APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 1

Appendix A	Order of the Rhode Island Supreme Court (SU-2024-152-MP) (June 27, 2024).....App.1
Appendix B	Order of the Rhode Island Supreme Court (SU-2024-152-MP) (June 13, 2024).....App.7
Appendix C	Order of the Rhode Island Supreme Court (SU-2024-152-MP) (June 7, 2024).....App.9
Appendix D	Order of the Rhode Island Supreme Court (SU-2024-152-MP) (June 5, 2024).....App.10
Appendix E	Order of the Rhode Island Supreme Court (SU-2024-152-MP) (June 3, 2024).....App.12
Appendix F	Rhode Island Supreme Court Article III (Disciplinary Procedure for Attorneys) Rules as of November 2023.....App.14
Appendix G	Rhode Island Supreme Court

Article V (Rules of Professional Conduct) Preamble Excerpts as of October 2023.....App.19

Appendix H — Appellant's Memorandum in Opposition to Appellee's Motion to Dismiss (SU-2024-0235-CA) (Forthcoming).....App.21

Appendix I — *In re* MICHAEL PRETE, Petitioner's SCOTUS Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Forthcoming) (Only Pages 1-55) (without its exhibits, etc.)..App.52

Volume 2

Appendix J — Appellant's Emergency Letter to All Supreme Court Justices (SU-2024-0152-MP) (Dated June 20, 2024) (Dated June 20, 2024).....App.107

Appendix K — Appellant's Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP) (Dated August 23, 2024) (without its exhibits).....App.112

Appendix L — State's Memorandum in Opposition to Appellant's

Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0152-MP) (June 4, 2024) (without its exhibits).....App.143

Appendix M — Second Motion to Reconsider (SU-2024-0152-MP) (Dated June 7, 2024).....App.149

Appendix N — Motion to Reconsider (SU-2024-0152-MP) (Dated June 5, 2024).....App.152

Appendix O — Second Addendum to Appellant's Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0152-MP) (Dated June 5, 2024).....App.156

Appendix P — Addendum to Appellant's Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0152-MP) (Dated June 3, 2024).....App.166

Appendix Q — Appellant's Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0152-MP) (Dated May 31, 2024) (without its exhibits).....App.172

Appendix R — Defendant's Fifth Emergency Letter to Associate Justice Rekas Sloan (P2-2023-3243A) (Dated May 31, 2024) (without its exhibits).....App.186

Volume 3

Appendix S — Defendant's Sixth Emergency Letter to Associate Justice Rekas Sloan (P2-2023-3243A) (Dated June 20, 2024) (without its exhibits).....App.250

Appendix T — Defendant's Seventh Emergency Letter to Associate Justice Rekas Sloan (P2-2023-3243A) (Dated July 2, 2024).....App.282

Appendix U — Defendant's Eighth Emergency Letter to Associate Justice Rekas Sloan (P2-2023-3243A) (Dated August 21, 2024) (without its exhibits).....App.299

APPENDIX A

[Rhode Island] Supreme Court

No. [SU-]2024-152-M.P.

[Dated: June 27, 2024]

State of Rhode Island :

v. :

Michael Prete. :

ORDER

The petitioner was directed to appear before the Court on June 20, 2024, at 9:30 a.m. to show cause why he should not be suspended from the practice of law based on the tenor and content of his filings in this matter. The petitioner failed to appear as directed. He did file, on the morning of the scheduled show cause hearing, what he characterized as an emergency letter, which he indicated was in lieu of an appearance that he represented was not necessary. However, that emergency letter does not excuse the fact that the petitioner failed to comply with this Court's June 13, 2024 Order directing him to appear. After considering the petitioner's failure to appear and the content of his filings before this Court, as detailed *infra*, we deem that cause has not

been shown and the petitioner is hereby suspended from the practice of law.

The facts giving rise to this suspension are as follows. The petitioner has been charged with two counts of knowingly publishing, passing, or tendering in payment as true, a false, forged, altered or counterfeit one-hundred-dollar bill with the intent to defraud in violation of G.L. 1956 § 11-17-3. That criminal case remains pending. On May 29, 2024, the petitioner filed in this Court (No. 2024-147-M.P.) an emergency motion to stay his criminal case while he pursued an appeal to this Court from the dismissal of his magistrate appeal seeking review of the denial of various motions including a motion to dismiss the case. In the petitioner's memorandum in support of his emergency motion, the petitioner made unsupported accusations of corrupt and fraudulent conduct by the magistrate who ruled on his motions. The emergency motion to stay was denied by the Duty Justice as having been prematurely filed and thus not properly before the Court.

The petitioner then filed a second, nearly identical emergency motion to stay the next day in this case (No. 2024-152-M.P.). The second emergency motion to stay was also denied by the Duty Justice after consideration of the petitioner's filings and the state's response. The petitioner's memorandum and addendums thereto made numerous unsupported allegations of corruption directed at this Court and again at the Superior Court magistrate. In one

instance, the petitioner stated that this Court was "going to do whatever it wants regardless of the law, facts, etc." and that "this Addendum is being filed to document this Court's further corrupt etc. actions * * *." The content of the petitioner's filings with respect to this Court, the Superior Court magistrate, and counsel for the state was unprofessional and contrary to the petitioner's responsibilities as an officer of the Court.

The petitioner then filed a motion to reconsider the denial of his emergency motion. In that filing, the petitioner accused the Duty Justice of bias without any foundation. On June 7, 2024, the motion to reconsider was denied after consideration by the full Court. On the same day, the petitioner filed a second motion to reconsider, which remains pending before this Court. That motion once again accused this Court of being corrupt, demanded that this Court "immediately issue a real decision", and inappropriately demanded the identity of the Duty Justice.

The tenor of the petitioner's filings in this matter has become increasingly confrontational. Additionally, the petitioner's remarks in his filings are contemptuous and demeaning. We cannot overlook the scorn directed at the justices of this Court and a magistrate of the Superior Court. We equally cannot overlook the petitioner's failure to comply with this Court's order directing him to appear. The petitioner's conduct raises serious

questions about his present ability to practice law and represent clients in this state. The Preamble to the Rules of Professional Conduct counsels that "[a] lawyer should demonstrate respect for the legal system and for those who serve it, including judges, other lawyers and public officials."

Due to this Court's concerns as to the petitioner's ability to practice law at this time, it is ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the petitioner, Michael Prete, is hereby suspended from engaging in the practice of law in this state, effective immediately and until further order of this Court. We refer this matter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for any further investigation.

For the sake of clarity, we deem it necessary to note that this suspension is based solely on the content of the petitioner's filings before this Court, his failure to appear, and this Court's resultant concern as to his ability to practice law at this time. It is not based on the fact that criminal charges are pending against the petitioner.

It is further ordered that Kerry Reilley Travers, Esq., Chief Disciplinary Counsel, be appointed as Special Master to take possession of all the petitioner's client files and accounts; to inventory them; and to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the clients' interest, including, but not limited to, returning the files to the clients or new counsel of the clients' choice. The petitioner is

ordered, within ***ten (10) days*** of the date of this Order, to provide a full list of the petitioner's clients to the Special Master or, in the absence of any clients, an affidavit so attesting. The petitioner is further ordered, within ***ten (10) days*** of the date of this Order, to cooperate with the Special Master by turning over all client files to the Special Master or, if he does not have any client files, providing an affidavit so attesting.

The petitioner's second "Motion to Reconsider" the denial of his emergency motion for a stay in this matter, as prayed, is denied.

This matter shall be closed.

Entered as an Order of this Court this ***27th*** day of ***June 2024.***

By Order,

/s/ Meredith A. Benoit

Clerk

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

SUPREME COURT – CLERK'S OFFICE

Licht Judicial Complex
250 Benefit Street
Providence, RI 02903

ORDER COVER SHEET

Title of Case	State of Rhode Island v. Michael Prete.
Case Number	No. 2024-152-M.P.
Date Order Filed	June 27, 2024
Justices	Suttell, C.J., Goldberg, Robinson, Lynch Prata, and Long, JJ.
Source of Appeal	N/A
Judicial Officer From Lower Court	N/A
Attorney(s) on Appeal	For Plaintiff:
	For Defendant:

APPENDIX B

[Rhode Island] Supreme Court

No. [SU-]2024-152-M.P.

[Dated: June 13, 2024]

State of Rhode Island :

v. :

Michael Prete. :

ORDER

The petitioner filed a "Second Motion to Reconsider" the denial of his emergency motion for a stay in this matter. The Court has reviewed that motion as well as his previous filings. After that review, the following is ordered:

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Rhode Island Supreme Court at ***9:30 a.m.*** on ***June 20, 2024*** to show cause why he should not be suspended from the practice of law based on the tenor and content of his filings in this matter.

Entered as an Order of this Court this ***13th*** day of ***June 2024.***

By Order,

/s/ Meredith A. Benoit

Clerk

APPENDIX C

[Rhode Island] Supreme Court

No. [SU-]2024-152-M.P.

[Dated: June 7, 2024]

State of Rhode Island :

v. :

Michael Prete. :

ORDER

The petitioner filed a "Motion to Reconsider" the denial of his emergency motion for a stay in this matter. After consideration by the full Court, the petitioner's "Motion to Reconsider", as prayed, is denied.

Entered as an Order of this Court this ***7th*** day of ***June 2024.***

By Order,

/s/ Meredith A. Benoit

Clerk

APPENDIX D

[Rhode Island] Supreme Court

No. [SU-]2024-152-M.P.

[Dated: June 5, 2024]

State of Rhode Island :

v. :

Michael Prete. :

ORDER

This matter came before a single justice of this Court, sitting as Duty Justice, on the petitioner's "Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order" filed on May 31, 2024. The petitioner filed a memorandum in support of his emergency motion as well as two addendums to that memorandum. The State filed a memorandum in opposition to the emergency motion. Upon consideration of the petitioner's filings and the State's response thereto, the following is ordered:

The petitioner's emergency motion for a stay, as prayed, is denied.

Entered as an Order of this Court this ***5th*** day of ***June 2024.***

By Order,

/s/ Meredith A. Benoit

Clerk

APPENDIX E

[Rhode Island] Supreme Court

No. [SU-]2024-152-M.P.

[Dated: June 3, 2024]

State of Rhode Island :

v. :

Michael Prete. :

ORDER

This matter came before a single justice of this Court, sitting as Duty Justice, on the petitioner's "Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order" filed on May 31, 2024. Upon consideration of the emergency motion for a stay, the following is ordered:

The State shall file a response to the emergency motion by ***12:00 p.m.*** on ***June 5, 2024.***

Entered as an Order of this Court this ***3rd*** day of ***June 2024.***

By Order,

/s/ Meredith A. Benoit

Clerk

APPENDIX F

[RI SUPREME COURT] ARTICLE III. DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE FOR ATTORNEYS

Rule 2. Grounds for discipline. Acts or omissions by an attorney, individually or in concert with any other person or persons, which violate the Rules of Professional Conduct as adopted and promulgated as a rule of this court, and failure to comply with reasonable orders or requests of Disciplinary Counsel or the Disciplinary Board shall constitute misconduct and shall be grounds for discipline, whether or not the act or omission occurred in the course of an attorney-client relationship.

Rule 3. Types of discipline. Misconduct shall be grounds for:

(a) Disbarment by the Court; or
(b) Suspension by this Court for a period not exceeding five (5) years; or
(c) public censure by this Court; or
(d) an order for restitution, community service, pro bono legal service, or substance-abuse treatment or other counseling.

Rule 6. Procedure.

(a) *Investigation.* All investigations, whether upon complaint or otherwise, shall be initiated and

conducted by Counsel. Upon the conclusion of an investigation, Counsel shall recommend to a screening panel consisting of three (3) members of the Board, the disposition of all matters involving alleged misconduct either by dismissal or by the prosecution of formal charges before the Board. No disposition shall be recommended by Counsel until the Respondent-attorney shall have been afforded the opportunity to state his or her position with respect to the allegations against him or her. The recommended disposition shall be reviewed by a screening panel of the Board which may approve or modify such recommendation. The screening panel will then consider the results of the investigation made by Disciplinary Counsel, including any response made to the complaint by the Respondent-attorney. If the screening panel makes a determination that there is probable cause to believe that the Respondent-attorney is guilty of misconduct, further proceedings shall be brought in accordance with subsection (b). A respondent-attorney may demand as of right that a formal proceeding be instituted against him/her before the Board. In the event of such demand, the matter shall be disposed of in the same manner as any other formal hearing instituted before the Board.

(b) *Formal Hearing.* Formal disciplinary proceedings before the Board shall be instituted by Counsel filing with the Board a petition setting forth with specificity the charges of misconduct. A copy of the petition shall be served upon the respondent-

attorney. Within twenty (20) days thereafter, the respondent-attorney shall serve a copy of his or her answer upon Counsel and file the original thereof with the Board. In the event the respondent-attorney fails to file an answer, the charges shall be deemed admitted; provided, however, that a respondent who fails to answer within the time provided may obtain permission of the court to file an answer if such failure was attributable to mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect. Following the service of the answer, if there are any issues of fact raised by the pleadings or if the respondent-attorney requests the opportunity to be heard in mitigation, the matter shall be assigned to the Board, and Counsel shall serve a notice of hearing upon the respondent-attorney, or his or her counsel, indicating the date and place of the hearing at least fifteen (15) days in advance thereof. The notice of hearing shall advise the respondent-attorney that he or she is entitled to be represented by counsel to summon and cross-examine witnesses and to present evidence in his or her own behalf.

In the event a division of the Board conducts a formal hearing, it shall receive evidence, make findings of fact and recommendations to the Board for Board action.

The Board shall submit a report to this Court within sixty (60) days after the conclusion of the hearing and submission of briefs, if any, containing

its findings and recommendations, together with a record of the proceedings before it.

If after notice of hearing has been served any member of the Board assigned to hear the matter is unable to serve and no other member of the Board is available, a former member of the Board, designated by the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson, is authorized and may sit in his/her stead.

(c) *Annual Report.* The Board shall annually in July report to the Court in writing all matters presented for its consideration during the year ended on the previous December 31.

(d) *Review by this Court.* If the Board determines that a proceeding should be dismissed, or that it should be concluded by public censure, suspension or disbarment, it shall submit its findings and recommendations, together with the entire record, to this Court. This Court shall review the record and enter an appropriate order. Proceedings, if any, before this Court shall be conducted by Counsel.

Rule 14. Reciprocal discipline.

(d) Upon the expiration of thirty (30) days from service of the notice issued pursuant to the provisions of (a) above, this Court shall impose the identical discipline unless Counsel or the respondent-attorney demonstrates, or this Court finds, that upon

the face of the record upon which the discipline is predicated, it clearly appears:

(1) that the procedure was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard as to constitute a deprivation of due process; or
(2) that there was such an infirmity of proof establishing the misconduct as to give rise to the clear conviction that this Court could not consistently with its duty accept as final the conclusion on that subject; or
(3) that the imposition of the same discipline would result in grave injustice; or
(4) that the misconduct established has been held to warrant substantially different discipline in this State.

Where this Court determines that any of said elements exist, this Court shall enter such order as it deems appropriate.

APPENDIX G

[RI SUPREME COURT] ARTICLE V. RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

PREAMBLE AND SCOPE

PREAMBLE: A LAWYER'S RESPONSIBILITIES

[5] A lawyer's conduct should conform to the requirements of the law, both in professional service to clients and in the lawyer's business and personal affairs. A lawyer should use the law's procedures only for legitimate purposes and not to harass or intimidate others. A lawyer should demonstrate respect for the legal system and for those who serve it, including judges, other lawyers and public officials. While it is a lawyer's duty, when necessary, to challenge the rectitude of official action, it is also a lawyer's duty to uphold legal process.

[20] Violation of a Rule should not itself give rise to a cause of action against a lawyer nor should it create any presumption in such a case that a legal duty has been breached. In addition, violation of a Rule does not necessarily warrant any other nondisciplinary remedy, such as disqualification of a lawyer in pending litigation. The Rules are designed to provide guidance to lawyers and to provide a structure for regulating conduct through disciplinary agencies. They are not designed to be a basis for civil liability. Furthermore, the purpose of the Rules can be

subverted when they are invoked by opposing parties as procedural weapons. The fact that a Rule is a just basis for a lawyer's self-assessment, or for sanctioning a lawyer under the administration of a disciplinary authority, does not imply that an antagonist in a collateral proceeding or transaction has standing to seek enforcement of the Rule. Nevertheless, since the Rules do establish standards of conduct by lawyers, a lawyer's violation of a Rule may be evidence of breach of the applicable standard of conduct.

[21] The Comment accompanying each Rule explains and illustrates the meaning and purpose of the Rule. The Preamble and this note on Scope provide general orientation. The Comments are intended as guides to interpretation, but the text of each Rule is authoritative.

APPENDIX H

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
PROVIDENCE, SC. SUPREME COURT

MICHAEL PRETE Hearing date: [Forthcoming]
Appellant

VS. SU-2024-0235-CA

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
Appellee

APPELLANT'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO APPELLEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

"Omelet de fromage" (means "Cheese Omelet")

Those are the words spoken by "Dexter" in an episode of the TV show "Dexter's Laboratory" where he cannot say anything other than those words (no matter what he is asked, etc.). Christopher Bush (State's counsel) appears to be similarly afflicted. It appears the only word Bush knows to argue (whether it applies or not) is: Interlocutory. Let's demonstrate:

> -Appellant's Request for Stay? Bush's Answer: Interlocutory (See Bush's "Memorandum in Opposition" Dated June 4, 2024 for Case #SU-2024-0152-MP)

-Appellant's Appeal #1? Bush's Answer: Interlocutory (See Bush's Memorandum Dated September 27, 2024 for Case #SU-2024-0235-CA)

-Appellant's Appeal #2? Bush's Answer: Interlocutory (See Bush's Memorandum Dated October 2, 2024 for Case #SU-2024-0299-CA)

As Appellant has already exposed (see Appellant's "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP)" (Dated August 23, 2024)), **Bush uses the argument of "Interlocutory" despite knowing it has NO RELEVANCE to the matters at hand.** Further, Bush will, as briefly demonstrated below, lie, conceal evidence, etc. to ensure his false argument is successful.

Bush's Motion to Dismiss must be denied (with prejudice) for: (1) Prematurity; (2) Intentionally Concealing Legal Authority Directly Adverse to the State; (3) Presenting a Knowingly Fraudulent Argument; (4) Violating Court Rules; (5) Violating Ethics, Etc. Rules; (6) ETC.

Before those reasons are briefly discussed, a brief background.

Bush had known about the existence of Appellant's impending appeal since before the appeal was even docketed in this Court (the appeal was docketed on

August 2, 2024). In fact, Bush's September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss is practically identical to Bush's "Memorandum in Opposition" **Dated June 4, 2024** for Case #SU-2024-0152-MP. Further, based on the time stamp contained in Bush's Motion filings, it appears Bush has had his fraudulent, etc. Motion to Dismiss ready to be filed within ONE HOUR OF THIS APPEAL BEING DOCKETED on August 2, 2024.

However, Appellant's Rule 12A Statement of Case has yet to be filed. Appellant's Prebrief Statement was due on August 22, 2024 but Appellant timely requested a 30-day extension (in accordance with Court rules). On September 23, 2024, Appellant timely requested an additional 30-day extension (in accordance with Court rules) which Clerk granted on September 24, 2024 (but backdated to September 23, 2024 (as documentation shows)). ETC.

Bush knew Appellant's Rule 12A Statement of the Case had yet to be filed and Appellant had, per Court rules regarding extension requests, until AT LEAST November 22, 2024 to file (see Appellate Rule 20(b)). Why did Bush file his fraudulent, etc. Motion to Dismiss on Friday afternoon, September 27, 2024?

Among other things, Bush had been holding off filing his Motion to Dismiss because, as Bush knew it is, as briefly discussed below, premature (since Appellant hasn't filed his Prebrief Statement (in which will discuss the bases for appeal)), etc. How can you move

to dismiss an appeal if you don't know the arguments for appeal? Only after Appellant has AT LEAST filed his Prebrief Statement (in which will discuss the bases for appeal) can Bush submit his Motion to Dismiss.

Why did Bush suddenly decide to ignore the prematurity of his Motion and file anyways?

As Bush (and this Court) was aware, Appellant is concurrently appealing (to SCOTUS) this Court's retaliatory, discriminatory, unconstitutional, etc. order (where Bush was opposing counsel (See Case #SU-2024-0152-MP)) effectively disbarring Appellant because, as this Court itself stated, Appellant dared to expose Judicial corruption (including corruption by Bush, etc. (which Bush's recent filings further reinforce)). On September 9, 2024, Appellant submitted a request for Extension to SCOTUS. In compliance with SCOTUS rules, Appellant provided Bush with a copy of the request. SCOTUS granted the request on September 16, 2024 and gave Appellant until November 25, 2024.

In other words, on September 16, 2024 and September 24, 2024, Bush, etc. saw that the MONTHS long derailment the State intentionally caused upon Appellant which diverted Appellant's attention away from Appellant's SCOTUS appeal were effectively to little avail since, because of Appellant's efforts, Appellant would have about two months to address both this Court's and SCOTUS's

appeals. Bush, etc. can't have that. The State submitted ANOTHER knowingly frivolous (fraudulent) matter to intentionally divert Appellant's attention away from his SCOTUS appeal.

Have any doubts? Here's more.

Expecting Appellant to have urgently responded to Bush's fraudulent, etc. September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss (after all, if this Court granted Bush's Motion, there goes Appellant's entire case before it even begins), at 10AM on October 2, 2024 (less than three business days later), with Appellant not having filed a response, Bush filed a SECOND Motion to Dismiss (this time for Appellant's second (separate and distinct) appeal (Case #SU-2024-0299) (despite the appeal having JUST been docketed ONE WEEK earlier)). Bush's October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss is shorter but otherwise **practically word-for-word identical to his September 27, 2024 Motion**.

Note:

> -Bush's September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss (for this appeal (Case #SU-2024-0235-CA)) was filed on **September 27, 2024**
>
> -Bush filed his appearance for Case #SU-2024-0299 on **September 27, 2024**
>
> -Bush's October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss (for Case #SU-2024-0299) is practically word-for-

word identical to his **SEPTEMBER 27, 2024** Motion to Dismiss (for Case #SU-2024-0235-CA)

Why didn't Bush file **BOTH** of his Motions to Dismiss on **September 27, 2024**?

As briefly noted below, Bush, etc. didn't want to have to resort to his October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss just yet because, in order to try to bring that Motion, Bush had to commit MORE fraud, concealment of evidence, etc., etc., etc. (thus, providing Appellant with more evidence, etc.).

Unfortunately for Bush, etc., in addition to adding additional counts of fraud, concealment of evidence, harassment, etc., etc., etc., Bush's actions reinforce things like Appellant's above brief discussion regarding the State's, etc. attempts to divert Appellant's attention away from Appellant's SCOTUS appeal. Review the facts:

-Bush's October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss filing (submitted just ONE WEEK after that appeal had been docketed) demonstrates Bush's ability to swiftly file his motion

-based on the time stamp contained in Bush's Motion filings, it appears Bush has had his fraudulent, etc. September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss ready to be filed within ONE HOUR

> OF THIS APPEAL BEING DOCKETED on August 2, 2024
>
> -Bush's September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss is practically identical to Bush's "Memorandum in Opposition" **Dated June 4, 2024** for Case #SU-2024-0152-MP
>
> -ETC.

If Bush was able to submit his Motion to Dismiss on October 2, 2024 for an appeal that was docketed on September 24, 2024 (a difference of only 8 days), why didn't, given the above (e.g. timestamps, identical, etc.), Bush submit his September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss on, say, August 12, 2024 for this appeal that was docketed on August 2, 2024 (August 10, 2024 (8 days) is a Saturday)? After all, again, his September 27, 2024 Motion is practically identical to his "Memorandum in Opposition" **Dated June 4, 2024** for Case #SU-2024-0152-MP, time stamp shows it appears Bush had the Motion ready within ONE HOUR of this Appeal being docketed on August 2, 2024, etc. Why did Bush file on September 27, 2024? Again, as stated above:

> On September 16, 2024 and September 24, 2024, Bush, etc. saw that the MONTHS long derailment the State intentionally caused upon Appellant which diverted Appellant's attention away from Appellant's SCOTUS appeal were effectively to little avail since,

> because of Appellant's efforts, Appellant would have about two months to address both this Court's and SCOTUS's appeals. Bush, etc. can't have that. The State submitted ANOTHER knowingly frivolous (fraudulent) matter to intentionally divert Appellant's attention away from his SCOTUS appeal.

Need more proof?

Refer to RI Supreme Court Case #SU-2022-0257-CA. That case was a criminal appeal in which Bush represented the State. That case was docketed on September 6, 2022. After making requests for extension, opposing counsel in that case submitted their Rule 12A Statement of Case on December 1, 2022 (Three (3) MONTHS after the case had been docketed). On December 2, 2022 (the next day), Bush submitted his "Omelet de fromage" (Interlocutory) Motion to Dismiss. As Bush's Memorandum (Dated December 2, 2022) made clear, despite Bush knowing what Order was being appealed (an "Order Denying Motion to Suppress" (Dated August 23, 2022)), despite Bush entering his appearance in the appeal on September 9, 2022, etc., Bush complied with court rules and waited through opposing counsel's requests for extension, etc. and ONLY filed his Motion AFTER opposing counsel filed their Rule 12A Statement of Case. Why is Bush acting differently here? Again, see above brief discussion.

1. PREMATURITY

Even before Appellant AGAIN demonstrates Bush's knowing FRAUD, etc., as this Court is aware, Bush's Motion is PREMATURE and must be denied.

Bush claims Appellant's appeal must be dismissed because Bush fraudulently, etc. claims the appeal is interlocutory. However, as Bush is aware, Appellant has yet to submit his Rule 12A Statement of Case (in which will discuss the bases for appeal). **Even if Bush believes he has developed the ability to read minds, Bush must wait until AT LEAST Appellant has filed his Prebrief Statement.**

Bush's Motion to Dismiss:

> "...asks this Court to waive the prebriefing process and/or any other requirements that ordinarily govern appeals in this Court."

If those words sound familiar to Bush, they should. Those were Bush's own words when, in a different case, he opposed a criminal Defendant's desire to waive this Court's prebriefing process. Amazing how Bush followed rules when it served his purposes.

Here, Bush claims he may bypass court procedure because he thinks (key word: THINKS) he knows Appellant's reasons for appeal because of Appellant's "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order" (Dated May 31, 2024) (Case #SU-2024-0152-MP). Appellant's Requests for Stay is IRRELEVANT to Appellant's Prebrief Statement and

subsequent Briefing Statement(s). Appellant's Prebrief Statement (which has yet to be filed) and subsequent Briefing Statement(s) are the controlling documents; nothing else. Again, Bush must wait until AT LEAST Appellant has filed his Prebrief Statement.

To again quote Bush from his previous case:

> "[T]his case should proceed in the ordinary course, and [Appellant] should be required to file a prebriefing statement consistent with this Court's [] Prebriefing Notice, and in accordance with Rule 12A of the Rules of Appellate Procedure."

In other words, **BUSH HIMSELF EFFECTIVELY ADVOCATES FOR THE DENIAL OF BUSH'S CURRENT MOTION.**

As a side note, the denial of Bush's Motion as PREMATURE should've occurred MONTHS AGO automatically by this Court immediately after Bush's prima facie premature motion was filed and without Appellant's need to file an objection/response. Appellant has firsthand experience of this Court's capability to do so. For example, in Case #SU-2024-0147-MP, this Court denied Appellant's Motion for Stay within only six and a half HOURS by fraudulently, etc. claiming it was PREMATURE (despite having (and Appellant's Motion pointing to)

evidence showing otherwise) and Bush never had to submit ANY filing whatsoever.

2. INTENTIONALLY CONEALING LEGAL AUTHORITY DIRECTLY ADVERSE TO THE STATE

We arrive back to Bush's "Omelet de fromage": Interlocutory.

Before Bush's fraudulent argument is briefly addressed, it speaks volumes that even AFTER Appellant PREVIOUSLY ALREADY exposed (TO THIS COURT (WHICH BUSH RECEIVED A COPY OF)) Bush's fraudulent argument, etc., Bush CONTINUES advancing the SAME fraudulent argument, etc. Emboldened by this Court's effective endorsement, etc. of his fraud, etc., Bush continues with his lies, etc.

Bush begins by stating:

> "Section 9-24-1 of the General Laws permits a party aggrieved by a 'final judgment, decree, or order of the superior court' to appeal to this Court. R.I. Gen. Laws § 9-24-1."

Bush then falsely claims Appellant's appeals are interlocutory and, therefore, cannot be appealed. Bush furthers his fraud by falsely claiming:

> "[Only o]ne exception exists to the general prohibition against interlocutory appeals filed by defendants in criminal cases: [Double Jeopardy]"

Before case law directly contradicting Bush's LIE is briefly discussed, among other things, turn to non-other than the very same Title (9) and Chapter (24) Bush cites. As Appellant has ALREADY exposed, Section 9-24-7 states (in full):

> "**Whenever**, upon a hearing in the superior court, **an injunction shall be granted** or continued, or a receiver appointed, or a sale of real or personal property ordered, **by an interlocutory order or judgment**, or a new trial is ordered or denied after a trial by jury, **an appeal may be taken from such order or judgment to the supreme court in like manner as from a final judgment**, and the appeal shall take precedence in the supreme court." (Emphasis Added).

The highlighted portions are what the average person would call, wait for it: AN EXCEPTION. Woah!

It's not as if Bush could have missed this EXCEPTION since **SECTION 9-24-7 (WHICH IS LABELED "Appeals from interlocutory orders and judgments")** directly follows Bush's cited

Section 9-24-1 (Sections 9-24-2 through 9-24-6 were repealed by RI Congress).

Bush LIED that there is ONLY ONE exception despite knowing there are statutory exceptions in the VERY NEXT SECTION. Again, Appellant ALREADY went through this in his previous filing (See Appellant's "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP)" (Dated August 23, 2024)) yet Bush CONTINUES with his LIE.

In fact, to show the extent to which Bush will go to pretend as if Section 9-24-7 doesn't exist, look to Bush's October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss (regarding Case #SU-2024-0299-CA). Despite Bush quoting and referencing Appellant's "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP)" (Dated August 23, 2024) (the very document in which Appellant discusses Section 9-24-7), Bush's October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss states:

> "...Prete is appealing the July 3 Order requiring him to undergo a competency examination. *See* Notice of Appeal; Appellant's Memorandum In Support of Emergency Motion For Immediate Stay Order dated Aug. 23, 2024, at 3 (SU-2024-0259-MP). The order does not constitute a 'final judgment, decree, or order of the superior court' that may be appealed to this Court under § 9-24-1. Prete did not cite to any contrary authority in the

> memorandum that he filed in support of his emergency motion for a stay, but rather argued, that the July 3 Order constitutes an injunction that is immediately appealable. *See* Appellant's Memorandum In Support of Emergency Motion For Immediate Stay Order dated Aug. 23, 2024, at 2-3 (SU-2024-0259-MP)." (No Emphasis Added).

To be clear, Bush's above statement specifically points to pages 2 and 3 of Appellant's Memorandum Dated August 23, 2024 and Bush definitely declares:

> "Prete **DID NOT CITE TO ANY CONTRARY AUTHORITY** in the memorandum..." (Emphasis Added).

How is it then that at the end of Page 2 and the beginning of Page 3 (the specific pages Bush points to) of Appellant's Memorandum Dated August 23, 2024, Appellant specifically stated:

> "...this is NOT an interlocutory appeal. **The Appellant's 'Notice of Appeal' (Dated July 23, 2024) is regarding an INJUNCTION which, per R.I.G.L. 9-24-7, is treated as final judgement for appellate purposes**..." (No Emphasis Added).

In other words, **Appellant DID CITE TO AUTHORITY IN THE MEMORANDUM AND**

DID SO IN THE EXACT PAGES BUSH CLAIMED IT DIDN'T EXIST.

Take things one step further. Compare the exhibits Bush provides in his September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss with the exhibits in his October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss:

September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss

-Exhibit 1: Case Summary of Case #P2-2023-3243A

-Exhibit 2: Record on Appeal Transmittal & Notice of Appeal

-Exhibit 3: Appellant's Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (Dated May 31, 2024)

October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss

-Exhibit 1: Case Summary of Case #P2-2023-3243A

-Exhibit 2: Record on Appeal Transmittal & Notice of Appeal

-Exhibit 3: Order for Competency Examination

-Exhibit 4: Transcript of July 3, 2024 Pre-Trial Conference

To quote Sesame Street:

"One of these things is not like the other[]..."

Notice how Bush includes in his September 27, 2024 Motion to Dismiss a copy of Appellant's Memorandum Dated May 31, 2024 (because Bush refers to statements contained in Appellant's Memorandum). Why then doesn't Bush include in his October 2, 2024 Motion to Dismiss a copy of Appellant's Memorandum Dated August 23, 2024 (especially considering Bush points to specific pages, quotes, etc. from that memorandum)? A simple demonstration:

If Bush were to have included Appellant's Memorandum Dated August 23, 2024 and the reader were to flip to pages 2-3 (as Bush instructs) to see how Appellant supposedly DOESN'T cite to *ANY* authority, the reader would be shocked, etc. to see not only that Appellant DID cite to authority (ON THOSE SPECIFIC PAGES) but the brazenness with which Bush LIES, etc.

Note, there is a difference between disagreeing with, etc. Appellant's authority and outright **LYING** that

Appellant DIDN'T EVEN CITE TO ANY AUTHORITY.

BUSH LIED, CONCEALED EVIDENCE, ETC., ETC., ETC.

Bush's actions are just the latest in a series of efforts by the RI AG's Office, RI Judiciary, etc. to falsify information, conceal evidence, deny reality, etc. to advance their goals. For example, in the lower court case (P2-2023-3243A):

> -Bush's colleague (Special Assistant AG John Perrotta) falsified what court rules stated so the AG's Office could conceal evidence (including exculpatory evidence) from Appellant (which is still being withheld to date)
>
> -Magistrate John McBurney signed a decision issued by himself claiming that CASE LAW (without stating what "case law" he is referring to) states a criminal Defendant is NOT ENTITLED TO EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE (despite well-established 60-year-old SCOTUS case law stating the complete opposite)
>
> -Superior Court Judge Linda Rekas Sloan denied the existence of Appellant's properly filed, accepted, time-stamped, etc. "Notice of Appeal" (Dated May 28, 2024) despite, as

documentation shows, seeing it directly in front of her on her computer (see e.g. Appellant's "Sixth Emergency Letter to Associate Justice Rekas Sloan (P2-2023-3243A)" (Dated June 20, 2024) for more)

-Rekas Sloan claimed RI Appellate Rule 11(a) and Rule 12 (governing how and when appeals are docketed in this Court) do not exist (Rekas Sloan even went so far as to claim Appellant was "magical[ly]" making up those rules and, effectively, lying to a Judge)

-ETC.

It gets better.

At an RI Bar Association Annual Meeting, Bush was one of six panel members (among which included former RI Supreme Court Chief Justice Frank Williams, future RI Bar President Nicole Benjamin, etc.) for a seminar regarding "Appellate Practice for Trial Lawyers."

As is obvious, presenters are usually people with experience and/or expertise in the given subject area. Nicole Benjamin posted on her firm's website highlights from her presentation which includes her "...top five appellate practice tips based on decisions from the [] Rhode Island Supreme Court..."

Among those top five is:

> "As a general rule (there are some exceptions), orders entered by the trial court are not appealable until the case has concluded and a final judgment has entered. The rule is designed to promote judicial efficiency and prevent piecemeal adjudication of disputes.
>
> *See* https://www.apslaw.com/on-appeal/category/final-judgment-rule/" (No Emphasis Added).

When one goes to the web address Nicole Benjamin provided, the reader will find the following:

> **"(2) COMMON LAW AND STATUTORY EXCEPTIONS TO THE FINAL JUDGMENT RULE.**
>
> There are both common law and statutory exceptions to the final judgment rule. The Court 'may hear an appeal from an interlocutory order if public policy considerations warrant or if immediate action is necessary in order to avoid imminent and irreparable harm.' *Furtado v. Laferriere*, 839 A.2d 533, 536 (R.I. 2004) (citing *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. v. Dial Media, Inc.*, 410 A.2d 986, 989 (R.I. 1980)). In addition, an interlocutory order may be considered final for purposes of appeal if the order (1) grants or continues an injunction, (2) appoints a receiver, (3) orders the sale of real or personal

> property or (4) orders or denies a new trial after a trial by jury. R.I. Gen. Laws § 9-24-7." (No Emphasis Added).

Amazing! Nicole Benjamin's discussion points out **THE SAME SECTION 9-24-7 BUSH CLAIMS DOESN'T EXIST AND THAT BUSH CLAIMS APPELLANT NEVER BROUGHT UP.**

There's more.

Nicole Benjamin's discussion also points to ANOTHER exception: Imminent and Irreparable Harm. Those words sound very familiar. Ah, yes! Those are the same words Appellant discussed on page 3 of Appellant's "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP)" (Dated August 23, 2024) in which Appellant stated:

> "Further, even if Bush were to argue that the Appellant's appeal is interlocutory (and this Court were to agree with Bush's fraudulent, etc. argument), the Appellant would suffer, as briefly noted below, imminent and irreparable harm from Rekas Sloan's Order. Consistent with this Court's precedent (see e.g. DeMaria v. Sabetta, 121 R.I. 648 (1979)), such imminent and irreparable harm overcomes any fraudulent, etc. dispute of interlocutory."

Again, not only did Bush definitively state that NO other exception exists (in essence calling Nicole Benjamin incompetent, a liar, etc.) but page 3 is one of the pages Bush pointed to to definitively state Appellant DIDN'T EVEN CITE TO ANY AUTHORITY.

But wait, there's more.

The above brief discussion only addresses the OBVIOUS exceptions Bush knew of. There are still other exceptions.

Bush states the ONLY ONE exception the RI Supreme Court will consider is for:

> "...an interlocutory appeal of a trial court order denying a motion to dismiss a case on double jeopardy grounds. *See State v. Rose*, 788 A.2d 1156, 1157 (R.I. 2001)..." (No Emphasis Added).

Bush then follows it up with a string-citation (citation of multiple cases) to four (4) other RI Supreme Court cases.

State v. Rose stated:

> "In criminal cases, the only interlocutory appeal that can be properly heard before this Court is the denial of a motion to dismiss

> based on double jeopardy grounds." State v. Rose, 788 A.2d 1156, 1157 (R.I. 2001)

That false statement of law (as demonstrated below) follows other false statements such as:

> "This issue would not come within the exception of *Abney v. United States*, [431 U.S. 651 (1977)], which allows an appeal from other than a final judgment solely on double jeopardy grounds.'" State v. Berberian, 411 A.2d 308, 312 (R.I. 1980) (No Emphasis Added).

This Court's evidently nearly half CENTURY old interpretation of *Abney* is 100% false. The following is how the decision in *Abney* effectively concluded:

> "Our conclusion that a defendant may seek immediate appellate review of a district court's rejection of his double jeopardy claim is based on the special considerations permeating claims of that nature which justify a departure from the normal rule of finality. Quite obviously, such considerations do not extend beyond the claim of former jeopardy and encompass other claims presented to, and rejected by, the district court in passing on the accused's motion to dismiss. **Rather, such claims ARE appealable if, and only if, they TOO fall within *Cohen's* collateral-order exception to the final-judgment**

> **rule**." Abney v. United States, 431 U.S. 651, 663 (1977) (Emphasis Added).

Notice the emphasized portion specifically states ANYTHING may be appealable as long as it TOO fits within the "...collateral-order exception to the final-judgment rule." There is NO limit to ONLY Double Jeopardy.

ETC.

3. PRESENTING A KNOWINGLY FRADULENT ARGUMENT

As stated above, Section 9-24-7 specifically states:

> "**Whenever**...**an injunction shall be granted**...**by an interlocutory order or judgment**,...**an appeal may be taken from such order or judgment to the supreme court in like manner as from a final judgment**..." (Emphasis Added).

Bush's Motion to Dismiss even acknowledges that among those being appealed is Rekas Sloan's:

> "...order[]...requir[ing Appellant] to appear at pretrial conferences..."

In other words, an INJUNCTION (in this case, an order requiring someone to do something).

Bush acknowledges Appellant is appealing an injunctive order. Section 9-24-7 specifically states injunctive orders are treated as "final judgment" for appellate purposes. Therefore, how can Bush's Motion to Dismiss claim:

> "...[Rekas Sloan's injunctive] order [does not] constitute[] a 'final judgment, decree, or order of the superior court' that may be appealed to this Court..."

Recall, again, Appellant has ALREADY addressed this basically identical point in Appellant's "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP)" (Dated August 23, 2024) in which Appellant stated:

> "**The Appellant's 'Notice of Appeal' (Dated July 23, 2024) is regarding an INJUNCTION which, per R.I.G.L. 9-24-7, is treated as final judgement for appellate purposes**..." (No Emphasis Added).

But, then again, as briefly demonstrated above, Bush claims Appellant never made such a statement and Bush concealed evidence in order to make his false claim.

Bush continues with his fraud, etc.

4. VIOLATING COURT RULES

Both Bush's Motion to Dismiss (Dated September 27, 2024) and Memorandum in Support (Dated September 27, 2024) state under "**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**" (No Emphasis Added) (signed by Christopher Bush):

> "I certify that, on September 27, 2024, I filed this [motion/memorandum] through the electronic filing system and served a copy through that system on, **OR** mailed a copy to, [D/d]efendant-[P/p]etitioner Michael Prete." (Emphasis Added).

Bush REPEATED the same "**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**" (No Emphasis Added) (signed by Christopher Bush) for his Motion to Dismiss Dated October 2, 2024 and Memorandum in Support Dated October 2, 2024 for Case #SU-2024-0299-CA.

These are not mistakes by an inexperienced person. The RI AG's filings should have been immediately rejected by the Clerk's Office for non-compliance with court rules. Court rules require definitive specificity regarding how service was completed (specifically stating whether electronic, mail, or in-person was used); not intentionally vague, maybe, either-or, it could have been, etc. statements like above.

Regarding alleged electronic service, to date, no electronic service of ANY KIND (automated court system e-mail, e-mail from Bush personally, etc.) has

been provided to Appellant. Bush's signed certification is effectively perjury.

Regarding Bush's alleged mailed service, any alleged service is not in compliance with Judiciary rules (therefore Bush violated court rules). As Appellant has stated in his filings (which Bush has copies of), **PER JUDICIARY RULES, ANY REGISTERED USER OF THE JUDICIARY'S ONLINE FILING SYSTEM (WHETHER THEY ARE AN ATTORNEY OR NOT) *MUST* BE SERVED ELECTRONICALLY.** Mail service is INVALID.

It also bears noting, Bush's Memorandum filings (Dated September 27, 2024 & October 2, 2024) contain BOTH a Memorandum and Exhibits in the same submission. Why did this Court's Clerk's Office approve of such filing when the same Clerk's Office (in fact, the same clerk) rejected Appellant's filings claiming Appellant's same type of filings needed to be separately filed (e.g. Memorandum filed separately from the Exhibits)? Appellant's filings were rejected and Appellant was told his Motion, Memorandum, and Exhibits needed to be filed as THREE SEPARATE ENTRIES ("1) Motion for Stay 2) Memorandum in Support and 3) Other (for exhibits)") yet for Bush (the RI AG (a member of the Judiciary's inner-circle)) such requirements are apparently waived. Further evidence of discrimination, etc. by this Court.

5. VIOLATING ETHICS, ETC. RULES

Though a massive understatement, as this Court would say, Bush's filings (containing fraud upon the Court, etc.) were unprofessional and contrary to Bush's responsibilities as an officer of the Court.

But, it appears such statements from this Court are only reserved for Appellant (e.g. this Court falsely accused Appellant of being unprofessional, etc. because Appellant dared to expose Judicial corruption (including corruption by Bush, etc.)).

Bush's filings have violated ethics, etc. rules. For example, as demonstrated above, in violation of Rule 3.3 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, Bush intentionally lied about facts, concealed legal authority that was directly adverse to the State (and such legal authority was directly in support of Appellant), concealed evidence, etc.

Further, this is the SECOND and THIRD time Bush has done this in front of this Court. Appellant even previously submitted a filing to this Court exposing Bush's actions.

Instead of hauling Bush in front of this Court to have Bush, at a minimum, explain his fraud, etc., the same court who provided Appellant with only three business days notice before proceeding to unconstitutionally, etc. effectively strip Appellant of his law license (violating Due Process, Equal Protection, multiple disciplinary rules (e.g. Disciplinary rules declare that the process should

take AT LEAST 95 days), etc.) (for, as this Court stated, Appellant daring to expose Judicial corruption (including corruption by Bush, etc.)) stated to Bush (State's counsel):

> "***If*** the State so chooses, it may file a response [to Appellant's allegations]..." (Emphasis Added).

Not shockingly, Bush never filed a response to Appellant's exposure of his fraud, etc.

Even pretending this Court thought Appellant was incorrect, this Court refused to even farce the appearance of neutrality and have Bush attempt to contradict Appellant. Why? Because that's how inescapable Bush's fraud was (as briefly demonstrated above).

Emboldened by this Court's effective endorsement of his fraud, etc., Bush continues with his lies, etc.

Further, as this Court is aware, among other things, the Rules of Professional Conduct PROHIBIT the filing of motions, etc. for the sole purpose to harass, delay, etc. Bush knew, when he filed, that his motions were, at the very least, premature. However, as briefly demonstrated above, Bush intentionally filed his premature motions to harass Appellant, distract Appellant from preparing his Prebrief Statements (Appellant has two appeals before this Court), SCOTUS appeal, etc., etc. Such conduct is

itself sanctionable (let alone the combined effect of all of Bush's actions, etc.).

As Appellant stated in his "Memorandum in Support of Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order (SU-2024-0259-MP)" (Dated August 23, 2024):

> "It bears noting that nearly identical circumstances were before this Court in the Appellant's previous Emergency Request for Stay (see Case #SU-2024-0152-MP) regarding, among other things, Rekas Sloan's May 6, 2024 Injunctive Order (Rekas Sloan ordered the Appellant to appear at imminent Pre-Trial Conferences or else the Appellant would be arrested). Despite Bush citing to R.I.G.L. 9-24-1 (and therefore being FULLY AWARE of R.I.G.L. 9-24-7), Bush fraudulently, etc. claimed to this Court that the Appellant's appeal was interlocutory in nature and therefore not properly before the Court and should be dismissed. Instead of reprimanding Bush for knowingly deceiving, etc. the Court by presenting a knowingly false argument, etc., this Court not only agreed with Bush, denied the Appellant's Emergency Request for Stay, etc. but, in violation of R.I. Disciplinary rules, the Appellant's Constitutional rights (including openly retaliating against the Appellant's First Amendment Freedom of Speech (speech consisting of exposing corruption, etc.)), etc., effectively disbarred the

> Appellant (indefinitely suspending the Appellant (itself a violation of Disciplinary rules (e.g. suspensions can only last a maximum of five (5) years)))." (No Emphasis Added).

Also, note, R.I. Chief Disciplinary Counsel Kerry Reilley Travers is receiving a copy of this filing. As this Court and Kerry Reilley Travers are aware, per Disciplinary Rule 5(b)(1), Chief Disciplinary Counsel has the **MANDATORY DUTY**:

> "to investigate all matters involving alleged misconduct which come to his/her attention whether by complaint or otherwise"

In other words, this filing (containing evidence of misconduct, etc. by Bush, etc.) has come to Kerry Reilley Travers's attention and therefore, per Disciplinary Rules, Kerry Reilley Travers has a mandatory duty to investigate Bush, etc.

This filing will be the third time Appellant has provided Kerry Reilley Travers with documents regarding fraud, etc. by Bush (and others). On July 8, 2024 and August 26, 2024, Appellant provided Travers with documents regarding Bush's fraud, etc. Under RI Disciplinary rules, once Bar Counsel received a copy of Appellant's filings, Bar Counsel was under an obligation to investigate. To date, Appellant is unaware of any investigation into Bush, etc.

ETC.

For the reasons stated herein, Bush's Motion must be denied with prejudice.

This filing and this Court's decision will be heading for SCOTUS. As should be obvious, again, ensure the Court's WRITTEN decision documents EACH JUSTICE'S reasoning (e.g. if there are concurrences, dissents, etc., ensure EACH JUSTICE'S reasonings, etc. are included in the written decision). The same way this Court would need the reasoning of a lower court Judge in order to review their decision, the United States Supreme Court will need this Court's reasoning in order to review the decision.

/s/ Michael Prete
Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road, Narragansett, RI 02882
[Forthcoming]

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that, on [Forthcoming], I filed and served this document through the electronic filing system to the RI Attorney General and it is available for viewing and/or downloading from the RI Judiciary's Electronic Filing System.

/s/ Michael Prete
Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road, Narragansett, RI 02882

APPENDIX I

[In The Supreme Court of the United States]

[In re MICHAEL PRETE,
Petitioner,]

[PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS]
[Forthcoming]

OPINIONS BELOW

Lower court's unreported orders reproduced at App.[].

JURISDICTION

Lower court orders dated July 3, 2024, December 20, 2023, and October 23, 2023. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S. Code §1651, §2241, §2242, and §2254.

LAWS INVOLVED

U.S. First Amendment provides:

"Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech..."

U.S. Fourth Amendment provides:

> "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

U.S. Fifth Amendment provides:

> "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 offence 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."

U.S. Sixth Amendment provides:

> "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed,

> which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence."

U.S. Eighth Amendment provides:

> "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

U.S. Fourteenth Amendment provides:

> "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities 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 within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

STATEMENT OF CASE AND REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

When discussing the importance of an independent Judiciary, Justice Gorsuch said:

> "...what does it mean to you as an American? It means that when you're unpopular, you can

> get a fair hearing under the law and under the Constitution...It's there for the moments when, when the spotlight's on you. When the Government's coming after you. And don't you want a ferociously independent Judge and a jury of your peers to make those decisions? Isn't that your right as an American?"

As briefly exhibited below, it's bad enough an ENTIRE State Judiciary system violates Petitioner's rights, refuses to comply with ITS OWN rules, precedent, etc. (as well as THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, THIS COURT'S ESTABLISHED PRECEDENT, ETC.), openly retaliates against Petitioner for exercising his Constitutional rights, etc., it's a whole other state of affairs when the R.I. Judiciary ("RIJ"), among other things, essentially refuses to even acknowledge the existence of bedrock rules, Constitutional guarantees, etc.

Simple illustration: Petitioner asks each of this Court's Justices to pick an Amendment from the Bill of Rights. In response to the selections, RIJ would:

> -deny the Bill of Rights exists
>
> -claim each Justice is making up the Amendments
>
> -claim each Justice is mentally impaired, needs psychological examination, and needs to be locked up in a psych-ward

Not an exaggeration, etc. Similar documented actions have already taken place and have been put in motion against Petitioner (who, as briefly noted below, is an attorney, etc.).

As RIJ has basically declared to Petitioner:

> Laws, rules, rights, etc.? What are you talking about? We are the Judiciary. We can do whatever we want, whenever we want.

As briefly discussed below, Petitioner was provably falsely arrested by Smithfield Police ("SPD") (App. []) and is being provably fraudulently, etc. prosecuted by State of R.I. (through the R.I. A.G. ("AG")).

When reviewing the below brief example demonstrations, note, all judges involved (Patrick Burke, John McBurney, Linda Rekas Sloan as well as all of the R.I. Supreme Court ("RISC") justices (Paul Suttell, Maureen McKenna Goldberg, Melissa Long, Erin Lynch Prata, William Robinson), etc.) are fully aware (**ALL DOCUMENTED**) of the crimes, etc. being perpetrated by the State. Among other things, despite judges having prima facie evidence (as well as evidence directly from the United States Secret Service ("USSS") (as noted herein)) that the alleged USSS letter (without which there would be no case) being used by Prosecution (the foundation of their case) is a forgery (counterfeit) by the State and despite having multiple opportunities to dismiss this

fraudulent, etc. case, RIJ has repeatedly aided and abetted, etc. the State's crimes, etc.

Some brief examples (see Appendix for some more):

-**JUDGE ISSUED BENCH WARRANT FOR PETITIONER'S ARREST DESPITE ADMITTING NO ARRESTABLE OFFENSE EXISTED**: Despite Petitioner NOT being required to appear and given that Petitioner's case was and had been (for months) on appeal (as Superior Court Judge Linda Rekas Sloan had been repeatedly informed) regarding foundational matters (which would ultimately lead to the dismissal of the case), Petitioner, following court protocols, had requested a new date (A.K.A. rescheduling) for the Pre-Trial Conference in advance of Rekas Sloan even contemplating issuing an arrest warrant. Not only was Petitioner's request ignored, Rekas Sloan illegally issued an arrest warrant. Rekas Sloan essentially ADMITTED (ON THE RECORD) SHE LIED TO ILLEGALLY ISSUE A WARRANT FOR PETITIONER'S ARREST. Rekas Sloan's own words made clear Petitioner DIDN'T have to appear for the Pre-Trial Conference (something that's ALSO reflected in RISC's own rules (as Petitioner had repeatedly stated in his multiple filings, etc.)) yet Rekas Sloan claimed otherwise in order to illegally issue a warrant for

Petitioner's arrest. Because of Rekas Sloan's illegal bench warrant, Petitioner:

-was jailed for four (4) days

-didn't have food or water for four (4) DAYS

-was strip searched TWICE (even down to Petitioner's anus (and one strip search occurred in front of MULTIPLE guards and MULTIPLE inmates (in all, a minimum of a dozen, if not TWO (2) DOZEN, people)))

-was sleep deprived for three (3) days

-was shackled by his hands and feet and perp-walked through the Courthouse

-ETC.

ALL FOR SOMETHING REKAS SLOAN ADMITTED (ON THE RECORD) SHE KNEW WAS NOT A VIOLATION, ARRESTABLE OFFENSE, ETC.

People could visibly see the toll the ordeal took on Petitioner. For example, Petitioner's leg began uncontrollably shaking aggressively (to the point of shaking Petitioner's body) (Petitioner had to press his leg hard against

the table in front of him just to try to stop the shaking).

Petitioner was deprived of his phone, ID, credit cards, cash, etc. and, when released, had to find some way to travel 30 miles to get home.

Petitioner (who had been arrested after having spent approximately five and a half (5½) HOURS doing yardwork, who had been put through a traumatic situation, who hadn't eaten or had water in four (4) days, who had been sleep deprived for three (3) days, etc.) had to find the strength to jog/walk home (and subsequently collapsed upon arrival at his house).

Petitioner ended up getting very sick (for WEEKS).

-**JUDGE CLAIMS DEFENDANT IN CRIMINAL CASE NOT ENTITLED TO EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE, ETC.**:
According to Magistrate John McBurney's signed decision, "After review of [Petitioner's] filing and the **CASE LAW**..." (Emphasis Added) (without declaring what supposed "case law"), Petitioner (a Defendant in a criminal case) is not entitled to exculpatory evidence (evidence reinforcing Petitioner didn't commit any crimes, etc.), etc. Yet, such

materials (exculpatory evidence) have their own name: "Brady" materials (referencing *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)).

-**JUDICIARY GENERAL COUNSEL EFFECTIVELY ADMITTED TO DESTROYING EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF PETITIONER (EVEN AFTER NOTIFICATION TO PRESERVE)**: Petitioner timely e-mailed Kathleen Kelly (RIJ's General Counsel) requesting and providing her with **LEGAL NOTICE** that she preserve surveillance videos for certain days (among other things, those tapes would've revealed the criminal conspiracy to deprive Petitioner of his Constitutional rights). Instead of preserving the evidence, Kelly e-mailed WEEKS later and basically stated she intentionally ignored Petitioner's e-mail, allowed the courthouse's normal preservation period of such materials to lapse, and destroyed the evidence. Notice, Kelly is **GENERAL COUNSEL of RIJ**. One would think Kelly would be one of the most ethical people. Instead, Kelly intentionally destroyed evidence to conceal criminal conduct, etc. by members of RIJ (actions, etc. which are themselves criminal).

-**JUDICIARY MADE-UP RULES (WHICH DON'T EXIST) TO DISMISS PETITIONER'S APPEAL**: Petitioner's

appeal of McBurney's unconstitutional denial orders (e.g. denying right to exculpatory evidence) was **dismissed by a still unidentified individual** claiming Petitioner didn't order a transcript as allegedly required by court rule. NO SUCH RULE EXISTS. Nowhere in rules regarding appeal of Magistrate decisions nor anywhere on the form used to appeal Magistrate decisions are there ANY mentions of a transcript needed.

Furthering the LIE, Rekas Sloan falsely claimed the rules even laid out a deadline by which to order the transcript. However, again, NO SUCH RULE EXISTS. Since the rules, etc. don't call for a transcript, there's no (and cannot be a) deadline Petitioner missed to order the non-required transcript.

-**TO COERCE PETITIONER (WHO WAS SHACKLED (HANDS AND FEET)), JUDGE LIED THAT PETITIONER WAS OUT OF OPTIONS AND HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO PLEA OR FACE UP TO 20 YEARS IN PRISON**: Among other things, to further fraudulently, etc. influence Petitioner (more like force Petitioner into submission) to do what they say, Rekas Sloan stated Petitioner's appeal had already been dismissed, Rekas Sloan fraudulently, etc. implied that the deadline to appeal the dismissal to RISC was over, Rekas Sloan

claimed Petitioner's stay motions are therefore moot

-**JUDGE EFFECTIVELY ACCUSED PETITIONER OF LYING TO A JUDGE FOR MERELY RECITING JUDICIARY RULES**: Despite knowing the hearing was being officially RECORDED, Rekas Sloan basically accused Petitioner of lying to a Judge when Petitioner merely recited RIJ's appellate rules of procedure. As Rekas Sloan was aware, those appellate rules would've prevented Rekas Sloan from moving forward with her plans to strip Petitioner of his bodily autonomy (as briefly noted below).

-**JUDGE DENIED EXISTENCE OF PETITIONER'S FILING AND CASE STATUS DESPITE JUDGE LOOKING AT SUCH DOCUMENT AND CASE STATUS ON HER COMPUTER**: On June 6, 2024, while reviewing the court record on her computer, Rekas Sloan LIED and falsely claimed she couldn't find any record of Petitioner's ALREADY FILED, accepted, time and date-stamped, etc. appeal whereas not only was Petitioner's appeal filing available for downloading, etc., Petitioner's docket specifically stated (confirmed by documentation):

"Case Status: **05/28/2024 Notice of Appeal Filed**" (No Emphasis Added)

-**JUDGE'S ONLY CONCERN WHEN DEALING WITH PETITIONER'S MOTIONS (WHICH JUDGE PREJUDGED WERE GOING TO BE DENIED) WAS TO COVER-UP CORRUPTION, ETC. OF JUDICIARY**: According to McBurney, when a litigant submits a motion, the motion is not addressed to discuss the facts, law, or whether the motion should be granted/denied but is, instead, addressed by RIJ "...primarily..." for the purpose of trying to fraudulently, etc. **COVER-UP, ETC.** Petitioner's proof of Judicial, etc. corruption.

-**JUDGE HAD PETITIONER'S CASE COURT RECORD FALSIFIED**: As documented, McBurney had the court record falsified to make it appear as though Petitioner "passed" (ABANDONED, etc.) on his own motions, etc. despite admitting knowing the opposite was true

-**JUDGES AID AND ABET, ETC. PROSECUTION'S FALSIFICATIONS, ILLEGAL WITHHOLDINGS, ETC.**: Example, Prosecution, among other things, purposely alters court rules to avoid addressing (and producing) OBVIOUS EXCULPATORY documents, etc. and, even

after Petitioner highlights their corrupt, etc. conduct to the court, RIJ aids and abets, etc. Prosecution's conduct

-**JUDGES AID AND ABET, ETC. PROSECUTION'S CONCEALMENT OF CRITICAL INFORMATION, ETC.**: Example, Prosecution, among other things, purposely leaves out critical exceptions to rules (exceptions which require Petitioner's emergency stay request be granted) and RISC (who knows of the exception) not only aid and abets, etc. Prosecution's conduct but strips Petitioner of his law license

-**COURTHOUSE POLICE INTERRUPT PETITIONER'S CASE TO ORDER PETITIONER TO STOP SPEAKING WHEN IT'S PETITIONER'S TIME TO SPEAK**: During a FORCED (UNDER ILLEGAL THREAT OF ARREST) Pre-Trial CONFERENCE (a CONFERENCE between Petitioner AND Prosecution (by definition, time for parties to converse) (where Petitioner brought up and was confronting Prosecution about their USSS letter being a proven forgery (a counterfeit) by the State)), while Petitioner was speaking, Courthouse police interjected to ORDER Petitioner not to speak to Prosecution. Note, the officer knew the session was being recorded yet still proceeded to give an order he has no power to give. Also, Rekas Sloan stood

by doing nothing (e.g. overrule, etc.) while the officer gave the order.

-**ENTIRE STATE SUPREME COURT BYPASSED DISCIPLINARY RULES, DUE PROCESS, ETC. AND EFFECTIVELY DISBARRED PETITIONER OPENLY IN RETALIATION OF PETITIONER'S FIRST AMENDMENT FREE SPEECH, ETC.**: Despite RIJ's own disciplinary rules stating any attorney discipline is to commence with an investigation initiated and conducted by Bar Counsel and EVENTUALLY (AT LEAST 95 DAYS LATER) the matter is brought to RISC, because Petitioner exercised his First Amendment right to Free Speech and dared to expose corruption by RIJ, etc. (as effectively admitted in RISC's order), **RISC SUA SPONTE (AND DEPRIVING PETITIONER OF RIGHTS TO NOTICE, OPPORTUNITY, ETC.) *IMMEDIATELY* ISSUED FINAL DISPOSITION (INDEFINITELY SUSPENDING PETITIONER (itself a violation of RIJ's disciplinary rules (suspensions are limited to a maximum of five (5) years))) AND *THEN* REFERRED THE MATTER TO BAR COUNSEL FOR INVESTIGATION (ALL DOCUMENTED IN RISC'S OWN ORDER)**. Further, not only were RISC's reasons for discipline LIES, etc. but RIJ was actively withholding from

Petitioner exculpatory evidence proving RISC's statements as LIES, etc.

-**RIJ REPEATEDLY TRIES SABOTAGING PETITIONER'S CASES TO PREVENT SCOTUS FROM INTERVENING**: Knowing RIJ's corruption, knowing Petitioner has explicitly and repeatedly stated he'll be heading for this Court, etc., RIJ intentionally tried to sabotage Petitioner's ability to reach this Court. Despite Petitioner's efforts, **SUPERIOR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE (CO) INTENTIONALLY MADE A PROCEDURALLY MANDATED DEADLINE LAPSE** (which, if not met, would result in dismissal of Petitioner's appeal). CO waited until a few HOURS (maximum three (3) business hours) AFTER the deadline lapsed to transfer the documents. RIJ believed that without a decision from RISC (which wouldn't be issued if the appeal is dismissed as untimely), Petitioner **has no way of reaching this Court** (therefore, they can continue to trap Petitioner in their corrupt, etc. system).

HADN'T IT BEEN FOR PETITIONER'S ACTIONS, ETC. (TAKEN THE DAY BEFORE) TO PRESERVE THE TRANSFER DEADLINE, CO'S DOCUMENTED ATTEMPTS WOULD'VE SUCCEEDED.

Though CO ended up having to transfer documents, Petitioner discovered that two MONTHS later, **CO went back and submitted KNOWINGLY FALSE INFORMATION INTO PETITIONER'S APPEAL RECORD in an effort to STILL attempt to sabotage Petitioner's appeal.**

For Petitioner's second (separate) appeal, CO ALSO tried to intentionally make the deadline lapse. Learning from Petitioner's previous actions, when Petitioner e-mailed clerk to prevent the lapse, clerk claimed everything was transferred to RISC. However, documentation demonstrated clerk knowingly LIED and hadn't transferred ANYTHING. Petitioner again had to preserve the transfer deadline. Further, when CO finally transferred things to RISC, CO intentionally (and violating court rules) left out basically everything Petitioner requested be transferred (e.g. Petitioner requested all seven transcripts, CO only sent ONE). When Petitioner pointed out their violations, clerk lied to Petitioner and claimed EVERYTHING had been sent (despite clerk aware court documentation exposed his lie). When Petitioner requested a copy of the court documentation (available to the public) which exposed clerk's knowing lie, clerk abruptly ceased communications with Petitioner and refused to further respond to Petitioner (trying to ensure Petitioner's appeal

would be successfully sabotaged). Petitioner pursued the matter. **When forced to respond, clerk submitted false documentation into the court record to make it appear they transferred everything** (whereas clerk had actually transferred nothing) **and even erased** (Petitioner has proof) **information and document from the court record to conceal the fraud.** ETC.

-**JUDGE LITERALLY MAKING UP "FACTS" THEY *KNEW* DON'T EXIST ANYWHERE IN THE RECORD**: Too long to discuss. See e.g. App.[].

-**REFUSING TO SCHEDULE PETITIONER'S PROPERLY FILED, ETC. MOTIONS**: For example, Motions filed A YEAR AGO have STILL not been scheduled for hearing (despite Petitioner requesting a hearing date (A YEAR AGO)).

-ETC.

Prosecution, Judges have even effectively claimed (and RISC has agreed) that the State may forge (counterfeit) documents, withhold exculpatory evidence, etc. and Petitioner may only appeal such criminal, etc. acts AFTER PROSECUTION HAS SECURED A CONVICTION OF PETITIONER.

The following is an example of a comparison Petitioner provided (from his Eighth Emergency Letter (Dated August 21, 2024)) showing RIJ's discriminatory, etc. actions, etc. toward Petitioner:

> "As a side note, for a Judiciary who KNOWINGLY FALSELY claims they don't address Emergency Motions within the same day of the motion submission (despite it being their procedure (as documented)), it's amazing how Perrotta [Prosecution] is able to submit a NON-emergency ORAL motion (no documentation submitted) to an INCORRECT Judge, that incorrect Judge HEARS that motion IMMEDIATELY on the spot (without providing the Defendant an opportunity to prepare a defense, etc.), that incorrect Judge GRANTS the motion (without Perrotta having met his statutory burden, etc.) within essentially SECONDS of the motion being raised (again, without providing the Defendant an opportunity to prepare a defense, etc.), etc. YET the Defendant's WRITTEN (DOCUMENTED) EMERGENCY Motions (which are properly filed, accepted by the Clerk's Office, served to Perrotta, etc., etc.) (filed MONTHS ago (e.g. 'Emergency Motion for Immediate Stay Order' (Dated January 5, 2024), etc.)) continue, to date (OVER HALF A YEAR LATER), to remain in limbo (unaddressed, unscheduled to be heard (despite requested hearing dates provided by

> the Defendant), etc.)." (No Emphasis Added). App.[].

The State has been caught (through prima facie and demonstrative evidence (from USSS)) forging (counterfeiting) a letter and claiming the letter came from USSS (in doing so, committing multiple federal felony offenses including impersonating a federal official, etc.) in order to bring the case against Petitioner. Despite Petitioner's repeated efforts to sound the alarms to MULTIPLE Judges, despite Judges being fully aware of Prosecution's fraud, etc., despite a Judge ADMITTING they're "...required to examine the information and the attached exhibits..." (which included the forged (counterfeited) letter), etc., RIJ has paradoxically allowed Prosecution's case (which is built upon the forged (counterfeit) letter (without which Prosecution has no case)) to continue while, at the same time, refusing to even discuss the forged (counterfeited) letter (discussion of which would require automatic dismissal (with prejudice) of the case, sanctions, etc. against Prosecution, etc.).

As Petitioner stated in his Eighth Emergency Letter (Dated August 21, 2024):

> "...**AS IS THE CASE FOR *ALL* AFFIDAVITS, in addition to the Defendant's signature**, the [RI Commission on Judicial Tenure and Discipline]'s affidavit complaint form **REQUIRES**

NOTARIZATION IN ORDER TO BE A VALID AFFIDAVIT (otherwise the affidavit would be considered invalid and rejected by the Commission (the Commission (which is part of the RI Judiciary system) is comprised of Judges (e.g. JUDGE Jeffrey Lanphear) and lawyers)). Thus, in one instance (which is just an ethics complaint), the RI Judiciary would reject the Defendant's affidavit if the affidavit was not signed and notarized YET, in another instance (the Prosecution bringing criminal charges against someone (a matter which up-ends someone's life, deprives someone of their liberty (e.g. bail conditions, jail, etc.), etc., etc.)), **the RI Judiciary did NOT reject and has NOT rejected the Prosecution's submission of an UNSIGNED, UNNOTARIZED, ETC. alleged Secret Service 'affidavit' letter dated August 3, 2023** (which has been proven (in multiple ways (including from the Secret Service themselves)) to be a forged (counterfeited) document by the State)." (No Emphasis Added). App.[].

In fact, when Petitioner tried to e-mail the ethics complaint, the Commission rejected Petitioner's e-mail because it was not notarized.

By this point, the reader is likely asking themselves: Why would a Judiciary system intentionally target

one seemingly insignificant individual? Unfortunately, given SCOTUS's word limitation, Petitioner cannot delve in this area. However, should the reader seek some insight, Petitioner refers the reader to Petitioner's lower court filings (some in Appendix hereto). To provide an extremely quick snippet, before this case began, Petitioner's family had lawsuits lined up against Santander Bank (who is contracted with RI) (where Petitioner was illegally arrested), FM Global (a nearly 200 year old (per FM's website) multi-billion dollar RI-based international insurance company), entities contracted with, controlled by, etc. FM, etc., etc., etc.

Below are SOME brief examples of actions by Prosecution and police:

> -Santander surveillance footage (which Prosecution premeditatively withheld from Petitioner) shows SPD entered Santander (**NOBODY FROM SANTANDER CALLED SPD** (confirmed by SPD's documentation, etc.)), positioned himself in a corner area (for approximately 45 seconds (believing no surveillance would capture his actions)) writing on a piece of paper, went into a back area office, handed the paper (as seen on surveillance) to an unidentified female employee ("UFE") (whose identity is, to date, being concealed by Santander, SPD, Prosecution, etc. (in violation of Petitioner's Sixth Amendment) and who is NOT a

confidential informant, etc.), and, upon receipt/speaking to SPD, UFE is seen, AFTER SPD LEFT SANTANDER, acting on SPD's instructions (with paper in-hand (exculpatory evidence, since destroyed)) leading to Petitioner's false arrest (before this incident, neither Petitioner nor Petitioner's family have had any interaction of any kind with SPD)

-Despite SPD having left, despite several minutes having passed since SPD left (a customer unexpectedly kept UFE busy), etc., UFE somehow knew to:

-exit Santander

-travel outside of Santander's parking area, and

-speak to SPD

Whereupon, UFE falsely accused Petitioner of passing counterfeit bills (despite having no firsthand knowledge of the situation, despite her fellow employee (a 43-year expert (who was the highest-ranking employee on staff that day)) having administered multiple authentication tests on both bills (e.g. watermark, security thread, dual detection pen) and each bill repeatedly testing GENUINE, etc.)

-within seconds of UFE's false accusation, six (6) officers (including K-9 unit) (representing approximately half of SPD's on-duty police force) (Lieutenant Gregg Catlow, Sergeant David Walsh, Investigator John Beausoleil, Michael McCoy, Gary McDole, Brendan McDonald) began entering and immediately arrested Petitioner (note, evidence shows officers knew in advance Petitioner was alone, it was a non-violent falsely alleged situation, etc.)

-**the gold mark on both bills** (from dual detection pen test administered by the 43-year expert (indicating the bills are authentic)) were clearly visible therefore **EACH OF THE OFFICERS HAD PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE THE BILLS PASSED YET SPD STILL PROCEEDED WITH THEIR ILLEGAL ARREST**

-at least five (5) SPD officers (including a Lieutenant, Sergeant, Investigator, etc.) refused to hold the bills up to the light (among other things, **they knew they were under surveillance cameras and they didn't want it on record that they knew the bills were GENUINE (FURTHER PROVING THEY WERE FULLY AWARE OF THEIR ILLEGAL ARREST))**

-instead, SPD was concerned with checks Petitioner deposited (despite SPD, etc. knowing no crimes of any kind were committed, SPD instructed Santander to see what they could create for those check deposits (e.g. check fraud, etc.) however, given the heavy documentation surrounding those checks (e.g. issued to Petitioner's family with invoices/stubs, for accounts owned by Petitioner's family, deposited into Petitioner's family's account, etc.), to their dismay, they couldn't make anything up)

-without a warrant, SPD illegally searched Petitioner's sealed belongings and vehicle (all of which were nowhere near Petitioner when they were searched), etc.

-SPD never advised Petitioner of his Miranda rights

-during the time Petitioner was placed in handcuffs and in police custody, Petitioner was sexually assaulted (e.g. fondling Petitioner's penis and testicles) approximately a dozen times by McDonald (who has a documented history of going after male genitalia) (and other officers stood by while: McDonald assaulted Petitioner, Petitioner said assaults were taking place, etc.). In fact, McDonald euphorically ridiculed Petitioner and said it's

going to happen more (and it did nearly a dozen times more).

-when SPD found out Petitioner was recording their actions (as is Petitioner's right (as this Court has held) (which SPD knew would be used in court against them) and Petitioner's recordings were IN NO WAY interfering with, obstructing, etc. SPD's actions, etc.) (including recording SPD's sexual assaults, etc.), etc., SPD went out of their way to shut off (successfully) and try to destroy (almost successfully) Petitioner's recordings (all documented) (among other things, blatantly violating Petitioner's First Amendment protections (as this Court has held)). Hadn't SPD stopped Petitioner's recordings, the recordings would've captured other evidence including statements from SPD, etc. like:

-SPD admitting the bills were GENUINE

-SPD admitting they were arresting Petitioner without any evidence a crime had been committed

-SPD admitting they weren't following procedure, etc.

-ETC.

-Santander had provided Petitioner (as seen on Santander surveillance footage) with photocopies of the bills (showing things like the pen detector test markings having been administered). Santander surveillance shows SPD confiscated those photocopies from Petitioner. **SPD later destroyed those photocopies** (four (4) counts of destruction of evidence (four (4) pages (front and back of each bill)))

-Santander surveillance footage shows that while SPD took possession of those photocopies (**which SPD later destroyed**), MULTIPLE officers (at least five (5) SPD officers (including Lieutenant, Sergeant, Investigator, etc.)) REFUSED to take custody of the bills themselves (the supposed evidence of the alleged crime). Why was SPD's only concern to destroy, etc. Petitioner's exculpatory evidence, etc.?

-in addition to Santander surveillance conveniently not having any audio (as well as camera angles missing) (audio would likely reveal the 43-year expert informed SPD the bills PASSED each of her tests (watermark, security thread, etc.)), surveillance also was conveniently cut off (A.K.A. evidence tampering, etc.) before the Police allegedly took custody of the bills (again, Santander surveillance shows MULTIPLE officers (at

least five (5) SPD officers (including Lieutenant, Sergeant, Investigator, etc.)) REFUSING to take custody of supposed evidence) (A.K.A. ***CONFIRMED*** **BREAK IN THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY (chain of custody which, to date, hasn't been produced, Prosecution has essentially declared they don't have, etc.)**)

-SPD effectively instructed Santander to destroy (and Santander has confirmed it did destroy) Santander's records of the serial numbers of Petitioner's bills, etc.

-as confirmed by documentation, Santander attempted to destroy surveillance footage of the incident

-SPD, among other things, falsified their police report claiming the serial numbers to the bills were not available ("NOT AVAIL" (No Emphasis Added) (EXACT WORDS USED)) (despite the serial numbers being crystal clear). **Review**:

> **-Santander surveillance footage was purposefully cut off (a CONFIRMED break in the chain of custody)**
>
> **-SPD intentionally didn't list the serial numbers in the police report**

-**SPD confiscated and later destroyed Santander's provided photocopies of Petitioner's GENUINE bills**

-**SPD effectively instructed Santander to destroy (and Santander confirmed it did destroy) Santander's records of the serial numbers of Petitioner's bills, etc.**

-**ETC.**

All resulting in the State forging (counterfeiting) a letter declaring information (about the alleged bills) which are in direct contradiction to the 43-year expert's findings at the time of the incident (e.g. the forged (counterfeited) letter claims the watermarks, security threads, etc. are incorrect whereas the 43-year expert confirmed (as seen on Santander surveillance footage) the watermarks, security threads, etc. were correct).

-SPD falsified other documentation. For example, **SPD (who never provided Petitioner with a listing of his Property) falsified documentation claiming Petitioner "Refused to sign" a listing of his alleged "Property."** Note, to date, SPD and Prosecution are continuing to withhold

things like SPD facilities surveillance (which would show, among other things, the above referenced document was NEVER presented to Petitioner). Further, RIJ has denied Petitioner access to such evidence claiming Petitioner is not entitled to it. As Petitioner has previously discussed (see e.g. App.[]), SPD falsified "Refused to sign" because SPD had confiscated Petitioner's exculpatory evidence (as seen on Santander surveillance) and later destroyed such evidence and SPD didn't want Petitioner to expose their crimes (e.g. Petitioner would have written that the evidence was confiscated by Police and not declared nor returned).

-In an effort to, among other things, raid Petitioner's residence, SPD falsified documentation claiming things like Petitioner's mom was the operator of the vehicle on the scene whereas not only was Petitioner alone (as SPD knew and confirmed) but Petitioner's mom (who is and was not doing well) was approximately 32 miles away at home (at the other end of the state) (Petitioner stated Petitioner's family has proof (imagine if Petitioner's family didn't (raid would've occurred, etc.))).

-SPD's documentation, etc. indicates SPD tampered with witnesses (e.g. coached (at a minimum) them as to what, etc. to write down in their witness statements)

-SPD's police report intentionally left out exculpatory evidence, information, etc. and, instead, was written in such a way as to portray vast criminality by Petitioner when in reality they not only KNEW no crimes of ANY kind had been committed but they ADMITTED the bills were GENUINE

-Among other things, SPD committed evidence tampering, witness tampering, chain of custody broken, destruction of exculpatory evidence, falsifying records, etc., etc., etc.

-SPD's own documentation shows even a WEEK AFTER Petitioner was illegally arrested, SPD was still referring to the bills as only suspected counterfeit (in other words, there still was no evidence a crime had been committed (further reinforcing the illegality, etc. of SPD's false arrest)) (**neither Prosecution's 43-year Expert Witness** (who conducted authentication tests prior to arrest (watermark verification, security thread verification, etc.)) **nor at least three (3) SPD Investigators, Detectives, etc.** (Detective Sergeant Joseph Marcello, Detective Lieutenant Douglas Cerce Jr., Investigator John Beausoleil) (not including the other Lieutenants, Sergeants, etc. that had been involved in the matter (including on scene at the time of arrest)) (testing the authenticity of the bills is as easy as breathing for these

individuals) **found any inauthentic watermarks, security threads, etc.**)

-Petitioner submitted R.I. Public Records Request (R.I.G.L. §38-2-1) requesting documents, etc. regarding Petitioner's arrest. Initially SPD connivingly, etc. claimed disclosure could interfere with ongoing investigation. MONTHS later (including almost 1½ months AFTER AG filed charges against Petitioner), Petitioner followed up and renewed his request (via e-mail) for documents, etc. regarding his arrest however, to date (and despite Petitioner's follow up e-mails), **SPD has completely ignored Petitioner (IN VIOLATION OF R.I. LAW)** (note, Petitioner's only recourse to enforce production would be appealing to AG (the entity who is not only prosecuting Petitioner but is itself refusing to produce things like exculpatory evidence) or bringing a lawsuit (to the same Judiciary who is (as documented) aiding and abetting, etc. SPD's, Prosecution's, etc. crimes, etc.))

-Petitioner began contacting AG's Office in August 2023 requesting documents, etc. regarding the case. AG's Office ceased all communications with Petitioner since August 4, 2023 (LAST YEAR)

-A MONTH before AG filed charges, Petitioner alerted AG's Office to fundamental flaws to their case including, but not limited to, their star witness's testimony was exculpatory (e.g. the 43-year expert conducted multiple authentication tests on both bills (as seen on Santander surveillance footage) and each bill repeatedly tested GENUINE). Despite being pre-advised of their witness's expected testimony, despite having corroborating evidence in their possession (e.g. Santander surveillance footage) of Petitioner's statements, etc., AG's Office, among other things, suborned perjury to try to, among other things, negate Petitioner's e-mail, etc. AG's Office STILL chose to bring false charges (see *State v. Binns*, 732 A.2d 114 (R.I. 1999) (noting that it's prosecutorial misconduct when prosecutor has pretrial knowledge of certain testimony and evidence in Defendant's favor is suppressed or withheld by State))

-Among the documents Prosecution filed (Not through grand jury, etc. Literally merely filed with the court) to bring charges against Petitioner was a knowingly (prima facie) forged (counterfeited) "**AFFIDAVIT**" (No Emphasis Added) letter dated August 3, 2023 allegedly from USSS. In addition to the prima facie evidence exposing the forged (counterfeited) nature of the document (e.g. the "**AFFIDAVIT**" is unsigned, unnotarized,

etc. (In other words, all things mandatory for an affidavit are missing)), USSS (the government entity from where this document supposedly originated) has informed Petitioner (via responses to Petitioner's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Requests #20230784 and #20230856) that **NO SUCH DOCUMENT EXISTS IN THEIR RECORDS (DESPITE THE DOCUMENT APPEARING TO ALLEGEDLY BE *FROM* USSS)** (see App.[]).

Note, **Prosecution states it does not have any evidence of any tests, etc. allegedly conducted by USSS, etc., USSS STATES (VIA FOIA RESPONSES) IT DOES NOT HAVE ANY RECORDS OF ANY KIND (E.G. SUBMISSION, TESTS, LETTER, ETC.) OF, ABOUT, CONCERNING, ETC. THE BILLS, ETC.**

In other words, **the State forged (COUNTERFEITED) a federal document (in the process, committed multiple federal felony crimes including impersonating a federal official, etc., etc., etc.) in order to bring this fraudulent, etc. case. WITHOUT THIS ALLEGED AFFIDAVIT LETTER, PROSECUTION HAS NO CASE.**

Note, not only has Petitioner proven it's a forgery (counterfeit) OVER A YEAR ago, but, to date, Prosecution hasn't contradicted/contested Petitioner's proof, denied the accusation, etc.

Again, AG didn't bring this case via grand jury indictment (which would've necessitated the appearance and sworn testimony of USSS agent who allegedly authored the affidavit letter), etc. AG brought this case via Information Charging Package (merely submitting documents to begin the case); in other words, a way ripe for fraud, abuse, etc. As AG knew, all it had to do was submit documents (even forged documents) just to satisfy the filing requirement and it was smooth sailing from there. As Petitioner has repeatedly pointed out, without the alleged letter from USSS, AG has NO CASE (as AG knows, the evidence shows the bills are GENUINE).

Among other things, THE STATE ACTUALLY DID THE ACT OF COUNTERFEITING. Further, among other things, in forging (counterfeiting) such FEDERAL document, the State effectively impersonated a federal official (a federal felony offense, up to three (3) years in prison (18 U.S.C. 912)), used Federal seals, letterhead, etc. without authorization (a federal felony offense, up to five (5) years in

prison (18 U.S.C. 1017, 18 U.S.C. 506)), etc. The State is the one doing ALL the crimes, etc. but Petitioner is the one that has been illegally arrested TWICE, fraudulently, etc. abused, tormented, etc., etc., etc.

Further, note, to date, despite Petitioner's repeated requests for Prosecution to obtain a notarized affidavit (as required for all affidavits) from the alleged author of USSS letter (as was supposed to occur before they filed), Prosecution refuses to do so (despite USSS agent being located 0.6 miles (HALF A MILE) away from Prosecution's Office AND courthouse where this case is being held).

GIVEN THAT THE ALLEGED USSS LETTER IS A FORGERY (COUNTERFEIT), THE STATE HASN'T PRESENTED ANY EVIDENCE THE BILLS ARE COUNTERFEIT (SINCE THE BILLS REPEATEDLY TESTED GENUINE), ETC., THE STATE HAS FAILED TO MEET ITS FILING THRESHOLD BURDEN.

-despite being required to produce to Petitioner BEFORE Arraignment its Information Charging Package, Prosecution refused to produce ANYTHING to Petitioner until weeks AFTER Arraignment (even then

critical exculpatory evidence was and is still being withheld)

-Prosecution refused to produce ANYTHING to Petitioner and intentionally made their discovery deadline (mandated by court rules) lapse (despite Petitioner following up with Prosecution via e-mail and reminding Prosecution of its obligation and deadline to comply). Petitioner had to file a Motion to Compel Discovery.

-After Petitioner's Motion to Compel Discovery was filed and scheduled, Prosecution produced bare minimum information (e.g. Arrest Report, Witness Statements) however falsified scope of court discovery rules and openly stated it was withholding exculpatory evidence

-Prosecution hasn't produced Santander's alleged criminal complaint

-Prosecution has declared, by omission, Prosecution:

> -will NOT call Petitioner's accuser at trial nor has Prosecution to date identified Petitioner's accuser (blatant Sixth Amendment violations)
>
> -does NOT have chain of custody for the bills, etc.

-will NOT introduce the bills into evidence

-will NOT allow Petitioner to examine the bills either before or during trial

-does NOT have any evidence of any tests, etc. allegedly conducted by USSS (reinforcing that the alleged USSS letter is a forgery (counterfeit) by the State)

-ETC.

-ETC.

Review, Prosecution:

-has submitted a knowingly forged (counterfeited) document (**WITHOUT WHICH THERE WOULD BE NO CASE**)

-has and continues to knowingly withhold exculpatory evidence, etc.

-refuses to identify Petitioner's accuser

-refuses to call Petitioner's accuser as a witness at trial

-refuses to allow Petitioner to inspect the alleged bills

-refuses to allow the future jury to inspect the alleged bills

-refuses to obtain an actual (notarized, etc.) affidavit from the alleged author of the USSS letter

-ETC.

Further, RIJ is fully aware (ALL DOCUMENTED) of all of the above and has effectively endorsed all of the above.

As the average person knows (by merely watching TV shows and Movies), without evidence a crime was committed, police cannot arrest someone nor even hold someone. Yet, **Petitioner was arrested, charged, and is being prosecuted when there was no evidence Petitioner committed any crime and SPD, Prosecution, etc. KNEW there is no evidence of any crime.**

As Petitioner stated in his e-mail to AG dated September 11, 2023 at 9:17AM (a MONTH before Prosecution filed charged) and as Petitioner repeated in his Emergency Motion to Dismiss (Dated October 19, 2023):

> "The fact of whether the bills are counterfeit or not should have been dealt with BEFORE any arrest was ever made. This is basic police, investigative, etc. work. In fact, if SPD, etc.

were not able to immediately determine whether the bills were genuine or not, the procedural thing to do would have been to collect all information and if and when the bills were determined to be counterfeit (which, to date, they have not (**in fact, they have been repeatedly determined to be GENUINE**)), a warrant for my arrest could have [maybe] been issued. Instead, SPD proceeded to arrest me not only without any evidence the bills were counterfeit (thus no crime having been committed) but **SPD arrested me despite knowing the bills were actually GENUINE (as determined by BOTH Santander AND SPD).**

As a side note, it's not as if my identity was unknown to Santander (and thus SPD). Not only did Santander already have all of my information (including, but not limited to, my full name, address, date of birth, social security number, e-mail address, a copy of my driver's license, etc.) via our accounts with Santander (**my family and I have had, for the past 28 years, the SAME ACCOUNT with Santander** (and its predecessors (e.g. Sovereign Bank, etc.))) but, on the day of the incident, I provided Santander with my driver's license (without being asked) (key facts which SPD, etc. purposely left out of their arrest report)." (No Emphasis Added).

Among other things, Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss also stated:

> "...even at least seven (7) DAYS (AN ENTIRE WEEK) AFTER the arrest was made, the Police STILL had no evidence a crime had been committed (e.g. referring to the bills at issue as only '...suspected counterfeit...' bills (see Prosecution Exhibit 7)). Yet, **SPD omitted the word 'suspected' from its arrest report, etc. and SPD falsified an arrest report to make it appear as though the bills being allegedly counterfeit was confirmed at the time of arrest (when they were not).**" (No Emphasis Added).

Even despite things like the above, Prosecution chose to file false charges, suborn perjury to bring charges, submit a knowingly forged (counterfeited) document to bring charges, etc.

Since October 19, 2023, Petitioner has repeatedly alerted MULTIPLE judges (each with jurisdiction over the matter) to SPD's and Prosecution's fraud, etc. (including the forged (counterfeited) nature of the alleged USSS letter (the foundation of Prosecution's case)). JUDGES REFUSE TO ADDRESS THE LETTER, RAILROAD PETITIONER TO THEIR GOALS, RETALIATE AGAINST PETITIONER, ETC.

Any truly neutral Judge would be so infuriated with AG's, etc. actions that AG, etc. would be immediately disbarred and a criminal trial against THEM would be initiated for the crimes THEY have knowingly and willfully committed in trying to bring this fraudulent, etc. case. Instead, not only is Petitioner the one being tried for non-existent crimes, PETITIONER had his law license illegally, etc. effectively revoked (among other things, in open retaliation of Petitioner's First Amendment Freedom of Speech (speech consisting of exposing crimes, corruption, etc. by members of RIJ, etc.)), PETITIONER is the one being stripped of his right to proceed pro se in his criminal trial, PETITIONER is the one being stripped of his right to submit ANY filings, defenses, motions, etc. in his own criminal trial, etc. In fact, RIJ has crossed an unthinkable, etc. line of attempting to strip PETITIONER of his bodily autonomy. The Judge trying to strip Petitioner of his bodily autonomy even euphorically made sure to point out that if Petitioner does not voluntarily submit to her unconstitutional, etc. order, he will be arrested and STILL FORCED (while in jail) to submit to her order. All why? Petitioner dared to expose corruption, etc. by members of RIJ (including specifically the Judge who issued the order attempting to strip Petitioner of his bodily autonomy), AG, etc.

Seeing that Prosecution's fraudulent, etc. case against Petitioner is only being held together by their crimes, etc. (which keep mounting), RIJ has,

among other things, taken the extraordinarily, etc. abusive, etc. actions of, among other things, ordering (without due process, etc., etc.) Petitioner be psychologically evaluated (against his will, under threat of arrest (and **JAILED INDEFINITELY IF HE DOESN'T COMPLY), USING AN INAPPLICABLE LAW, IN VIOLATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THAT SAME INAPPLICABLE LAW, ETC.**) so RIJ can proceed to holding Petitioner in a psychological facility for 13.33 years, etc.

Setting aside other malicious reasons, etc., notice the efforts of stripping Petitioner of his law license, trying to label Petitioner a crazy person, etc. are trying to destroy Petitioner's credibility, etc. Why would RIJ (who is supposed to be an independent, neutral decision maker) decide to take an active and "Interested Party" role in Petitioner's case (and, in doing so, committing multiple constitutional, human rights, etc. violations against Petitioner) to try to discredit Petitioner (who, by law, is entitled to the presumption of innocence, etc.)? Consistent with RIJ's above-described complete disregard for the laws, rules, etc., Petitioner's lower court case file literally notes that a "Judicial Officer" has been added to Petitioner's case as an "Interested Party." Petitioner has asked the court to declare who this "Judicial Officer" is but Petitioner is completely ignored and their identity has been concealed from Petitioner (effectively, RIJ is claiming Petitioner has no right to know who is involved in his own case).

Per other court documentation, "Judicial Officer" refers to Judges and/or Magistrates of RIJ.

Also notice, RIJ's actions of stripping Petitioner's bar, falsely labeling Petitioner, etc. don't address the underlying false, etc. criminal charges (the whole reason for the existence of the case) (thus further exposing this case was a fraud, etc. from the start). Instead, RIJ's actions are attacks, etc. on Petitioner as a person.

As RIJ is aware (but refuses to acknowledge), evidence (intentionally (and in violation of court rules, the Constitution, etc.) withheld by Prosecution) conclusively proves Petitioner didn't commit any crimes. Prosecution continues withholding other key pieces of evidence (including, but not limited to, exculpatory evidence).

Despite Petitioner being a highly educated, competent, etc. person (as RIJ was ALREADY AWARE), despite RI Law ordering that Petitioner is presumed competent, despite RI Law ordering Prosecution provide evidence (by a preponderance of the evidence (R.I.G.L. §40.1-5.3-3(b))) to overcome the legal presumption, despite Prosecution having provided NO evidence to overcome the legal presumption, despite Prosecution lying and literally making up "facts" (as clearly demonstrated by the record and as Petitioner pointed out), despite the issuing Judge being aware of all of the above (including, the federal felony crimes committed by

the State), etc., etc., etc., per an Order issued by RIJ, **RIJ has Ordered Petitioner (the same attorney, etc. described below) to SUBMIT, AGAINST HIS WILL, UNDER THREAT OF ARREST (AND JAILED INDEFINITELY IF HE DOESN'T COMPLY), ETC., TO BE PSYCHOLOGICALLY EXAMINED FOR *COMPETENCY.***

Note, just moments before RIJ issued the blatantly unconstitutional, etc. order (fraudulently claiming Petitioner may not be competent to stand trial), RIJ and Prosecution were trying to coerce Petitioner into accepting a plea deal. How could, IN ONE MOMENT, someone be of sound mental capacity (able to enter into a binding contract (which, under established case law, a mentally impaired individual cannot enter into)) BUT, IN BASICALLY THE VERY NEXT MOMENT (with nothing having changed except that same person not bending to the Government's coercion (of being forced to enter into the binding contact)), suddenly be declared (by THAT SAME GOVERNMENT THAT WAS EAGER TO COERCE THAT PERSON INTO THE BINDING CONTRACT) to not be of sound mental capacity?

Petitioner:

> -is an attorney (having passed two (2) different Bar exams (on his first try and which were taken simultaneously) in two (2) different States (after the Tuesday and Wednesday two-day Bar exam, on Thursday, Petitioner then

had to drive himself from Narragansett, RI to Boston, Massachusetts and took that bar exam upon arrival), etc.)

-has FOUR (4) degrees (including a masters degree, a doctorial degree, a masters doctorial degree (LLM (MASTERS IN LAW)) (graduating with a perfect 4.0 out of 4.0 GPA), etc.)

-has received (not including things like being consistently on the Dean's List, Honor Roll, etc.) at least a dozen scholastic achievements (the majority of which are inductions into honor scholastic achievement organizations), etc., etc., etc.)

-ETC.

As demonstrated from the above brief discussions, from Petitioner's lower court filings, from actions, etc. by each level of RIJ (as well as AG (who is being aided and abetted, etc. by RIJ)), etc., these are not mistakes, etc. This is an entire Judiciary system hell-bent on ending Petitioner by any and all means necessary (no matter the cost, exposure of their corruption, crimes they need to commit, etc.). In fact, based on the above, should this case go to trial, Petitioner can accurately predict the outcome:

If, by some miracle, the jury hasn't been fully tampered with against Petitioner, etc., etc.,

> etc., and the jury unanimously finds Petitioner not guilty (beyond any and all doubt) of any crime, etc. (based on the overwhelming exculpatory evidence), RIJ has demonstrated that it will fully abuse its powers and, for example, vacate the jury's verdict using, for example, its power to issue Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict (which, of course, Prosecution won't even have to inconvenience itself by asking since RIJ is working in tandem with Prosecution to end Petitioner), find Petitioner guilty, and sentence Petitioner to 20 years in prison (the statutory maximum penalty). ETC.

In fact, for example, on July 3, 2024, a quasi-trial took place in Petitioner's case and, as the court record demonstrates, Rekas Sloan completely ignored the laws, facts, etc. and granted (within effectively SECONDS) Prosecution's unwarranted, unconstitutional, etc. motion. Rekas Sloan granted their abusive, etc. motion despite knowing:

> -the law ordered Petitioner is presumed competent
>
> -Prosecution failed to meet its burden of proof and provided NO evidence to overcome the legal presumption
>
> -Prosecution lied and literally made up "facts" (as clearly demonstrated by the record and as

Petitioner pointed out to Rekas Sloan (despite Rekas Sloan being already fully aware))

-Petitioner didn't receive any notice of Prosecution's motion

-Petitioner didn't receive an opportunity to prepare a response/defense to Prosecution's motion

-ETC.

RULE 20.4(a) STATEMENT

Despite all above brief discussions, some may still ask:

Why involve SCOTUS? Why not seek RISC intervention?

Petitioner has tried. For example, Petitioner's first interaction with RISC involved merely requesting a stay of lower court proceedings while Petitioner appealed to RISC. RISC managed to warp the situation such that RISC denied the stay request and effectively disbarred Petitioner.

RISC even ADMITTED the disbarment was in retaliation of Petitioner's First Amendment Free Speech (speech consisting of exposing corruption, etc. by members of RIJ, etc.).

RISC violated its own Disciplinary rules, effectively provided Petitioner with NO notice, opportunity, etc., RIJ effectively withheld exculpatory evidence (which would've nullified their entire narrative, etc.), etc.

RISC bypassed all disciplinary procedures, etc. and proceeded to completely disbar Petitioner within a matter of effectively three (3) business days (whereas, per procedure, the disciplinary process takes a MINIMUM of 95 days).

An extremely brief glimpse of RISC's unconstitutional, etc. actions, etc. were provided above. See App.[] for some more.

As RIJ has already demonstrated, Petitioner cannot obtain a fair trial, fair appellate review, etc. (as guaranteed by law, the Constitution, etc.).

RIJ has had multiple opportunities to disprove Petitioner and demonstrate it's a neutral decision maker. Instead, RIJ keeps reinforcing Petitioner's statements. For example, on September 6, 2024, RISC had another opportunity (especially knowing its unconstitutional order (stripping Petitioner of his law license (in open retaliation of Petitioner's First Amendment Free Speech)) was being appealed to this Court (deadline being September 25, 2024)) to at least farce the appearance of neutrality and grant Petitioner's request for stay of Rekas Sloan's blatantly unconstitutional, etc. July 3, 2024 attempt

to strip Petitioner of his bodily autonomy, etc. Petitioner's request for stay merely needed to:

-**meet RI appellate procedure rule 8(a) (requiring to first ask for stay in lower court)**-CHECK (Lower court had deadline by which to respond to Petitioner's request for stay, after which deemed denial. Deadline came and went and lower court, to date, ignored Petitioner (as has been done before))

-**show appeal is not interlocutory or, if interlocutory, appeal meets exception(s)**-CHECK (Petitioner demonstrated his appeal is not interlocutory as defined by R.I.G.L. §9-24-7. Petitioner also demonstrated his appeal is not interlocutory because, even if considered so, exception applied (e.g. Petitioner would suffer imminent and irreparable harm (see e.g. *DeMaria v. Sabetta*, 121 R.I. 648 (1979)))

-**show likelihood of success**-CHECK (not only did Petitioner provide an explanation of appeal's merits, Petitioner referred RISC to his lower court documentation (which RISC's justices had already personally received a copy) for more full discussion of merits)

-**show irreparable harm will be caused if not granted**-CHECK (Petitioner explained Rekas Sloan's order was unconstitutional, etc. invasion of privacy, deprivation of Petitioner's

liberty, etc. (e.g. HELD IN JAIL INDEFINITELY), cruel and unusual treatment, etc., etc., etc. Further, Petitioner explained that if RISC didn't stay the order, RISC would effectively be intentionally mooting, etc. appeal before RISC even hears appeal since, by the time appeal is docketed (which had yet to occur) (let alone briefs submitted, etc.), Rekas Sloan's Injunctive order would have already gone through.)

-**show State and public interest won't be affected by granting**-CHECK (State and public are not affected in any way (in fact, by staying, public interest is advanced so case can play out to expose Governmental, etc. corruption))

Further, Petitioner's request for stay was not objected to (despite having opportunities to submit an objection, the State DIDN'T submit ANY objection).

Despite meeting all of the above, RISC waited until 4PM on a Friday afternoon (effectively on the eve of the expected completion of Rekas Sloan's injunctive order) to state (in full):

"The petitioner's emergency motion to stay, as prayed, is denied.

This matter shall be closed.

> Entered as an Order of this Court this ***6th*** day of ***September 2024.***" (No Emphasis Added).

No reasoning provided.

Petitioner's request for stay also not only explained to RISC that **Rekas Sloan's order was THE DIRECT RESULT OF RISC NOT GRANTING A STAY to Petitioner's original request for stay** but that State's counsel (Christopher Bush) previously LIED to RISC and presented knowingly false information in order to have RISC deny Petitioner's previous request. Instead of hauling Bush in front of them to have him, at a minimum, explain his fraud, etc., the same court who provided Petitioner three business days notice before proceeding to unconstitutionally, etc. effectively strip Petitioner of his law license (violating Due Process, Equal Protection, multiple disciplinary rules, etc.) stated to State's counsel (Bush):

> "***IF*** the State so chooses, it may file a response [to Petitioner's allegations]..." (Emphasis Added).

IF the State so chooses?!

Among other things, RISC refused to even farce the appearance of neutrality and have Bush attempt to contradict Petitioner. Why? Because that's how inescapable Bush's fraud was. See App.[] for some more.

Even more, by law, Petitioner is guaranteed the right to appeal lower court decisions to RISC. Instead, RISC, etc. are currently trying to unconstitutionally deny Petitioner his right to merely appeal (let alone get to the subject matter of the appeal). See App.[] for some more.

At every turn, RISC has explicitly demonstrated its refusal to uphold Petitioner's statutory, Constitutional, etc. rights. Among other things, RISC's only concern is to protect, conceal, etc. corruption by members of its inner circle. Even seemingly "independent" avenues (e.g. the Commission) have the same focus (as has been proven). See e.g. App.[]. Instead, RISC, among other things, explicitly retaliates against Petitioner for daring to expose prima facie corruption (briefly discussed herein), etc.

RI is openly referred to as a "relationship rich," "I know a guy," etc. State.

Seeking assistance from the U.S. District Court (DC) would also be futile. For example, setting aside things like the "relationship rich" issues, DC being 0.3 miles away from RISC, etc., news articles reflecting the "all in the family" nature of RIJ (which appears to similarly effect DC (see e.g. DC Magistrate Lincoln Almond)), etc., the entire DC would be required to recuse themselves from Petitioner's case. Prosecution's fraudulent case against Petitioner has unveiled RIJ's corruption

against Petitioner. All members of DC are members of the RI Bar. The RI Bar's overseen by RISC (who retaliated against Petitioner for exposing RIJ's corruption). All members of DC would be required to recuse themselves given prima facie conflicts of interest.

CONCLUSION

Thus far, not including things like multiple violations of RI Law, etc., the aiding and abetting, etc. of federal felony crimes, etc. committed by the State, etc., etc., RIJ has repeatedly violated Petitioner's Constitutional rights (including Petitioner's First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights (multiple counts of each)), etc.

Petitioner respectfully seeks this Court's emergency intervention and, ultimately, dismissal (with prejudice) of the prima facie defective, fraudulent, etc. case against him (among other things, as Petitioner's filings have demonstrated, Prosecution hasn't presented threshold evidence (regarding the most critical elements of the charges) needed to file the case (because no such evidence exists (they know no crime was committed) (hence why the State forged a document to fraudulently manufacture "evidence"))).

Petitioner's various filings (which are being submitted with this filing (all of which Petitioner

incorporates by reference (in their entirety (which includes all referenced documents, etc.))))), etc. briefly further elaborate on the various issues (issues which require this case's immediate dismissal (with prejudice)).

Note, to put the outrageousness of this situation in further perspective, not only was Petitioner merely depositing GENUINE bills into his OWN bank (where Petitioner and his family had been customers for 28 consecutive years) into his OWN 28-year Santander bank account, not only did Petitioner TWICE provide (WITHOUT BEING ASKED) his Driver's License as identification (critical exculpatory information confirmed by Santander surveillance footage (which was being withheld) and conveniently kept out of both Witness Statements and SPD's report), etc., Petitioner is an attorney who was, prior to RIJ's unconstitutional First Amendment retaliation, etc., licensed in TWO STATES (something Petitioner spent years to achieve, something Petitioner had had with an immaculate record for almost EIGHT (8) YEARS, etc.), etc.

Justice Thomas said at his SCOTUS confirmation hearing that the false attacks against him (meant to stop his confirmation) were effectively "...modern-day lynching..."

Over 30 years since that statement, the sophistication, malevolence, etc. of such attacks, set ups, etc. against others have grown at an exponential

rate. People like Petitioner (who seek to do justice, expose corruption, etc.) are actively targeted, arrested without cause, justification, etc., etc., authorities make up crimes to fit the circumstances, etc.

What makes Petitioner's case particularly unique and outrageous is that such efforts, etc. have involved the willful aiding and participation of an ENTIRE judiciary system (different levels, clerks, judges, etc.).

Things are infinitely worse when, as is the case here, Petitioner's Life, Liberty, etc. are jeopardized. Petitioner is facing up to 20 years in prison (with a mandatory minimum of 4 years) for a crime that not only was never committed but that SPD admitted NEVER EXISTED, AG has evidence NEVER EXISTED, etc., etc.

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY SEEKS THIS COURT'S EMERGENCY INTERVENTION.

Signed, sworn, and verified

Respectfully
Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
[Forthcoming]

Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office.