SJC-13508, and it is the Commonwealth belief that appeal from denial is her application to pursue an interlocutory review, under M.G.L. c. 211.3.” “the Commonwealth is not entitled to file a response unless requested by the court to do so. As such, the Commonwealth respectfully leaves the matter to the judgment of this Court.

49. Petitioner’s Evidentiary Hearing Motion filed on June 5, 2023, Petitioner’s June 6, 2023 Supplement Emergency Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Exclude filed, and

50. June 5, 2023 Defendant’s Supplemental Emergency Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Exclude

51. June 6, 2023 Defendant’s Supplement to Emergency Motion For Production of BHA video footage filed.

52. June 16, 2023 Defendant’s Supplement to Emergency Motion For Production of BHA video footage filed

53. August 10, 2023 Defendant’s Motion for Clarification of Schedule Court event on July 28, 2023 before Judge Jonatan Tynes, According to the Court’s Docket Date July 28, 2023 there is “**NO Order of DENIED or ALLOWED**” entered on the date of Defendant’s Scheduled Court Event or Judge’s decision regarding the Defendant’s file Motions as mentioned in the above captions.

Therefore Defendant Sharon Riddick is seeking clarification on her filed motions, Judge Jonathan Tynes statement made into the BMC Electronic Court Transcripts “We haven’t gone to trial because you filed many frivolous things; and at this

point, I am not entertaining that.” “So we’re picking a trial date.” Pages 15, 16, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts BMC Dorchester Courtroom Session 6 on

July 28, 2023.

54. October 4, 2023 Appellant Rule 15 Under M.R.C.P. Interlocutory Appeal with attachments, filed by Sharon Camille Riddick, Motion for stay under M.R.A.P. 6, filed by Sharon Camille Riddick, Affidavit of indigency (IMPOUNDED) filed for Sharon Camille Riddick, Copy of Docket Sheets, received from Boston Municipal, Dorchester Div.

55. October 5, 2023 EMAIL WITH NO ORDER ATTACHED WITH NO JUDGE'S SIGNATURE FROM Massachusetts Appeals Court Docket entry stating: “ Re#1 & 2: The pro se defendant in this ongoing criminal case pending in the Dorchester Division of the Boston Municipal Court has filed a petition with the single justice seeking leave to take an interlocutory appeal with attachments. The defendant has also filed a motion for an emergency stay of all legal proceedings including the trial, which is scheduled for 10/23/2023 according to the trial court docket report. The Appeals Court single justice does not have jurisdiction over interlocutory criminal matters. See G. L. c. 231, § 118, first par. Accordingly, the motions are denied without prejudice to renewal in the Supreme Judicial Court for the County of Suffolk (the single justice session of the Supreme Judicial Court). See G. L. c. 211, § 3; Mass. R. Crim. P. 15. (Englander, J.). \*Notice/Attest.

56. October 10, 2023 Case entered as a Motion to Dismiss - Criminal at the SJC Supreme Judicial Court, Petition Pursuant to G. L. c. 211, sec. 3 with Certificate of Service and attachments filed by Sharon Camille Riddick, pro se, Exhibits 1-5 to Paper #2 filed by Sharon Cammille Riddick, pro se. Appellant Sharon Riddick's Rule 6 M.C.R.P. Emergency MOTION of a Temporary Stay into a Single Justice Case at MA Supreme Court and Before a Full Panel with Certificate of Service filed by Sharon Camille Riddick, pro se. (SEE PAPER #7)

57. October 12, 2023 Appellant Sharon Riddick's Supplemental Motion of Exhibits to the Interlocutory Appeal Into a Single Justice Case at the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court with Certificate of Service and Exhibit #'s 3 and 2 filed by Sharon Camille Riddick, pro se.

58. October 18, 2023 JUDGMENT: WITH NO JUDGE'S SIGNATURE FROM THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT SINGLE JUSTICE ONLY SIGNATURE ON JUDGMENT ORDER IS MAURA DOYLE CLERK "This matter came before the Court, Georges J., on the defendant Sharon Cammille Riddick's petition pursuant to G. L. c. 211, § 3, and emergency motion for stay. Upon consideration thereof, it is ORDERED that the petition and motion be, and the same hereby are, DENIED." (Georges, J.)

October 19, 2024 at 10:00AM email from the SJC Full Court Clerk Francis V. Kenneally stating the following **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF APPEAL**

On October 19, 2023, the above referenced appeal from the single justice session was entered on the docket of this court.

You must determine whether SJC Rule 2:21 or the Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure apply to this appeal to ensure that you meet the applicable filing requirements.

**Briefs or a Rule 2:21 Memorandum and Appendix may be submitted through eFileMA.com.** After review of the e filing submission, the clerk will send notice to file a limited number of paper copies.

October 19, 2023 10:00AM email from SJC Full Court Clerk Francis V. Kenneally to Petitioner Sharon Riddick stating the following legal matter No. SJC- 13508 was entered on the docket on October 19, 2023 along with motion and affidavit of indigency to waive filing fee payable of \$300.00 to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts within 10 days. email cc to Commonwealth Counsel David D. McGowan, A.D.A.

59. October 19, 2023 Motion of Clarification to Appellant Sharon Cammille Riddick's Petition Pursuant to G. L. c. 211, sec. 3 and Emergency Motion for

Stay at the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court with Certificate of Service filed by Sharon Camille Reddick, pro se. (No Action Necessary)

60. November 28, 2023 Petitioner Motion SJC 13508 of a Nonconforming Brief and Appendix filed and accepted at the SJC Supreme Judicial Court

61. March 23, 2024 Rescript: (February 23, 2024) ORDERED with NO JUDGE'S SIGNATURE, OF A MASSACHUSETTS COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE, NO SIGNATURE OF A SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT SINGLE JUSTICE, NO SIGNATURE OF A THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT FULL PANEL OF JUDGES, ONLY SIGNATURE OF THE CLERK MAURA S. DOYLE, that the following entry be made in the docket; viz., --Judgment affirmed.

61. February 23, 2024. Riddick's failure to comply with S.J.C. Rule 2:21

presents

a further reason not to disturb the judgment of the single justice, neither erred nor abused his discretion by denying extraordinary relief.

Judgment affirmed.

62. March 23, 2024 CORRECTED JUDGMENT after Rescript from the SJC for the Commonwealth.

63. March 25, 2024 Judgment After Rescript from the Supreme Judicial Court with NO SUPREME COURT JUDGE SIGNATURE ON THE JUDGMENT AFTER RESCRIPT, stating the following "it is an ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the following entry of Judgment be, and the same hereby is made: "Judgment affirmed"

64. March 25, 2024 CORRECTED Judgment After Rescript from the Supreme Judicial Court, stating the following: This matter came before the Court, and in accordance with the Rescript Opinion that was entered in the Full Court in SJC-13508 on February 23, 2024, it is ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the

following entry of Judgment be, and the same hereby is, made:

"Judgment affirmed."

with the following attached footnote stating "The correction is limited to correcting the spelling of the petitioner's name from Camille to Cammille."

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The 1st Amendment, 5th Amendment, 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution are the cornerstone of American democracy, ensuring the right of citizens to petition the government to redress their grievances, without self incrimination under 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. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that no state shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." This amendment is a fundamental guarantee of fairness and justice in the American legal system, ensuring that all individuals are treated equally and without bias. The right to due process is essential for the protection of individual liberties and the maintenance of a fair and impartial judicial system.

With all aspects the Fourteenth Amendment plays an important role to the First Amendment to the United States Constitution for it is safeguarding the fundamental right of citizens to petition the government for redress of grievances. The First Amendment guarantees every citizen the right to petition the government for redress of grievances. This right is essential to ensuring that the government hears the voices of its citizens and addresses their concerns. However, the petitioner's right to petition is not absolute, and there are limits to the exercise of this right. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the right to petition is not a license to engage in disruptive or unlawful conduct. The right to petition remains a vital component of American democracy. The ability of citizens to bring their grievances to the attention of the government is essential to ensuring that the government remains accountable to the people. When the judicial system is used to suppress the right to petition and the right to due process, it undermines the very foundations of democracy, and opens the "dark pathway" for Citizens to self incrimination, which the fifth amendment discourages; the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution is a fundamental right that safeguards individuals from self-incrimination.

This provision is essential in ensuring that individuals are not compelled to provide testimony that could lead to their criminal prosecution. The Fifth Amendment provides that no person "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Therefore the damaging judgments of denial by the Commonwealth Massachusetts Appeals Court, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts injured the Petitioner greatly. In fact their judgment of denial against the Petitioner is compelling the Petitioner to be a witness against herself in the criminal matter of 2007cr3256.

**I. The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts & Massachusetts Appeals Court Ruled Incorrectly to deny the Petitioner's Complaint on the Basis of False Procedural Requirements of Jurisdiction, & Submission of a Legal Brief and Not a Memorandum.**

The Massachusetts Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 15 (b)(c) which outline the circumstances and procedures for such interlocutory reviews. The Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure does not require a complaint to be denied on the basis that the Appeals Court Single Justice does not have jurisdiction over interlocutory criminal matters.(exh#1)

Nor should Petitioner's Complaint be denied for non-compliance with SJC Rule 2:21. In direct contrast to the Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure, the Petitioner has met the applicable filing requirements by submitting a Brief and appendix through eFileMA.com.(exh#2) In doing so the Judgment did not support a denial of the petitioner's complaint based on a preponderance of the evidence against the Commonwealth, 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 and reversals across the board. 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 denied by the Massachusetts Appeals Court & the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts on the basis

of SJC Rule 2:21 and Rule 15(b)(c) of The Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure, as these rules do not provide an adequate basis to deny. Rule 15 (b)(c) allows a defendant to assert various defenses. A Single Justice indeed has the jurisdiction to hear this appeal. This did not automatically warrant a denial of the complaint, nor did the Petitioner's complaints meet the threshold for a denial. Similarly, Rule 15 (b)(c) does not permit a court to strike insufficient defenses such as lack of jurisdiction. SJC Rule 2:21 requires a Brief OR a Memorandum and Appendix, but it does NOT require ONLY a Memorandum and Appendix . Lastly, Rule 15 (b)(c), and SJC 2:21 sets forth specific filing and procedural requirements for certain claims, but non-compliance with these requirements necessarily warrants a denial of complaints. Denying 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 in accordance with the principles, and Law of Void Judgements and Decisions of the United States Supreme Court Decisions on Void Orders, a judgment may NOT be rendered in violation of constitutional protections. Ultimately, the Supreme Court's opinion underscores the importance of Rule 15 (b)(c) of Massachusetts Rules of Criminal Procedure, Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure, and the SJC Rule 2:21 in maintaining the integrity of the legal system and upholding the principles of justice.

## **A. Reasons On Why There Is A Existing District Attorney Brady's List**

June 5, 2023, Petitioner submitted motions to the BMC Dorchester Court as is: "DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR AN EMERGENCY EVIDENTIARY HEARING," "DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL EMERGENCY MOTION FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING TO EXCLUDE," "DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL TO EMERGENCY MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF BHA VIDEO FOOTAGE" (Exh#3) Stating its purpose of this Motion for an evidentiary hearing is the "exclusion" of Boston Police ``altered body camera footage" that is to be entered as the prosecution's material evidence at the time of trial. The Petitioner made reference that exclusion of this "prosecution altered material evidence" is

crucial to the resolution of this case. It was the Petitioner's belief that the altered body camera footage that is being presented as "material evidence" is fraudulent and is being used to frame the Defendant Sharon Riddick for a crime she did not commit in a scheme to cover up Boston Police Officers Thomas Flynn & Christopher Simpson criminal activities surrounding case no. 2007 ro 1368 Commonwealth v. Sharon Riddick, due to Boston Police Officer Thomas Flynn being a relative of President of the Boston City Councilor Edward Flynn, and the son of City of Boston Former Mayor Raymond Flynn. October 29. 2021 at 10:19 am email from Defendant Sharon Riddick's previous Court appointed CPCS Committee for Public Counsel Service Attorney Michael Mckinnon in support of BPO Flynn, Simpson body camera footage is NOT in its entirety stating the following; "Ms.Riddick, Here is a link to the Body Worn Camera video. There are two videos, one from each officer. Unfortunately they begin after the confrontation in the building lobby. I continue to await a response to the BHA video." The email dated October 29. 2021 at 10:19 from the Petitioner's previous Court appointed CPCS Attorney Michael Mckinnon, clearly validating the Boston Police Body Camera footage is altered.

Petitioner brought it to the attention of the Boston Municipal Court Dorchester, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office, and the Massachusetts Court of Appeals, and Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts attention of factual evidence of allegations lodge against Boston Police Officer C-11 Christopher Simpson ID# 111814, (**Exh#4**) Case Number IAD2016-0483, Internal Affairs Complaint filed by Complainant Telisha Gillard dated April 7, 2021;citing the following violations: BPD Rule 304 Section 2 - Use of Non Lethal Force, BPD Rule 102 Section 20 Failing to Properly Identify Self Upon Request, BPD Rule 102 Section 9 Respectful Treatment. "In her Complaint Ms. Gilliard reported that the police yelled at her using profanities." "Ms. Gilliard stated that she had a video of the incident but the video was not produced as evidence." "She stated that she asked Officers for their badge numbers and they refused to provide them, she further stated the officers refused to provide medical assistance." "Ms. Gilliard stated the Officers "choked" her and "bang her head on street pavement." "She reported the Officers threw her down the stairs at her home and slammed the police cruiser door on her leg." "She also reported she was indecently assaulted while she was on the ground."

Ms. Gilliard goes on to describe the sexual assault made against her by C-11 Boston Police Officers Christopher Simpson, and Jason Romano in great details “ IAD2016-0483 Page 2 of 8 “call a female officer to escort me when I was nearly naked while one office straddles me from behind I felt like I was in a satanic sex porno as I felt the erratic officer’s penis harden as he choked and rode my back and the worst thing about is that they falsified the police report siting I was attacking five officers,” “my video clearly shows two officers strangling me from behind not letting me stand up and continue walking to the car.” Boston Police Officer Christopher Simpson “credibility of untruthfulness” concerning the Internal Affair Complaint of Telisha Gilliard is as: “Police Officer Christopher Simpson reported that he and Police Officer Jason Romano responded to a radio call at for an unknown incident.

Ms. Gilliards also stated that Officers “falsified police reports.” February 17, 2021 Boston Police Investigative Findings Case No. IAD 2016-0438 of PoliceBoston Police Officer Christopher Simpson “credibility of untruthfulness” concerning the Internal Affair Complaint of Telisha Gilliard is as: “Police Officer Christopher Simpson reported that he and Police Officer Jason Romano responded to a radio call at for an unknown incident.

Petitioner Sharon Riddick’s Internal Affairs Complaint (**Exh#5**) describes a incident of Sexual Harassment by C-11 Boston Police Officer Christopher Simpson, and falsefying of Reports by C-11 Boston Police Thomas Flynn, investigated by Sergeant Detective Michael Hanson Bureau of Professional Standards Internal Investigations Unit January 13, 2021, as follows: “Ms. Riddick reported while at the police station site she was fingerprinted and searched by a female officer while her mugshots were take11 by a male officer. After the site was searched by the female officer, Officer Simpson informed her that the strings in her hooded sweatshirt had to be removed.

Site made attempts to remove the string from her hooded sweatshirt, however the strings were sewn into the hood. It was at this point Boston Police Officer Simpson sexually harassed her by wanting to touch her and by instructing her to take off her sweatshirt, She told Officer Simpson “do not touch me.” She questioned why she was being told to take off her sweatshirt after she had already been searched by a female officer. Site informed the officer to get away from her and claimed by asking for her to remove her sweatshirt was sexual harassment. The female officer came with a pair of dull scissors and finally cut the strings off her hooded sweatshirt.” Ms. Riddick expressed that Officer Simpson’s presence gave her a creepy feeling. Ms. Riddick articulated that she has filed a complaint against Judge Coffey

for Judicial Misconduct. Investigated findings by Sergeant Detective Michael Hanson Bureau of Professional Standards Internal Investigations Unit January 13, 2021 **A review of Officer Simpson and Officer Flynn's body cameras was conducted.**

Wherefore Boston Police Officers C-11 Thomas Flynn, Christopher Simpson each have IA Internal Affairs Complaints, (**Exh#6**) formal POST Commission Peace Officers Standards Training lodge against them. Somehow there is NO Brady's List with their names identifying each one the perpetrators as having prior complaints against them. When in fact the policy and procedures of the Brady List clearly states the "Brady List " refers to a system used in the United States to track police officers who have a history of misconduct, particularly actions that could affect their credibility as witnesses in court. This concept originates from the 1963 U.S. Supreme Court case "Brady v. Maryland." In this case, the court ruled that the prosecution must turn over all evidence that might exonerate a defendant to the defense. This includes information about the credibility of law enforcement officers involved in the case.

The key points about the Brady List and its impact on Boston Police Officers C-11 Thomas Flynn, Christopher Simpson and the Suffolk County District Attorney Office is that their primary purpose in listing the Officers names on the Brady List is to ensure fair trials. With Boston Police Officers Christopher Simpson and Thomas Flynn identified as officers on the list involved in a case, the defense must be informed about the officer's history of misconduct, as it would have affected their testimony's reliability.

Therefore addressing the officers prior and present misconduct. The list often includes officers with histories of lying, use of excessive force, corruption, tampering with evidence, and other forms of serious misconduct. Abruptly disqualifying both Officers as material witnesses for the Commonwealth.

This Petitioner could have used the information from the Brady List to challenge the credibility of police officers during the (**Exh#7**) July 28, 2023 court proceedings before presiding Judge Jonathan Tynes and at trial. This could have prompted a dismissal outcome of the case, particularly if the officer's testimony is tainted.

The Management and Accessibility by Suffolk County District Attorney Office of their Brady List has demonstrated a "litany of atrociousness of injustices," and a violation of **18 U.S.C. 1512** "Tampering with Documents" in their jurisdiction. In some areas, where the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office maintains the list you will find A.D.A. Charles Marshal engaged in prosecutorial misconduct by violating **18 U.S.C.2** **Aid & Abet** by acting as a fortuide veil of protection towards Boston Police Officers Thomas Flynn, Christopher Simpson, and the Boston Police Department by preventing the defendant from accessibility of these lists that are available to the public.

In doing so BMC Judge Jonathan Tynes, Suffolk County District Attorney (**Exh#8**) A.D.A. Charles Marshal has violated **18 U.S.C. 2384** **Seditious Conspiracy** and have demonstrated neither party could care less about the negative Controversy and Impact on their Careers. Their conspiracy to exclude Boston Police Officers Thomas Flynn, Christopher Simpson on the Brady List is controversial and has significantly impacted their careers.

Wherefore, the Brady List raises various legal and ethical questions, especially regarding the rights of the officers on the list and the impact on law enforcement credibility. The Brady List is an important tool in the criminal justice system, ensuring transparency and accountability, especially in cases where the integrity of law enforcement officers is essential for a fair trial for defendants.

Case 2007cr3256 is very similar to the Karen Read v. Commonwealth case concerning a (**Exh#9**) covered up by District Attorney's Office, Massachusetts State Police Troopers and Boston Police Department to cover up criminal activity of Boston Police Officers, surrounding their handling of the case 2007cr3256, Massschusetts State Police years. Massachusetts State Trooper Keefe, Massachusetts State Police Violent Apprehension Fugitive Unit at 450 Worcester Road, Framingham, Massachusetts 01702 failure to investigate registered sex offender Vincent Wright unregistered status in Boston Massachusetts.

## **II. By Denying The Brief of the Petitioner Has Raised Important Federal Questions of Constitutional Provisions, RICO Criminal Activity That Conflicts With Relevant Decisions Of This Court.**

The Massachusetts Appeals Court & Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts falsely stated in their Judgment Orders of the Petitioner's Brief and Appendix to deny the action. See. Rios-Campbell vs. United States Department of Commerce, No.18-1420 (1st Circuit 2019). Although cited Massachusetts Appeals Court & Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts the Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 15 (b)(c) & the SJC Rule 2:21 does not offer an analysis of Rules that supports both Courts Judgments Report to deny, and as to why the Petitioner's Complaint should be denied in the first place. Considering the Respondents informed the Supreme Judicial Court on (Exh#10)January 8, 2024 that the Commonwealth, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office, District Attorney Kevin R. Hayden "the Commonwealth is not entitled to file a response to the Petitioner's Brief unless requested to do so by the Court." "As such, the Commonwealth respectfully leaves the matter of judgment to this Court."

The Petitioner has filed voluminous Motions, requesting for evidence and to Dismiss only to fall upon deaf ears at the lower court and the District Attorney's Office. The prosecution did not one time respond to any of the Petitioner's motions nor did the lower court, or at the Supreme Judicial Court, request the prosecution to respond. The Petitioner's case should have been dismissed due to the prosecution's failure to reply to motions to dismiss. In most jurisdictions, the failure to reply to a motion may result in the motion being granted by default, leading to the dismissal of the case.

As an Appellate 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 Petitioner's allegations make it plausible that, on a full factual record, a factfinder of Petitioner's exhibits and Supplements could reasonably regard the Respondent Letter to the Supreme Judicial Court as a covert plea to deny the Petitioner's Complaint as desperate

remedial tactic that is often sought by the Respondents in other legal venues i.e., ignoring the Petitioner motions, yet somehow only to receive manufactured favorable rulings through **18 U.S.C. 1346 Honest Services Fraud** by bribery from the prosecution co-conspirator BMC Dorchester Judge Jonathan Tynes. The criminal tactics of the Commonwealth/Respondent are again on display at the Massachusetts Appeals Court, and The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. Considering the SJC Full Court Judgment Order dated February 23, 2024 clearly states the following: "**Riddick made "numerous factual allegations concerning judges and ada" but has not requested any particular relief related to those allegations.**"

The Appellant's filings in the lower District Court consisted of the Petitioner's filings and evidence, exhibits over 1500 pages and coincidentally the Respondent/ Commonwealth receives "manufactured favorable rulings without responding to any of the Petitioners motions to dismiss; 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.

Judge Jonathan Tynes denied(**Exh#11**) several of the Petitioner's Motions for  
Defendant's Evidentiary Hearing Motion filed on June 5, 2023,  
June 6, 2023 Supplement Emergency Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Exclude filed, June 16, 2023 Defendant's Supplement to Emergency Motion For Production of BHA video footage filed.

All motions were requesting the lower court to grant subpoenas i.e. video footage, the Prosecution's Witness list, the Brady's List. Which would have exonerated the Petitioner from all charges, and dismissed the case of 2007cr3256.

A conspiracy to deprived the Petitioner of her First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, and Fourteenth Amendment Constitutional and Civil rights under the color of law evolved between the Clerks, Prosecutors, and Judges utilizing the BMC Dorchester Court, The Suffolk County District Attorney's Office, The Massachusetts Appeals Court, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts as RICO criminal enterprises, by engaging in **18 USC 1346 Honest Service of fraud** to commit multiple counts of a pattern of racketeering for reciving bribes in exchange for favorable rulings.

The Respondents are granted all manufactured denial of the Petitioner motion to dismiss; 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). These criminal activities between the Respondent/Commonwealth, Judge Jonathan Tynes, Clerks Maura Looney, Maura Doyle, Francis Kenneally, Prosecutors

Charles Marshall, David D. McGowan, Erin D. Knight

are also a scheme to a **18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy** to infringe on the Petitioner's intangible rights is very similar to what the Petitioner was experiencing in the Massachusetts Appeals Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. This criminal activity of Judges, and attorneys to manufacture criminal cases on the docket for favorable rulings in exchange for bribes; and Clerks in the Appellate Court impersonating Judges and signing Judgments and Orders.

BMC Court Judge Jonathan Tynes, Massachusetts Appeals Court, Judge John C. Englander, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts

Clerks Maura Looney, Full Court Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Maura Doyle, Francis Kenneally, Suffolk County

District Attorney's Office Assistant District Attorneys Charles Marshall, David D. McGowan, Erin D. Knight all have violated the following 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.

Therefore, how was the Petitioner to defend herself when all of the court filings of the Appellant were denied; and at the expense of a favorable ruling steered towards the Respondent. 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 Respondent and BMC Court Judge Jonathan Tynes, Massachusetts Appeals Court, Judge John C. Englander, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Clerks Maura Looney, Full Court Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Maura Doyle, Francis Kenneally, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office Assistant District Attorneys Charles Marshall, David D. McGowan, Erin D. Knight, engaged in an 18 U.S.C. 2384 Seditious Conspiracy to Tamper with Documents of the Petitioner's Legal Brief 18 U.S.C. 1512, in order to commit 18 U.S.C. 371 Obstruction of Justice to weaponize the BMC Dorchester Court, Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts as a RICO criminal enterprise to manufactured the Petitioner's Court Case SJC-15308, through interference of her intangible rights, through 18 U.S.C. 1346 honest services fraud -bribes in exchange for favorable rulings; JUDICIAL CLERKS are engaged a fraudulent scheme of 18 U.S.C. 1001 False Statements of "NO JURISDICTION IN CRIMINAL MATTERS," "PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS NOT FOLLOWED" Judgment Orders without the signature of a Judge's name on ALL fraudulent (Exh#12) Judgment /Orders funneled to the Respondent. In doing so the Respondent and BMC Court Judge Jonathan Tynes, Massachusetts Appeals Court, Judge John C. Englander, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Clerks Maura Looney, Full Court Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Maura Doyle, Francis Kenneally, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office Assistant District Attorneys Charles Marshall, David D. McGowan, Erin D. Knight was comfortable with their actions surrounding the fraud, considering the Petitioner's Google Docs account was "hacked" by "Federal corrupt agents" and "Subcontractors" through her Macbook to alter the Petitioner's Legal Brief by way of removing the Petitioner's main argument to the SJC outlining across the board violations of due process clauses. This illegal action of invasion of privacy by way of "hacking" was meant to correlate with the actions of the Massachusetts Appeals Court, and Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Clerks unlawful action of Tampering of Documents by way of replacing court filings with minuet documents NOT identifying relief the Petitioner is seeking as well as the Petitioner's arguments for Constitutional Provision violations.

The Respondent and BMC Court Judge Jonathan Tynes, Massachusetts Appeals Court, Judge John C. Englander, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Clerks Maura Looney, Full Court Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Maura Doyle, Francis Kenneally, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office Assistant District Attorneys Charles Marshall, David D. McGowan, Erin D. Knight has committed crimes of RICO, criminal enterprise, (18 U.S.C. 1956) Pattern of Racketeering, and (18 U.S.C. 1341) Wire and (18 U.S.C. 1342) Mail Fraud through fraudulent ORDERS from Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court Judges Tynes, Englaner. A "pattern of racketeering" is commissioned by two or more individuals, To constitute "racketeering activity," the predicate offense need only be committed; see.

Sharon Riddick v. Mark Miliotis et.al

### **III. Judicial Clerks (18 U.S.C. 2) Aiding & Abetting to Commit Constitutional Amendments Violations on fraudulent Judgments**

February 23, 2024 Petitioner received a fraudulent order with no signature or Judges name attached to this order from the Full Court of Supreme Judicial of Massachusetts from SJC Clerk Maura Doyle entering the following

(18 U.S.C. 1001) False Statements into the record by stating:

- "Before seeking relief under G. L. c. 211, § 3, Riddick filed a petition seeking interlocutory review of the same pretrial rulings in the single justice session of the Appeals Court. That petition was denied on the ground that the Appeals abused his discretion by ruling against her motion for certain subpoenas and by allowing the Commonwealth to withhold exculpatory information.<sup>3</sup> Riddick also requested that her criminal case be dismissed.<sup>4</sup> A single justice of this court denied relief without a hearing."

- "Because Riddick is appealing from the denial of relief from a challenged interlocutory ruling of the trial court, she was obligated to file a memorandum and appendix "set[ting] forth the reasons why review of the trial court decision cannot adequately be obtained on appeal from any final adverse judgment in the trial court or by other available means." S.J.C. Rule 2:21 (2), as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001). She did not file the required memorandum but simply filed a brief, in which she scarcely mentioned the existence of an alternative remedy.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, it is clear on the record before us that Riddick cannot make the required showing, as the challenged

pretrial rulings can be addressed on appeal from a final judgment if she is convicted.”

“-Because Riddick has an adequate remedy in the ordinary appellate process, the Court single justice lacks jurisdiction over interlocutory criminal matters.”

“-In addition, Riddick made numerous factual allegations concerning certain judges of the BMC, a judge of the Housing Court, and an assistant district attorney, but, as far as we are able to discern, without requesting any particular relief related to those allegations.”

Massachusetts Appeals Court, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, Judicial Clerks are using fraudulent Judgments and tampering with the documents of the Petitioner’s legal brief as a “pretext” for justification to silence me due to the fact the evidence was “overwhelming” and “exposing” against the Respondent and their co-conspirators. Of course this pretext of the Massachusetts Appeal Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts came as no surprise to the Petitioner. The (18 U.S.C. 2384) Seditious Conspiracy to through (18 U.S.C. 1346) Honest Services Fraud -bribes in exchange for favorable rulings; JUDICIAL CLERKS are engaged a fraudulent scheme of 18 U.S.C. 1001 False Statements of “NO JURISDICTION IN CRIMINAL MATTERS,” “PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS NOT FOLLOWED.” The February 23, 2024 Judgment of Supreme Judicial Court shares 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 exposing a scheme of \$44,000,000 Money Laundering between Federal State Local Judges, Clerks and Attorneys manufacturing cases on the docket for bribe monies, in exchange for favorable rulings; the theft of client settlements through IOLTA (Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts) are the opening of "Pandora's box" concerning an important federal question that 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 Massachusetts Appeals Court, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts truly functions... "unlawfully" in a (18 U.S.C. 2384) Seditious Conspiracy.

By engaging in this Seditious Conspiracy on fraud, the Massachusetts Appeals Court & Supreme Judicial 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 Supreme Court of the United States consider its stance and grant the Petitioner's Writ of Certiorari to ensure the proper interpretation and application of federal law.

The denial of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts's Judgment and Petitioner's Writ of Certiorari raised concerns regarding the violation of the Petitioner's Sharon Riddick due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment in the Petitioner's Legal Brief and Writ of Certiorari. The decisions made by the Massachusetts Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts 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 15 (b) (c) of the Massachusetts Rules of Criminal Procedure does not provide a mechanism for enforcing a judgment for the delivery of a dismissal of a lower court, its application and enforcement are subject to the discretion of the court.

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

The inconsistency of the Massachusetts Appeals Court, and The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Judgments 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, Massachusetts Appeals Court, and The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Clerks tampering 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 Supreme Court of the United States consider its decision and grant the Petitioner's Writ of Certiorari.

In doing so, this court can rectify the violation of the petitioner's due process rights and address the conflict with relevant decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Furthermore, 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.

By denying the Petitioner access to court her intangible right to due process, Massachusetts Appeals Court, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts effectively obstructs justice and undermines the principles of transparency and accountability.

18 USC 1503 pertains to obstruction of justice. By enforcing fraud, the court obstructs the petitioner's access to crucial information necessary for her defense or relief to the dismissal of the legal proceedings in the lower court. 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 tampering of the Petitioner's court documents by erasure of factual recordings is crucial for ensuring equal protection under the law and maintaining the principles of justice.


The Importance of the 1st, 5th, 14th Amendments to the Constitution is designed to provide a clear framework for the right to petition the government to redress grievances, self-incrimination, and due process. These amendments ensure that the judicial process is fair, transparent, and in line with constitutional principles. By not enforcing these Amendments, the Massachusetts Appeals Court & the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts 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 Massachusetts Appeals Court & the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts decisions 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 courts 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,



Sharon Cammille Riddick

Petitioner:

Sharon Riddick *Pro Se*,

P.O. Box 220517

Dorchester, MA. 02122

857.381.6356

sharon.riddick@gmail.com

May 23, 2024

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sharon Riddick, hereby certify that I filed a copy of the "Writ of Certiorari" and exhibits via said document has been electronically delivered via email to the BMC Dorchester Court Clerk's Office, Respondents, BMC, Dorchester Suffolk County District Assistant District Attorney, David McGowan, David.McGowan@mass.gov, Charles Marshal at charles.marshall@mass.gov, Cailin M. Campbell Office of the District Attorney, Plymouth 166 Main Street, Brockton, MA 02301 cailin.campbell@mass.gov on the 23rd day of May 2024.