

25-7412

No. _____

ORIGINAL

FILED
APR 22 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LINCOLN G. LATHAM JR

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

ARJUN ROY

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for 1st Circuit

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

LINCOLN G. LATHAM JR

(Your Name)

55 Roxbury Street P.O. Box 191113

(Address)

Roxbury, Massachusetts 02119-9998

(City, State, Zip Code)

774-539-5427

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1] When a Executive Agency Contract signed by Re-entry Services Division in Massachusetts Department of Correction did AWARD a Temporary Housing Permit to a person scheduled for release from a state correctional institution, is it a violation of applicable federal statues such as 41 USC 7102, for a private housing company to break a entering and change locks on doors to obstruct a specific person from entering there family residence with Awarded Re-entry Plan ?

LIST OF PARTIES

Petitioner is:

Lincoln G. Latham Jr
55 Roxbury Street
Post Office Box 191113
Roxbury, Massachusetts 02119-9998

Respondent is:

Arjun Roy
Flynn Law Group
185 Devonshire Street
Suite 401
Boston, Ma 02110

RELATED CASES

Latham Jr vs. Roy [U.S District Court in Massachusetts]
Docket Number: 1:25-CV-11441-FDS

Latham Jr vs Roy [U.S Court of Appeals for 1st Circuit]
Docket Number : 25-1809

Poah Communities & Bridle Path versus Lincoln Latham Jr
[Metro South Housing Court in Commonwealth of Massachusetts]
Docket Number: 25H82CV00020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INDIVIDUAL RE-ENTRY PLAN in regards to
MANDATE OF U.S COURT OF APPEALS 1st Circuit Denying Appeal, and
ORDER OF DISMISSAL IN U.S DISTRICT COURT (Boston)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

- 1] **Menominee Indian Tribe v. United States**
Court: Court of Appeals for the D.C Circuit
Date filed: 2010-07-30
Citation: 614 F.3d 519, 392 U.S App. D.C. 202, 2010 U.S. App.
LEXIS 15893, 2010 WL 2977225
Case Number: 09-5005
Argued: 11, 17, 2009 Decided: 7, 30, 2010
Finding: Court rejected Government Ideology that tolling
limitations would undermine statute of limitations.
- 2] Page Number referenced in Writ of Certiorari is:

STATUES AND RULES

Title 41 - Public Contracts - Subtitle III - Contract Disputes -
Chapter 71 - Contract Disputes, Section 7102, Subsection (a) (1)
EXECUTIVE AGENCY CONTRACTS

RULE 39 of SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A___ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A___ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

1.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 4/7/2026.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 1] 41 USC 7102 requires that in any event a Executive Agency Contract can not be isolated or neglected to stop the procurement of services.
- 2] The 5th Amendment of U.S Constitution requires that a Executive Agency Contract can not be taken or withheld without due process of law.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 7/24/2024 the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security assigned State Correctional Officials to authorize a public contract named Individual Re-entry Plan for Petitioner to exit a state correctional center and enter his family residence at site of 152 Bittersweet Lane, Unit 350, Randolph - Ma 02368. However on 1/28/2025 the Respondent filed a verified complaint for injunction in Metro South Housing Court to obstruct the petitioner's lawful entry into his family residence. On 3/31/2025 the Respondent then committed a offense of breaking a entering to change locks on doors at petitioner's family residence in violation oof Executive Agency Contract. The referenced Table of Authorities cites a particular case in which APPEALS COURT ruled that tolling limitations can not be combined with time restrictions. Respondent intentionally violated that principle by asking state & federal courts to mix tolling limitations (injunctions) with statues of limitations (re-entry plans). The U.S District Court & U.S Court of Appeals made a error in ignoring the respondents intentional misconduct.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Petitioner has a legal contractual right to exercise the liberty afforded to him in the Re-entry Plan as Executive Agency Contract. That Liberty supported by 5th Amendment of U.S Constitution can not be taken or withheld by aggressive deceit manifested by the Respondent's attempt at breaking a entering. As illicit conduct can not precede legal victories. Then Respondent has no valid claim to ability of breaking a entering to change locks on doors. The changing of locks in violation to public contracts is apparently Unconstitutional Behavior.

CONCLUSION

The petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully,

/s/ Lincoln G. Latham Jr
Pro Se Petitioner

Lincoln G. Latham Jr]

Date: 4/14/2026

[Pg 6]