


26-5639

No. _____



IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States of America

Ian R. Buenaventura - Petitioner

v.

Leslie C. Buot - Respondent

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
the Supreme Judicial Court**

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Ian R. Buenaventura
6000 Ohio Drive
Apartment 2915
Plano, Texas 75093
213-434-8787

Questions Presented

Is it “folly” in “each and every single outcome for Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura, Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura, Ms. Jane Doe 1, Ms. Jane Doe 2, Ms. Jane Doe 3, [] my family members[, and my family as a unit]” to “stake upon it [my] all”?

For what are at “stake”, Please see Appendix G.

Whether or not the “divorce law of Maine (eg., “irreconcilable marital differences”)” “violate[s] the US constitution, federal statutes, and international laws ”?

Whether or not “ ... [a] complaint [] “filed to silence, dissuade, coerce, [harass,] intimidate, and punish” “the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19)[.]” “violate[s] the US constitution, federal statutes, and international laws ”?

The Honorable Judge Learned Hand said,

“To many this is, and always be folly, but we have stake upon it our all.”

List of Parties

I am the petitioner.

Respondent is Leslie C. Buot.

Related Cases

The judgments and orders below “ar[o]se[]” from the “exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19).”

- The Estate of Attorney Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 2:23-cv-00211-JDL, Federal District Court of Maine, Judgment was August 4, 2023.
- The Estate of Attorney Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 23-1651, First Circuit Court of Appeals, Judgment was October 25, 2023.
- The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 2:23-cv-00325-JDL, Federal District Court of Maine, Judgment was January 5, 2024.
- The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 24-1211, First Circuit Court of Appeals, Judgment was September 25, 2024.
- Ms. Doe 3 v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 2:23-cv-00358-JDL, Federal District Court of Maine, Judgment was January 5, 2024.
- Ms. Doe 3 v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 24-1212, First Circuit Court of

Appeals, There is no judgment.

- Ian R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 2:24-cv-00089-NT, Federal District Court of Maine, Judgment was June 3, 2024.
- Ian R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President et al., No. 24-1718, First Circuit Court of Appeals, Order was January 3, 2025, There is no judgment.
- Ian R. Buenaventura v Timothy Kinney, State Bar of California, No. 2:25-mc-00154-NT, Federal District Court of Maine, Order (denying my "request [for] permission from the Court to submit the [] temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction") was March 21, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura ("Notice of Removal"), No. 2:25-mc-00465-LEW, Federal District Court of Maine, Order (denying "Motion For Leave to File a Notice of Removal") was October 20, 2025, Order (denying "Motion for Reconsideration") was October 30, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was May 5, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. And-25-246, Supreme Judicial Court, Order was June 24, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was October 23, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. And-25-498, Supreme Judicial Court, Order was December 29, 2025.
- An appeal from an order was filed in the Supreme Judicial Court. It's docket number was And-25-246. Appeal was dismissed on June 24, 2025. An appeal from an order was filed in the Supreme Judicial Court. It's docket number is And-25-498. Appeal was dismissed on December 29, 2025.

The orders and notice below are "directly related" to complaint filed in the Lewiston District Court of Maine.

- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was May 5, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Scheduling Notice was October 2, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was October 6, 2025.

- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was October 6, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was October 23, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was August 1, 2025. I received this order on October 27, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was August 22, 2025. I received this order on October 27, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. And-25-246, Supreme Judicial Court, Order was October 15, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. And-25-498, Supreme Judicial Court, Order was November 24, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. And-25-498, Supreme Judicial Court, Order was December 5, 2025.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. And-25-498, Supreme Judicial Court, Order was January 13, 2026.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order (for “final hearing notice” “scheduled on September 19, 2025) date unknown. “I have not received it in regular mail [as of January 31, 2026].” This is an example of “no receipt of orders.”
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order date unknown. “[On November 3, 2025, I was informed by phone there was a continuance in proceedings because of an appeal. I was informed by phone that a notice of the stay will be mailed out. As of [January 23, 2026], I have not received the notice of the stay.]” On January 23, 2026, I asked by phone if an order was issued for the “continuance”. There was none.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was March 11, 2026.
- Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura, No. LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042, Lewiston District Court in Maine, Order was March 17, 2026.

Table of Contents

Questions Presented

List of Parties

Related Cases
Table of Contents
Table of Authorities
Opinions Below – 1
Jurisdiction – 1
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved - 1
Statement of the Case – 1 to 6
Reasons for Granting the Petition – 6 to 98
Conclusion – 98

Index to Appendices

Appendix A (Source : Rule 14(1)(i)(i))

Lewiston District Court Orders

District Court order dated May 5, 2025.
District Court order dated August 1, 2025.
District Court order dated October 6, 2025.
District Court order dated October 6, 2025.
District Court Scheduling Notice dated October 2, 2025.
District Court order dated October 23, 2025.
District Court order dated March 11, 2026.
District Court order dated March 17, 2026.

Supreme Judicial Court Orders

Supreme Judicial Court order dated June 24, 2025.
Supreme Judicial Court order dated October 15, 2025.
Supreme Judicial Court order dated November 24, 2025.
Supreme Judicial Court order dated December 5, 2025.
Supreme Judicial Court order dated December 29, 2025.
Supreme Judicial Court order dated January 13, 2026.

Maine Federal District Court

Maine Federal District Court order dated October 25, 2025.
Maine Federal District Court order dated October 30, 2025.

Appendix B (Sources : Rule 14(1)(i)(ii), Rule 14(1)(i)(iii))

Federal District Court

June 5, 2023 recommended decision in The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.
August 4, 2023 order in The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

August 4, 2023 judgment in The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

October 2, 2023 recommended decision in The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

January 5, 2024 order in The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

January 5, 2024 judgment in The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

October 2, 2023 recommended decision in Ms. Jane Doe 3 v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

January 5, 2024 order in Ms. Jane Doe 3 v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

January 5, 2024 judgment in Ms. Jane Doe 3 v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

April 1, 2024 recommended decision in Ian R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

June 3, 2024 order in Ian R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

June 3, 2024 judgment in Ian R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

March 21, 2025 order In re : Ian R. Buenaventura

First Circuit Court of Appeals

September 25, 2023 order in The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

October 25, 2023 judgment in The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

October 3, 2024 mandate in The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

September 25, 2024 judgment in The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

November 19, 2024 mandate in The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

November 4, 2024 order in Ms. Jane Doe 3 v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

January 3, 2025 order in Ian R. Buenaventura v The Executive Office of the President, et. al.

Appendix C (Source : Rule 14(1)(i)(v), subparagraph 1(f))

Constitutional provisions, treaties, statutes, ordinances, and regulations (Source : Rule 14(1)(f))

Appendix D (Source : Rule 14(1)(i)(v), subparagraph 1(g))

Appendix 14(1)(i)(v) to 14(1)(g) – Timely and properly raised

Appendix E (Source : Rule 14(1)(i)(vi))

Special Anti-SLAPP motion

Case Management Conference Transcript

Appeal as of Right – Special Anti-SLAPP motion

Motion for Electronic Sound Recording

Motion for Alternative Format For Court Proceeding
 Request to correct electronic mail and sent as "Confidential Communications"
 Motion to Correct Mislabeled Documents
 Motion to Request Copies of Dockets Entries, Orders, and Documents (pdf) via Regular Mail
 Motion to Seal a Document Submitted as "Confidential Communications"
 Motion to Request a Copy of a Docket Entry via Regular Mail
 Motion to Request Redaction of Physical Address(es), Electronic Mail Address(es), and All Other Personal Identifying Information
 Motion to Request for a Copy of Procedures to Correct Errors in the Hearing Transcript
 Motion to Request for an Online "[L]egal [R]esearch [M]aterials" Resource without "[C]onstitutional [I]mpediments"
 Request to change physical mailing address
 Motion to Request Trial Schedule and Other Requests
 Motion for Summary Judgment
 Motion to Request August 22, 2025 Materials (if any), Schedule of Discovery (if any), and "[B]est interests (if any)"
 Motion for Stay (October 7, 2025)
 Motion for Alternative Format for Court Proceedings (attached to "Motion for Alternative Format for Court Proceedings form)
 Motion for Alternative Format for Court Proceedings form
 Motion for Stay (October 10, 2025)
 Motion to Amend; Renew the Special Anti-SLAPP Motion (eg., dismissal of the whole action); Strike; an Objection to a Final Hearing; Comprehensive Discovery; Motion for a Jury Trial; and Costs, attorney's fees, and expenses
 Motion to dismiss - fraud on the Court and the public
 Notice of Intent to File Motion for Sanctions Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 or under Maine Rule 11
 Motion to Set Aside Orders Issued, on August 1, 2025 and August 27, 2025
 Notice of Appeal Form
 Reply to "Plaintiff's [Response] to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment"
 Reply to "Plaintiffs [Response] to Motion for Stay"
 Motion to Dismiss based on (1) lack of subject matter jurisdiction, (2) failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and (3) failure to join an indispensable party
 Witness and Exhibit List
 Motion for a Stay (October 31, 2025)
 Answer
 Motion to Extend Time to File a Brief and Appendix
 Appeal as of Right – Special Anti-SLAPP motion (December 22, 2025)
 Objections to "Order Expediting Appeal"
 Motion for Reconsideration
 Motion for Sanctions

Appendix G (Source : Rule 14(1)(i)(vi))

"Malitis hominum est obviandum"

At "stake"

Weaponization - "duration" – segment

Federal District Court of Maine – “[R]equested permission on [March] 8, 2025[.]” seems to have not been entered in the docket.

Federal District Court of Maine – It seems an entry was made after “September 29, 2025” and was backdated.

Supreme Judicial Court – The Supreme Judicial Court stated that “emails containing document[s] for the US Supreme Court will not be docketed and will be deleted[.]”

Plaintiff's Proposed Divorce Judgment

Elyse B. Segovias, Esq. – Ms. Segovias stated that she “does not represent [Ms. Buot] in whatever [I] filed with the US Supreme Court.” It seems she does want not copies of documents sent to the US Supreme Court. I have not received in the mail a leave from Court for her withdrawal.

Brushed off

Concealment - “develop [the case] in a misleading or slanted way ... caus[ing] prejudice to [my] position”

“Actus repugnans non potest in esse produci”

Table of Authorities

Cases

Abrahamsen v Trans-State Express Inc

Ashcroft v Iqbal

Barber v City of Salem

Bell Atlantic Corp v Twombly cited in Ashcroft v Iqbal

Bivens v Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics

Blue Diamond Coal Co. v Trustees of UMWA Combined Benefits Fund

Bond v Floyd cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et.al

Borough of Duryea v Guarnier

Bradbury v City of Eastport

Brady v Maryland

Briggs v. Eden Council for Hope & Opportunity, 969 P.2d 564, 573 (Cal. 1999)

Brown v. Mississippi

Carney v Hancock County

Chambers v Eppolito

Chrysafis v Marks cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et.al

Colorado River Water Conservation District v. United States

Colorado v New Mexico

Connick v Thompson

Crozier v Westside Community School District

Dayton Area Visually Impaired Persons, Inc. v. Fisher cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et. al.

Esmail v. Macrane, 53 F.3d 176 (CA7 1995)

Ex parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339, 346, 25 L.Ed. 676 (1880)

ExxonMobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman, 512 S.W.3d 895, 898 (Tex. 2017)

Gerstein v. Pugh, 420 U.S. 103, 95 S.Ct. 854, 43 L.Ed.2d 54 (1975)

Grupo Mexicano de Desarrollo v Alliance Bond Fund

Haines v Kerner

Haley v Boston

Hormel v Helvering

In Re: Abd Al-Rahim Huessein Muhammed Al-Nashiri
Industrial Development Bd. of Town of Section, Ala. v. Fugua Industries, Inc.
Johnson v City of Shelby, Miss.
Jones v City of Chicago
Keen v. Overseas Tankship Corp
League of Women Voters of N.C. v. North Carolina cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et. al.
Libby v Fecteau
Limone v Condon
Lopez Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce
Marbury v Madison
Mattson v Mattson
McCullen v Coakley
Mitchum v Foster cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et.al
Mooney v Holohan
Napue v. Illinois
Newsome v McCabe
Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 U.S. 644 (2015))
Owen v City of Independence
Pearson v Callahan
Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey Casey v. Planned Parenthood of
Southeastern Pennsylvania
Powell v McCormack cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et. al.
Pyle v Kansas
Reed v Town of Gilbert
Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn v. Cuomo cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et.al
Rotella v. Wood
Salerno v Spectrum Medical Group, P.A.
Sanders v US
Sills v Bureau of Prisons
Simon v Hartford Life Inc.
Smallwood v DOJ
Smith v Bank of Am., N.A.
Steel Co v Citizens for Better Environment
Steffler v United States
Supreme Court of Virginia v Consumers Union of the United States, Inc. cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau
et. al.
Tandon v Newsom cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et.al
Thompson v Bell
U.S. v Fortner
United States v Trident Seafoods Corp.
United States v. Ballin
United States v. Raines cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et. al.
United States v. Wright
Village of Willowbrook v Olech
West v Bell Helicopter Textron Inc.
Westfall v Erwin
Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 91 S.Ct. 746, 27 L.Ed.2d 669 (1971)

Statutes

702

§ 1881 (a)

§ 741

§733.2 Applicability

§734. Special motion for expedited relief

§735. Stay

§735. Stay - 6. Dismissal

§736. Judicial priority

§737. Proof

§738. Dismissal of cause of action in whole or in part

§739. Appeal

§740. Costs, attorney's fees, and expenses

14 M.R.S.A. § 556

18 U.S.C. § 1343 - Fraud by wire, radio, or television

18 U.S.C. § 1512 - Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant

18 U.S.C. § 1832 -Theft of trade secrets

18 U.S.C. § 4

19 M.R.S.A. § 691

28 U.S.C. § 1654

28 U.S.C. § 2283

28 U.S.C. §§ 1254(1), 1651(a))

28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(a)

42 U.S.C. § 1983

42 U.S.C. § 1985

42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)

42 U.S.C. § 1985(3)

42 U.S.C. § 1988

42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d et. Seq.

5 U.S. Code § 706

5 U.S.C. § 552 (a)(4)(B)

Administrative Procedure Act

American Servicemembers Protection Act of 2002 - Hague Invasion Act

Federal Tort Claim Act

Foreign Assistance Act

Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act - 50 U.S.C. §§ 1801-1813

Freedom of Information Act - 5 U.S.C. § 552

Maine revised statutes, 14 MRS §§ 731-742

Prima facie evidence - § 556

Procedure - § 556

Racketeering, Influenced, and Corrupt Organization Act

Section 2(b)(3)

Title 22 Foreign Military Financing Programs

Title 4, Chapter 5, § 183

Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964 -Title VI, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq.

Uniform Public Expression Protection Act

Rules - Procedures

26(f) conference
Federal Rule 60(b)
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11
Glomar
M.R. Civ.P.34
Maine Rule 11
Maine Rule of Civil Procedure - Summary judgment
Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6)
Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(7); Rule 19
Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)
Motion to dismiss, pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 12(b)
Supreme Court Rule 14
Supreme Court Rule 20(1) - "adequate relief" - "in any other form or from any other court."
Supreme Court Rule 23.3
US Supreme Court Rule 10 : Considerations Governing Review on Writ of Certiorari

Rules - Ethical Rules

ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct
ABA Model Rule 3.1, comment 2
California Code of Judicial Ethics
Maine Code Judicial Conduct
Rule 2.6 - Ensuring the Right to Be Heard - Maine Code of Judicial Conduct

Other - United States Constitution

1st amendment under the US constitution – freedom of speech
1st amendment under the US constitution – freedom of press
1st amendment under the US constitution – right to a peaceful assemble
1st amendment under the US constitution – right to petition
1st amendment under the US constitution – right of association
1st amendment under the US constitution – freedom of religion
1st amendment under the US constitution – prohibition against prior restraint
Bill of attainder under the US constitution
Ex post facto law
4th amendment under the US constitution - "Protection against unreasonable searches, seizures and arrests."
5th amendment under the US constitution - "Prohibition against double jeopardy and compelled self incrimination."
5th amendment under the US constitution – "Protects against the deprivation of life, liberty or property interests" without due process of law.
5th amendment under the US constitution – privacy
5th amendment under the US constitution – marriage

5th amendment under the US constitution – familial rights
5th amendment under the US constitution – family relationships
5th amendment under the US constitution – parent-child relationship
5th amendment under the US constitution – child rearing
5th amendment under the US constitution – right to develop parental interests
5th amendment under the US constitution – education
5th amendment under the US constitution – interstate travel
5th amendment under the US constitution – right to live
5th amendment under the US constitution – right to contract
5th amendment under the US constitution – right to engage in gainful employment
5th amendment under the US constitution – right to be free of defamation by government
5th amendment under the US constitution – “Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.”
6th amendment under the US constitution – right to confront and subpoena witnesses
6th amendment under the US constitution – right to a fair trial
6th amendment under the US constitution – right to a impartial trial
7th amendment under the US constitution – jury trial
8th amendment under the US constitution – cruel and unusual punishment
11th amendment under the US constitution
13th amendment under the US constitution – involuntary servitude
14th amendment under the US constitution – equal protection
Amdt14.S1.5.4.5 Impartial Decision Maker
Separation of powers under the US constitution

Other - Miscellaenous

3 Deschler's Precedents Ch.12 §§15-15.1 cited in Libby et. al. v Fecteau et.al
131st Maine Legislature, First Regular Session-2023, An Act to Strengthen Freedom of Speech
Protections by Extending Laws Against Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation
Restatement (Third) of Agency § 2.04 (2005))

Other - Evidence Code

Judicial notice – mandatory

Other - International laws

Article 4 and 5 of the Convention
Article 4(a) of the Convention
Article 34 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949
Articles 19 to 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
Charter of United Nations
Combating the Glorification of Nazism, Neo-Nazism, and Other Practices That Contribute to Fueling
Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance
Convention against Torture
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

International Humanitarian Law
Rome Statute
Universal Declaration of Human Rights
War Crimes Act

Opinions Below

The order dated June 24, 2025 of the highest state court appears at Appendix A.

I do not know if the June 24, 2025 order is reported, has been designated for publication but is not yet reported, or unpublished.

The order date May 5, 2025 of the trial court appears at Appendix A.

I do not know if the May 5, 2025 order is reported, has been designated for publication but is not yet reported, or unpublished.

Jurisdiction

The date on which the highest state court dismissed my appeal was on June 24, 2025. A copy of the order appears at Appendix A.

There was no petition for rehearing that was submitted.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including November 21, 2025 on October 2, 2025 in Application No. 25A377.

Basis of jurisdiction is 28 U. S. C. § 2403(b).

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

Legal basis are the US constitution, RICO, and international laws.

Other laws are part of the legal framework. Please see appendix C.

Statement of the Case

"[The US constitution is] a front to" "create, coordinate, and carry out" "secret[ion of] ill-gotten wealth" by "piracy, pillage, and plunder" "to the prejudice of people".

"I am a regular lay person." "[E]xtinguishing claims" and "erasing claimants" by a SLAPP ""cloaked" this time as "irreconcilable marital differences" is "unprecedented punishment". In addition to its "unifying features that makes [it] a dangerous force", the US Supreme Court since 1789 has not seen a strain of a SLAPP that becomes more virulent. First example of mutation is obstruction of justice. Second example of mutation is misprision.

"I am not "blind" to ""affluence, influence, immutable features, approved expression, or belief in 'bidder[s]'" as the "genuine" "factors" for "consideration".

"[Government's] proclivity in publicity road shows is a reflection of its being above the law (eg., U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, sovereignty of nations)."

“Judiciary of Maine has decided” that the “US constitution is fiction”.

First example is that “[m]erely by checking box of “irreconcilable marital differences” in “twenty two (22) pages” where “[n]one” “contained a legal basis, factual background, rationale, and proof underlying the ground for the divorce[.]” a spouse is “stripped” of his/her constitutional rights and human rights. Legal basis for the divorce action is unconstitutional.” Second example is that “[the Court] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.” Third example is that “[a] divorce is allowed to be filed, proceed, and heard as a no-fault divorce without any cause of action, “essential elements” that are to be pleaded and proven, factual background, and evidentiary support.” ““Complaint contained no legal basis, a fact, an explanation, and evidence. Ditto for the response to the motion. There were no affidavits and discovery materials included in the response.” Relief was sought in Lewiston District Court. “Motion contained legal basis, factual background, rationale, and proof. Nonetheless, the case was not dismissed with prejudice at the case management conference and mediation was even ordered.” An Appeal as of Right – Special Anti-SLAPP motion was timely made. It contained legal basis, factual background, rationale, and evidence in support of the paper. “Response to “Reply to Defendant's “Appeal as of Right”” was submitted. It cited a case law that was “eighty-seven (87) years before 2025. Effective date of UPEPA is January 1, 2025.” ““Magically”, “leading” [] was stated in the “Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's 'Appeal as of Right'” (hereinafter called Reply). This move is objectionable. It causes prejudice as no elements were argued in the complaint and during the case management conference. [] Insertion of the word “leading” in the Reply is an admission by plaintiff of the necessity of causation as an element.” Informed that the pleading of the plaintiff contained a concession that there is a burden of persuasion as to causation, the appellate court dismissed the appeal. “My family and I moved to Texas from Maine. This was on July 1, 2025. A change of address request was submitted to USPS on June 10, 2025 [] with a start forwarding date of June 30, 2025. Order dismissing the appeal was issued on June 24, 2025. [] It was postmarked on June 27, 2025. [] I received it through regular mail only on July 17, 2025. The Supreme Judicial Court is geographically located in Maine.” There were twenty-three (23) days from the date of the issuance of the Order dismissing the appeal and my receipt of the order. The US Supreme Court grants only ninety-days (90) days to file petition for a writ of certiorari “after entry of the order denying discretionary review”.

Plaintiff confirmed that the “US constitution is fiction”.

First example is that “[w]hen I asked what these irreconcilable marital differences were, I was told by plaintiff that we disagree. These were on the my job search, my filing petitions, and the education of our child.”

Second example is that “[w]hen asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion “merits [no] further response” which is another confirmation that it had no specific facts.”

Third example is that “[s]he tells me to stop talking about certain topics such as retaliation [and corruption].” I can not discuss there is no commitment to the U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to conscience. One result of an oath that is minimized was a United States President was installed. But, plaintiff can discuss her political preference (eg., democrat party) without different views.”

Plaintiff made undisputed “written concession[s]” of “[g]laring deficiencies ... exist in the complaint.”

First example of a “written concession” is that “elements are necessary.” Response contained the word “leading”

Second example of a “written concession” “it had no facts.” “ ... [P]aid trained legal assistance stated the motion “merits [no] further response” ... ”

Speech

“I spoke against overtime shaving [“teachers' timesheets”][at University of Southern California in Los Angeles county].”

Surveillance

“There is surveillance on my family and I.”

U.S. constitution, Freedom of Information Act, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Administrative Procedure Act, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Federal Tort Claim Act, Racketeering Influence Corrupt Organization Act, and Geneva Conventions

“The U.S. constitution, Freedom of Information Act, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization Act, Federal Tort Claim Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and the Geneva Conventions are the legal basis of [complaints submitted on behalf of my family members] and [my] complaint [in the Federal District Court of Maine].”

Legal basis of this paper are the same as my complaint. Also, legal basis includes all the citations in my submissions in this matter.

Retaliation

“The retaliation methods being deployed against me and my family members are voluminous, various, vicious, violent, and depraved.” “In light of the nature, extent, duration, and depth of the misconduct, at a minimum it is strong circumstantial evidence that the adverse actions in their totality are carried out with retaliatory intent.”

First example of retaliation is that “[h]ad I not veered from the “favored” “viewpoint”, shaved overtime from teachers' timesheets as instructed, and kept quiet about my thoughts,” [Ms. Doe 3 would have qualified for the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test in October 2025.]”

Second example of reprisal is that “[Ms. Doe 3] is being exposed to obscenity.”

Third example of retribution is that “[Ms. Doe 3] is being brainwashed.”

Fourth example of retaliation is that “I have been unable to find a livelihood “on my own”[.]” for nearly nine (9) years.”

Fifth example of reprisal is that Plaintiff as the plaintiff/legislator, plaintiff/executive, plaintiff/judiciary, plaintiff/jury, and plaintiff/executioner of more punishment and sentence.

Part of the sentence is the "deep state[s]" "premeditated and coldblooded" "planned [] remov[al] [of my, family members', and my family as a unit's] feeding tube."

Sixth example of retribution is that "deep state" "[orchestrates], coordinate[s], and carr[ies] out" threats. "'On November 7, 2021, a message on my iPhone flashed saying '... to commit suicide ...'" "I received a message from a "source" who said " ... you are dead ... "" Some recent examples of blackmail are : "I will soon be homeless." I will soon be living in a region of "warm" weather. "[Bar license'] was [again] converted to extort silence[.]" by a counsel." Threat of changing Ms. Doe 3's name was made before a hearing conducted through an alternative method started."

Concealment

"Concealment of misconduct, omission, wrongful conduct, and negligence is zealously synchronized."

First example of concealment "masquerade[s]" as " irreconcilable differences. [] The "designed" outcome of irreversible ramifications on "rights" "substantive [in] nature" such as "I will remain in isolation and incommunicado for the remainder of [my] life", "imminent threat to my life, health[], and safety", and "shredding my constitutional rights and human rights" were not presented in the orders."

Second example of concealment is that "[[d]angers of the deliberate indifference"] [are] apparent in its "readiness" "to process" a "[f]inal hearing" on November 4, 2025 ... without responses to my request[] [for a] discovery [schedule]... " and a full, impartial, and fair discovery." "Evidentiary proof of this is "10. Discovery/Other documents" was blank in [the September 19, 2025 Order]. []"

Third example of concealment is that "[the complaint] was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19)." "[Proposed Divorce Judgment]" is compelling documentary evidence of the "bias in favor of plaintiff, divorce, and breaking up a family". "With no remorse, "water clears" "unnatural deeds"."

Fourth example is that "Ms. Doe 3 is being brainwashed." She is being told by plaintiff that I do not want to work even when "[s]he is aware that I am retaliated on.". "But for the retaliation, I could find a livelihood "on my own" in two (2) weeks." Income tax returns are proof that I work every year before the retaliation started.

Fifth example is that there are "[m]anufacturing and/or spoliation of documents; electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities sully the integrity thereof []."

Sixth example is that there is coercion. "I am forced to agree to the destruction of my family."

Cravings

"Cravings for ill-gotten wealth is compounded by piracy, pillage, and plunder."

First example is that “[there is a] ... swelling---estimated to be \$ 180 billion by 2010---yearly government-contracted surveillance industry.””

Second example is that “this country is for “peace and justice”.[] It is a skit so “stocks” “surge”. “US military equipment sales” increased to “\$318.7 billion”, by “29%[]”, “in 2024”. []”

Third example is that the “[e]bbs and flows of the transactions in these financial statements [“from an agency (eg., Central Intelligence Agency) for the last one hundred (100) years”] are related to the “crisis [(eg., “Covid-19”)], chaos, confusion, conflicts, and conflagrations.”

Damages

Personal

“[My family members' and my] injuries are not for “even minimal periods of time”.

“Attorney Buenaventura was “deprived of his life in [the Philippines], dispossessed of property, and being defamed and painted in false light with the abuse of public resources.”

“My mother was coerced by her Caretaker.” “[Mrs. Buenaventura] was subjected to torture.” “Mrs. Buenaventura was deprived of her due process (eg., life) rights.”

“There were two (2) attempts on Ms. Doe 3 's life.”

“There were two (2) attempts on plaintiff's life.”

“There was an attempt on my life.”

“This was not addressed. There was no recorded concern that dismissal of the complaint [in the Federal District Court], when my family is being “fracture[d]”, deprived an “adequate, effective, and meaningful' access” to the Court.”

“I am not in favor of breaking up our marriage, our relationship, and our family. Our marriage can be saved. Our family can be saved.”

“[My family] ha[s] a constitutional right and human right to life.” But, “I am forced to agree [by the Court] to the destruction of my family.”

““‘[T]otal exclusion' [], “expulsion” [] or “or any form of punishment”[] [] “robs” [my family] “of its right to [] representation”.” “For [my family] whose due process (eg., lives, liberties, and property interests) [is being] denied, “there can be no do-over and no redress”[]”

Public

“The Court's authority is based on a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of the families and the support of their children.” “... [O]nce the court is weaponized ... it becomes a star chamber. It virtually extinguishes marriages and families.”

Policy

"US constitution does not apply to "[a]pproximately one million children a year [who] become divorce statistics[.]" and who "witness[ed] that commitments in the most basic unit of society they are born in are judged by capacious and hollow words, are not evaluated in substance, are not measured by deeds, and are not gauged by outcome[.]" "in a nation that is obsessed with public opinion and image"."

"This seems to be "policy" or "custom" of "exhibited deliberate indifference" to "a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of families and the support of their children".

"Theatrics of roles portray a valiant vanquishing a villain and saving a victim. But, behind a curtain of ["system of justice that is responsive to the needs of families and the support of their children"], the U.S. constitution, universal declaration of human rights, and conscience play no role. Credits meanwhile covertly go to piracy, plunder, and pillage to the prejudice of the people.""

"This looks like a well developed policy by the [state] government to avoid [commitments] entirely rendering the ideal of "Equal Justice Under Law" less genuine and more illusory.""

Reasons for Granting the Petition

Respectfully, this is to submit a writ of certiorari. This document consists of three (3) requests.

1st

First request is to hear the case on June 8, 2026 to address all the issues in this petition for review.

2nd

Second request is to declare that the divorce law of Maine (eg., "irreconcilable marital differences"), procedures of Maine (eg., "online legal research materials resource without "constitutional impediments", "no receipt of orders"), and structural bias (eg., "I was described as " ... disturb Buenaventura ... " [by the Court]") violate the US constitution, federal statutes, and international laws by June 9, 2026.

3rd

Third request is to send to the Lewiston District Court an expedient instruction by June 9, 2026. Instruction consists of three (3) items. Item one is to dismiss the divorce action with prejudice. Item two is to instruct plaintiff to immediately cease weaponizing public resources to infringe on my constitutional and human rights. Item three is to instruct plaintiff to immediately cease from "creating, coordinating, and carrying out" racketeering activities (eg.,

obstruction of justice, extortion).

"Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura was my father." Papa and I biked together.

"Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura was my mother." Mama and I read together.

My Papa and my Mama "were the "model[s]" "given" to me by the One."

I have no more "model[s]".

Background

"I was told to shave overtime [from teachers' timesheet when I was working at University of Southern California]." "I spoke against it." "There is surveillance on me and my family members." "Legal basis of the complaint are the U.S. constitution (eg., 1st, 5th), Freedom of Information Act, Federal Tort Claim Act, Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization Act, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Administrative Procedure Act, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and Geneva Conventions."

Clear and convincing evidence (Source : Colorado v New Mexico)

"[C]lear-and convincing-evidence standard" means that the "factfinder" is convinced "that the truth of [the] factual contentions are 'highly probable'".

"At this stage of the proceedings [in Haley v Boston], we must take the complaint's factual allegations as true, and those allegations paint an ugly but plausible picture."

Here, "[t]he retaliation methods being deployed against me and my family members are voluminous, various, vicious, violent, and depraved." "In light of the nature, extent, duration, and depth of the misconduct, at a minimum it is strong circumstantial evidence that the adverse actions in their totality are carried out with retaliatory intent."

"[Attorney Buenaventura's name] is being defamed and painted in a false light."

"[Mrs. Buenaventura] was tortured."

Ms. Jane Doe 3 lost her "home, friends, school, community, standing in California, and grandmother." "I submitted applications to eleven (11) schools on behalf of my child. None accepted her. She could not transfer to a private physical school even when she has good grades. With no remorse, ongoing retaliatory activities to silence my speech have been working overtime weaponizing systems like education. It is exceptional in slogans. An example is "We rise by uplifting others." It is another ruse to cover up self promotion of the favored (eg., demographics, expression) while exploiting the defenseless and who have no voice."

She is suffering "great, immediate, and irreparable losses" as "[h]er education is [further] being destabilized." "... [S]everance of subpoena powers hinder the timely and organized prosecution of claims". It increases the already significant losses to her

education and "whole human development". Recently, she lost her "Honors" designation she earned in all core subjects namely Mathematics, English, Science, and History. She lost her "dual enrollment" eligibility she earned in all core subjects namely Mathematics, English, Science, and History. She lost her ability to participate in spelling bees on a yearly basis. She lost her status as a published contributor she earned in a school newspaper. At the conclusion of 10th grade she had a total of fifteen (15) published articles. In 11th grade, she will have none. Same for 12th grade. She was "funneled" in a school funded by "an enterprise". "To subjugate an "entire population" by terrorism, [United States government] has no compunction in committing "indiscriminate mass murder".[]" Hegemony is "amending" the "Military Selective Service Act to require registration of [18-year old] women for" "draft" for its next "produc[tion]" "of "crisis, chaos, confusion, conflicts, and conflagrations to ignite an arms race."

"I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own"[.] for nearly nine (9) years. Another of the "various" "methods" is a Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation. "[P]urpose" of SLAPP "is "to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity."

"Concealment of misconduct, omission, wrongful conduct, and negligence is zealously synchronized." "Inability to "buckle" their "distempered cause[s]" for gain obtained by wrongful conduct by those who represent to be the "belt of rule" is suggested in the complaint." "Mrs. Buenaventura was deprived of her due process (eg., life) rights." "Resources paid by the public to enhance public interest being used to deny constitutional rights and human rights is suggested in the complaint."

"Incorporation by reference

This incorporates my complaint submitted to a Federal District Court and my appeal submitted to a Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Additionally, this incorporates the complaints, appeals, endnotes, attachments, and addendums submitted to the federal judiciary on behalf of my family members. Please see table below."

Plaintiff's name	Federal District Court case number	Federal Circuit Court of Appeals case number
The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura	2:23-cv-00211-JDL	23 -1651
The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura	2:23-cv-00325-JDL	24-1211
Ms. Jane Doe 3	2:23-cv-00358-JDL	24-1212
Ian R. Buenaventura	2:24-cv-00089-NT	24-1718

This incorporates all my submissions to the Lewiston District Court, Supreme Judicial Court, and United States Supreme Court. Submissions include appeals, motions, letters, endnotes, attachments, addendums, forms, transcripts of proceedings, and electronic mails. Please see table below.

Plaintiff's name / Appellant's name	Lewiston District Court case number	Supreme Judicial Court number case number	United States Supreme Court case number
Leslie C. Buot v Ian R. Buenaventura	LEWDC-DWC-2025-00042	And-25-246	
Ian R. Buenaventura v Leslie C. Buot			25A377

Court under no obligation to hear

The United States Supreme Court is not required to grant a writ of certiorari. When it exercises its discretion, it hears only 1%-2% of writs of certiorari. It receives "more than 7,000 cases" to review per annum. It is extremely rare a writ of certiorari is granted.

Circumstances – writ of certiorari – granted

There are scenarios where the Court grants a writ of certiorari.

1

First scenario is when there is national significance.

Here, "the significant impact is not limited to [United States of America]. There is significant impact on me. There was one (1) attempt on my life. I am being deprived of my due process (eg., "marriage", "childrearing", "familial") rights. There is significant impact on the estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura. She is being defamed and painted in a false light. There was significant impact on the person of Mrs. Buenaventura. She was deprived of her due process (eg., life) rights. There is significant impact on the estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura. He is being defamed and painted in a false light. There was significant impact on the person of Attorney Buenaventura. He was deprived of his due process (eg., life) rights. There is significant impact on Ms. Jane Doe 3. "Her education and holistic development are being held hostage. [] []" Her education is being destabilized. There were two (2) attempts on her life. There is significant impact on [Ms. Jane Doe 2]. She was deprived of her due process (eg., livelihood) rights on June 2, 2025. There were two (2) attempts on her life. There is significant impact on the living and deceased members of my family. There is significant impact on California. There is significant impact on Maine. There is significant impact on Texas. There is significant impact on the Philippines. There is significant impact on the United States. There is significant impact on the world. There is significant impact on humanity."

There is significant impact when "graces" such as "verity", "devotion", "courage", "stablness", "fortitude", "justice", "unity on earth", and "universal peace" "must appear ..." in "substance", "deeds", and "outcome".

Second scenario is when there is conflicting opinions of the law.

Here, "[o]ur peculiar security," Thomas Jefferson said, "is in the possession of a written constitution."

"Considerations Governing Review on Writ of Certiorari" ¹

Judiciary of Maine has decided an important question of federal law. US constitution is fiction.

US constitution does not apply to a defendant in a "camouflaged activities (eg., divorce action) ["created, coordinated, and carried out"] by the "deep state". US constitution does not apply to its Court proceedings. US constitution does not apply to a state procedural law. US constitution does not apply to a state substantive law (eg., divorce law, § 556, UPEPA). US constitution does not apply to an "order", "dismissal", "decision", or "judgment" that have "great, immediate, and irreparable" "substantive consequences" : "[our child] could not reasonably be expected to defend herself[.]" against a "[h]egemony [that] is "amending" the "Military Selective Service Act to require registration of [18-year old] women for" "draft" for its next "produc[tion]" "of "crisis, chaos, confusion, conflicts, and conflagrations to ignite an arms race."; "I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own"[.]" for nearly nine (9) years"; "I am being coerced to participate in activities." US constitution does not apply when there is "a structural bias "in favor of breaking up our marriage, our relationship, and our family[.]"" while the Court "expressly states" it "shall provide a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of families and the support of their children." US constitution does not apply when there is a "“[d]emonstrable prejudice” [] apparent in the consequences, for example, from lack of respect for the sovereignty, independence, and security of others, "improper application of law[s]", and flouting the US constitution and international laws (eg., Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Convention Against Torture) with impunity."” US constitution does not apply when there is a "[] deliberate indifference towards the "irreparable harm"[.]" to defendants, families, children, and society from an unconstitutional law. US constitution does not apply to "[a]pproximately one million children a year [who] become divorce statistics[.]" and who "witness[ed] that commitments in the most basic unit of society they are born in are judged by capacious and hollow words, are not evaluated in substance, are not measured by deeds, and are not gauged by outcome[.]" "in a nation that is obsessed with public opinion and image".

Judicial notice - mandatory

State courts "must take judicial notice without request" of the United States constitution, federal statutes (eg., RICO), federal treaties, public acts of Congress, federal case law, state constitution, state statutes, and state case law.

Federal subject matter jurisdiction

U.S. constitution (eg., 1st, 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th, 11th, 13th, 14th, separation of powers, bill of attainder) is

involved.

The federal statutes raised are Administrative Procedure Act, Federal Tort Claim Act, Freedom of Information Act, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Racketeering, Influenced, and Corrupt Organization Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1512 (tampering with a witness, victim, or informant), Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964 – Title VI, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d et. seq., 42 U.S.C. § 1988, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and 42 U.S.C. § 1985.

War Crimes Act and Uniform Code of Military Justice are linked.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Geneva Conventions, International Humanitarian Law, Convention Against Torture, and Rome Statute are connected.

1st amendment

“[T]he public as a whole has a significant interest in ensuring equal protection of the laws and protection of First Amendment liberties.” ²

“ . . . I [am] retaliated on due to my speech. Part of the retaliation is deprivation of due process rights. I have been unable to find a job 'on my own'.”

“Source confirmed, “ ... you will never be able to find work here [in the United States] or in the Philippines ... ””

““In light of my expression, another Source warned “ ... do not do this to yourself [because government will retaliate] ... ””

““It was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19). Plaintiff knows that I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own". She knows that there were petitions I filed. She knows that I guide our child in her education.””

“I reminded her. I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living "on my own". This stemmed from my airing my view. It is ongoing for years. She is aware that I am retaliated on. I informed her of the instruction to delete overtime hours from teachers' timesheets in 2016. When I was not retaliated on, "I could find work in two weeks time and the latest one month from the start of a job search. I would select the better offer. This was in a congested Los Angeles, California job market." When I was able to earn a livelihood "on my own" she rarely worked overtime, if at all. Shortly after I was retaliated on, plaintiff "lost a job she loved in California, where she was valued, and where she had a work-life balance." I show plaintiff lists of jobs I applied to. One example is an Addendum A of a Freedom of Information Act request dated August 19, 2021 (FOIA case number 112627) listing entities to which I submitted my resume by electronic methods. I filed petitions in order to put a stoppage to the retaliation and to seek substantial justice. There is a "deep" capacity central to government to betray the "trust and confidence" of the public. United States government retaliates at those who report on government "gross oversight within the FBI". "Funding of gain-of-function that led to Covid-19 display a wanton disregard for human lives." [] "[7,091,788] lives lost due to Covid-

19[.]" as of March 16, 2025. I guide our child in her education. Her education is a delicate balance moreso with its destabilization and weaponization which is being "coordinated" for years. An example was when her World Language in French was destabilized. I have a responsibility to raise our child according to my religious beliefs (eg., 5th commandment, 6th commandment, 8th commandment)."

““Plaintiff indicated that we disagree about my job search. I told her that I am going through retribution because I spoke up against overtime shaving. I am unable to find a livelihood "on my own". Inception of the retaliation was on 2016. She knows when the retribution started. She knows that before I was subjected to reprisal I could find work in two (2) weeks. When I was not retaliated on, I am able to find a livelihood "on my own". Soon after the commencement of the retribution, she lost a job she loved and she would be in right now but for the reprisal.””

“Here, plaintiff is aware of the petitions before she filed the divorce action. She never mentioned she did not want these petitions to be submitted. She did not indicate that these petitions should not be pursued before she filed the complaint on January 13, 2025. Only time she told me she did not want me to pursue these was when I asked about the "irreconcilable marital differences".”

“It was conveyed that "[r]esulting from my speech" there is "destabilization of [our child's] education". I conveyed that "[t]here were two (2) attempts on [our child's] life. A request submitted was "for the immediate cessation of threat/s enumerated, but not limited to those, in the addendum A attached to the inquiries dated July 4, 2022, July 9, 2022, and July 10, 2022." These are written statements made to a judicial body.”

“Here, I have been guiding our child in her education. I have been establishing the study schedule, ensuring yearly assessments are administered, researching a program that may enhance her learning, looking for opportunities for her to take practice tests related to Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT), and organizing campus and online visits for our family in universities. Expressing my views to my family in private about our child's education is within my 1st amendment right. Imposing an unipolar environment wherein competing views on the education of our child are deterred does not look like a compelling interest. Communications concerning the education of our child is also within my fundamental rights (eg., familial rights). When I discussed with plaintiff the "irreconcilable marital differences" she stated that we disagree on the education of our child. I keep vigil so that her education is not destabilized further and it is growing. Divorce action is a clear animus towards different ideas.”

“It is the only ground for a no-fault divorce. Yet, it says "irreconcilable marital differences". It is contradictory and makes no sense. It is ambiguous.”

“It deprives a spouse of his fundamental right to observe his religious belief. I have lifelong vows. These are to be faithful, to love, and to honor plaintiff for the rest of my life. There are no condition precedent to these duties.”

4th amendment

“Circuit Court cited that “[o]ur system of discovery was designed to increase the likelihood justice will

be served, not to promote gamemanship and deception in which the person who hides the ball most effectively wins the case.” [3] ”

“ . . . [T]he deception of deleting the Response, Complaint, and file storage happened before any discovery. Surveillance, suppression, schemes of reprisal (eg., racketeering), and concealment begun in earnest years before one paper was submitted. A person who decides to go through these activities more likely than not is hiding a basket full of balls from the Court. In effect, justice is not served as to Mrs. Buenaventura[.][, Ms. Doe 3, and myself.]”

“Property interest in [Ms. Doe 3's] data (eg., attendance data from School 4) related to education was seized without notice.”

“[S]ervant[s]” - all “house[s]” (Source : Macbeth by William Shakespeare)

Macbeth: “There's not a one of them but in his house
I keep a servant fee'd.”

Here, “[s]urveillance is an inherently dangerous activity not to mention it is imbued with a far greater capacity for harm (eg., suppression of speech, injuries caused by a car crash, deprivation of due process).”

5th amendment

“[Dismissal of the appeal and complaint not dismissed with prejudice are] not narrowly tailored to attain an enhancement of the administration of justice for [an individual and his family] ... going through retaliation.”

“It shocks the conscience that the complaint was sprung up after many years I have been going through retaliation.”

“Complaint and preliminary injunction did not state with specificity what these differences were. There was no context.”

“Upon asking plaintiff what the "differences" were, she stated we disagree on things. She mentioned three (3) items we disagree on. One is my job search. Two are the lawsuits I filed. She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits. Three is the education of our minor child. I can not disagree with her on interests impacting me, my family members (eg., alive and deceased), and the public. She tells me to stop talking about certain topics such as retaliation.”

“None of the twenty two (22) pages that were served contained a legal basis, factual background, rationale, and proof underlying the ground for the divorce. To a lay person such as myself, "irreconcilable marital differences" mean differences were identified. There were no details what the identified "irreconcilable marital differences". "Irreconcilable" means that

attempts were diligently made to reconcile identified differences. There were no details when exactly the attempts were diligently made to reconcile the identified "irreconcilable marital differences". Before the papers were filed, there were no earlier dialogues with me and our child related to the identified differences much less any efforts to reconcile the differences. Yet, the ground for the divorce is labeled "irreconcilable marital differences".

"Refusal of the Court to exercise jurisdiction over the motion is an error as a matter of law."

"A court-ordered mediation rather than exercising jurisdiction over the Special Anti-SLAPP motion is an effective denial of the Special Anti-SLAPP motion. It is no different from stating there is no authority to hear the motion.

Further, there are no "irreconcilable marital differences". I indicated during the conference that I am not sure what mediation meant. I intended to get back with an answer after I research what it means. However, it was stated that the court will decide for me whether it will be before the move or after the move. Without full knowledge what mediation meant, I informed the Court that I preferred the mediation after the move.

After having some understanding of what mediation means, I disagree to mediation. I am not in favor of breaking up our marriage, our relationship, and our family. Our marriage can be saved. Our family can be saved."

"In the intervening time, I am forced to litigate an action that has no merit. I am coerced to agree to mediation where fees range between [] \$3,000 to \$8,000. I am compelled to agree that our marriage can not be saved even when there are no "irreconcilable marital differences". I am forced to agree to the destruction of my family. "

"Title of the response to the motion was "Plaintiffs Response to Defendant's Answer to Complaint/Special Motion." The motion was not an answer. It mischaracterized the motion as an answer.

It seems that the Court without arguments and briefing considered the mischaracterization of the motion as an answer even it is not. Court stated the "open motion" appeared to be an "unusual motion".

Plaintiff did not overcome her burden. Her burden was clear. One is that she has to establish that the petitioning activity was devoid of any reasonable factual support. Alternatively, she has to establish that the petitioning activity was devoid of any arguable basis in law. Two is that the exercise of my constitutional rights and human rig[h]ts caused her actual injury.

This was in addition to a purported legal basis consisting of three (3) words, "irreconcilable marital differences", on a complaint. Complaint did not cite a legal basis such as the United States constitution, a federal statute, a federal case law, a treaty, a state constitution (eg., California, Maine), a state statute (eg., California, Maine), a state case law, a municipal law, local law, and international law. Complaint did not contain one (1) fact. Because there was not a single fact, no explanation can be made even where there was an inclination to provide a reasoning. Complaint that has no legal basis, factual basis, and explanation likewise did not

have evidentiary support.

Glaring deficiencies (eg., United States constitution, Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), Bell Atlantic Corp v Twombly cited in Ashcroft v Iqbal) exist in the complaint. There was no attempt to satisfy the burden of a non movant in responding to a Special Anti-SLAPP motion. Motion stated legal basis, factual basis, rationale, and proof. One of the laws stated in the motion was that under the 14 M.R.S. § 556 a "Court shall grant the special motion.""

"Divorce causes substantial expenses (eg., mediation expenses, litigation expenses), damages, and injuries such as irreversible and deleterious effects on individuals, relationships, couples, families, and on children. "

"It is an error not to dismiss the divorce action with prejudice during the case management conference. It is an error not to advance and prioritize the motion in order to dismiss the divorce action with prejudice. These errors "ignore[]" that "[our child] could not reasonably be expected to defend herself.""

"A marriage is minimized to a business transaction that is "terminable at will" [], "without cause" [], and "against [the defendant's] will" []."

"On the "final hearing" on September 19, 2025, the Court stated that "[t]he trial is when all of the evidence will be submitted." However, at the case management conference on April 29, 2025 "[t]he Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.""

"In other words, divorce proceedings move forward even over my objection that there are "irreconcilable marital differences". Mediation is ordered even over my objection that "the marriage" "can not be saved", our marriage will break up, our family will be broken, and our child will grow up in a broken family. Divorce is not dismissed with prejudice even over my objection to the divorce. Terms of the divorce are imposed even over my objections with the divorce, the mediation, and that the marriage and the family will be broken. However, my motion is effectively denied when a plaintiff objects without a legal basis, a fact, an explanation, proof, affidavits, and discovery materials.

This seems to be bias in favor of plaintiff, divorce, and breaking up a family. (Source : **Maine Code Judicial Conduct**)"

"Response contained no legal basis. Response did not contain any fact demonstrating the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. It did not contain any fact demonstrating the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. It did not contain any fact that the exercise of my rights caused her actual injury. There was no explication. There was no evidence."

"Nonmovant did not establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of a cause of action."

"I am being "forced to continue to litigate the entire trial before the finding on the motion could

every be appealed".

"It deprives a spouse of his/her fundamental rights to marriage, as a spouse, and as a parent. These include but are not limited to "security", "stability", "permanency", "safeguarding [our child]", "rais[ing] our child according to my religious beliefs" (eg., 5th commandment, 6th commandment, 8th commandment), educating our child, speaking to my child, imparting values to our child, and defending our child from camouflaged activities by the "deep state". Examples of these activities deployed against our child are "assault, battery, conversion, defamation, false imprisonment, fraud, invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional distress, interference with prospective advantage, kidnapping, nuisance, trespass to chattel ... trespass to land[.]" and racketeering activities (eg., obstruction of justice, attempted murder)."

"It deprives my child of her fundamental right to grow up with "model[s in their parents] to follow".

"Causation does not need to be shown." "Legal basis for the divorce is patently unfair."

"Regulations affecting fundamental rights (eg., divorce laws, surveillance) are reviewed under the strict scrutiny standard."

"Here, basis for the divorce action is "irreconcilable marital differences". This infringes on my fundamental rights (eg., marriage, familial rights). "Expressing my views to my family in private about our child's education is within my 1st amendment right. Imposing an unipolar environment wherein competing views on the education of our child are deterred does not look like a compelling interest. Communications concerning the education of our child is also within my fundamental rights (eg., familial rights). When I discussed with plaintiff the "irreconcilable marital differences" she stated that we disagree on the education of our child. I keep vigil so that her education is not destabilized further and it is growing. Divorce action is a clear animus towards different ideas."

"“There is a structural bias “in favor of breaking up our marriage, our relationship, and our family.” I was described as “ ... disturb Buenaventura ... ” [by the Court] in a “final hearing” on September 19, 2025.”

"I was informed on September 16, 2025 through a phone call that a “final hearing notice” was mailed out. This connotes a decision was going to be made in the absence of the other party. “[F]inal hearing notice” scheduled on September 19, 2025 was mailed out on August 29, 2025. Twenty (21) days after it's mailing, September 19, 2025, I have not received it in regular mail.” As of [November 7], 2025, I have not received the “final hearing notice” scheduled on September 19, 2025.”"

"“Demonstrable prejudice” are apparent in the consequences, for example, from lack of respect for the sovereignty, independence, and security of others, “improper application of law[s]”, and flouting the US constitution and international laws (eg., Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Convention Against Torture) with impunity.”

"Dangers of the deliberate indifference for the "irreversible" "adverse consequences" being and will be sustained by an individual who has no "affluence, influence, [preferred] immutable features, approved expression, or belief in 'bidder[s]'" are "palpable".

"This is apparent in its "readiness" "to process" a "[f]inal hearing" on November 4, 2025 ... without responses to my request[s for] ... evidence ... " until it was denied on October 6, 2025 whereas "[t]he Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences." Meanwhile, "[l]egal basis for the divorce action is unconstitutional." "Complaint has no legal basis, factual basis, reasoning, and evidence supporting its claim." "None of the twenty two (22) pages that were served contained a legal basis, factual background, and rationale, and proof underlying the ground for the divorce." "Glaring deficiencies (eg., United States constitution, Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), [Haines v Kerner,] Bell Atlantic Corp v Twombly cited in Ashcroft v Iqbal) exist in the complaint."

"This is apparent in its "readiness" "to process" a "[f]inal hearing" on November 4, 2025 while ignoring [[i]njuries from the "unprecedented punishment" (eg., no receipt of orders [dated August 1, 2025 and August 22, 2025 until October 27, 2025], no receipt of "final hearing notice" scheduled on September 19, 2025)]."

"This is apparent in its "readiness" "to process" a "[f]inal hearing" on November 4, 2025 ... without responses to my request[] [for a] discovery [schedule]... " and a full, impartial, and fair discovery.

""This is apparent in its "readiness" "to process" a "[f]inal hearing" on November 4, 2025 ... without responses to my request[] [for] "arguments" and "briefing" on substantive federal questions." On April 29, 2025, the first hearing, "I asked [the Court] where was I supposed to submit the ["Special anti-SLAPP"] motion. I was informed that it was to be submitted to a district court. An order for mediation was issued on May 5, 2025." Appeal from the order was denied. On October 11, 2025, "I [sought] an "expedited hearing of [Special anti-SLAPP] motion[s] and a "ruling" on the Anti-SLAPP motion. " There was no brief from plaintiff. There were no arguments."

"This is apparent in its "readiness" "to process" a "[f]inal hearing" on November 4, 2025 while ignoring my request" "for a jury trial".

""[C]onstitutional right" - "meaningful access to the courts"

I “[s]ubmitted [on] June 20, 2025” a “request for an online legal research materials resource without “constitutional impediments” containing the constitution and all laws including but not limited to statutes (eg., legislative history of a statute), rules, regulations, procedures, and local ordinances of the state of Maine. Further, [I] request[ed] for an online legal research materials resource without economic and logistical blocks containing all case law in the state courts such as the Superior Courts, District Courts (eg., Family Division), and Supreme Judicial Court.”

I “[s]ubmitted [on] September 15, 2025” a “Motion to Request Trial Schedule and Other Requests”. Included in this paper is following-up my “[r]equest for an [o]nline “legal research materials” [r]esource without “[c]onstitutional [i]mpediments”.

As of October 15, 2025, I have not received a response.”

““[C]ontrary to constitutional right” - substantive due process - - “lopsided proceedings”

“I did not receive trial schedule, status conference order purportedly on August 22, 2025, and proposed judgment purportedly sent on August 29, 2025.”

“[On September 15, 2025] ... [I] ... request[ed] the following:

1. Schedule of the trial, if applicable.
2. Status conference order purportedly on August 22, 2025, if applicable .
3. Proposed judgment purportedly on August 29, 2025, if applicable.

I am objecting to the judgment, if applicable

4. Thirty (30) days to provide an answer.
5. Additional thirty (30) days to provide a response to the Proposed Judgment by plaintiff.
6. To equalize an “unfair” and lopsided proceedings wanting of equal terms and good faith, this is to follow-up previous requests.

These pertain to the following:

- a. “Correct Mislabeled Documents”,
- b. “Request Copies of Dockets Entries, Orders, and Documents (pdf) via Regular Mail”,
- c. “Seal a Document Submitted as ‘Confidential Communications’”,
- d. “Request a Copy of a Docket Entry Via Regular Mail”,
- e. “Request Redaction of Physical Address, Electronic Mail Address, and All Other Personal Identifying Information”,
- f. “Request for a Copy of Procedures to Correct Errors in the Hearing Transcript”,

and

g. “Request for an Online “[L]egal [R]esearch [M]aterials” Resource without “[C]onstitutional [I]mpediments”.

7. Close captioning, live transcription of the entire proceedings, ability to enlarge font size of close captioning and live transcription, and an ability to download the full transcription immediately after a hearing concludes.
8. Participants in a hearing to identify themselves and their roles (eg., transcriber).
9. Attendees of a conference and/or hearing to speak clearly, to enunciate the words, and to speak slowly.
10. Reconsideration of my requests for “Independent Recording” and “Alternative Methods for Court Proceedings”.

As of October 15, 2025, I have not received a response.”

“ “[C]ontrary to constitutional right” - substantive due process - - “lopsided proceedings”

“[On September 23, 2025]... [I] request[ed] the following:

1. August 22, 2025 materials

There were purported “finding” and “testimony”.

This is to request a copy of materials such as “finding”, “testimon[ies]”, evidence, and full transcript, if any, at the August 22, 2025 hearing.

2. Schedule of discovery

This is to request for a schedule of discovery, if any.

3. “[B]est interests”

This is to request for the definition of “best interests”, source of the definition, and standard of the definition, if any.”

As of October 15, 2025, I have not received “purported” “finding”, “testimon[ies]”, evidence, and full transcript, if any, at the August 22, 2025 hearing[.]”, “schedule of discovery, if any”, “the definition of “best interests” ... and standard of the definition, if any.” In connection with “best interests”, there is no definition, no standard, no legislative history, and no case law explaining these two (2) words. “[Proposed divorce judgment does] not provide any proof leading to and at its decision.” There is no explanation in the proposed judgment how the “finding” is made. There are no “testimon[ies]”. There are no evidence.”

“‘[S]ubstantive in nature’ - ‘substantive consequences’ - ‘impairment of First Amendment rights’ - ‘time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit’” ⁴

“‘Although the Act operates in a procedural manner—specifically, by altering the typical procedure parties follow at the outset of litigation—the rights the act protects are most certainly substantive in nature. [] (applying California's anti-SLAPP law to diversity actions in federal court because the statute was "crafted to serve an interest not directly addressed by the Federal Rules: the protection of 'the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and petition for redress of grievances.'"). Otherwise stated, the Act's procedural features are designed to prevent substantive consequences: the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit. [] As stated by one California court, "[t]he point of the anti-SLAPP statute is that you have a right not to be dragged through the courts because you exercised your constitutional rights." []”

Here, purported “proposed Divorce judgment” states “All other requests for relief or pending motions, not specifically addressed herein are denied. Specifically, the Defendant’s Anti-SLA[P]P Motion is denied.”

Purported “proposed Divorce judgment” was sent even when “[t]here are no “irreconcilable marital differences.” “[C]omplaint had no legal basis. Complaint had no factual background. Complaint had no reasoning. Complaint had no evidentiary support. Response to the motion did not state any legal basis. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights caused plaintiff actual injury. No reasoning was stated. No support was provided. In the case management conference, like the complaint and response to the motion, no specific facts were provided. When asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion “merits [no] further response” which is another example that it had no specific facts.”

Terms of the purported “proposed Divorce judgment” is another confirmation that the complaint was “filed to silence, dissuade, coerce, [harass,] intimidate, and punish” “the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19).”

“‘Promoting Public Confidence’” ⁵

“A judge shall respect and comply with the law[] and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity[] and impartiality[] of the judiciary. A judge shall not make statements, whether public or nonpublic, that commit the judge with respect to cases, controversies, or issues that are likely to come before the courts or that are inconsistent with the impartial [] performance of the adjudicative duties of judicial [] office.”

Here, counsel of plaintiff stated “mediation is the next step”.

The Court asked what my “position with regard to mediation taking place now or in the future

after relocation to Texas?"

I said "I have, like, a vague understanding of how mediation works. And from a layperson's perspective, it seems like the marriage is — cannot be saved. On that point, the marriage could be saved. The family does not need to be broken up." " ... there are no irreconcilable differences, and we are having dialog[ue]s. So my answer to mediation is -- I'm not sure how to answer that."

The Court said, "So what I can tell you is that both parties do not have to agree that there are irreconcilable marital differences. The Court can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences. So the — the fact that you disagree whether or not there are irreconcilable marital differences doesn't mean the case can't go forward."

"So this -- we will schedule it for mediation. And the question really is, does it make sense to do that on the soonest available docket, or to wait until you've relocated to Texas by agreement, and then you can determine what your family plan will look like based on where you're residing at that time."

I said, "I would like to request time to find out the implications of both two options, if — if you don't mind, Your Honor. And I can — because I'm not sure how to answer that."

The Court said "Okay. Well, we're going to schedule the first mediation, sir. I've given you a chance to be heard with regard to your position of when that should take place, and you don't have a response that's helpful to the Court. So I'm just going to pick a date for the parties to mediate by video.

And to the -- I may have misspoken a bit when I talked about irreconcilable marital differences, sir, and I apologize, but I do encourage you to seek an attorney's advice on that because it's a no-fault divorce. So it's not, you know, specific that both parties would agree to the divorce or even to the terms of the divorce if the Court ultimately has to make the decision. I don't know if that's helpful to you, but I'm just making sure I didn't misstate irreconcilable marital differences. It's no-fault grounds in Maine. Okay. So let me look back at the --"

I received from plaintiff's counsel on September 12, 2025 purportedly a "proposed Divorce judgment". It stated "After hearing, and finding that it is in the best interest of the minor child, it is hereby ORDERED and ADJUDGED as follows ..." "I was informed on September 16, 2025 through a phone call that a "final hearing notice" was mailed out. This connotes a decision was going to be made in the absence of the other party. "[F]inal hearing notice" scheduled on September 19, 2025 was mailed out on August 29, 2025. Twenty (21) days after it's mailing, September 19, 2025, I have not received it in regular mail." "[On September 23, 2025]... [I] request[ed] the following:" "a copy of materials such as "purported" "finding", "testimon[ies]", evidence, and full transcript, if any, at the August 22, 2025 hearing[.]", "schedule of discovery, if any", "the definition of "best interests", source of the definition, and standard of the definition, if any." As of October 15, 2025, I have not received "purported" "finding", "testimon[ies]", evidence, and full transcript, if any, at the August 22, 2025 hearing[.]", "schedule of discovery, if any", "the definition of "best interests" ... and standard of

the definition, if any.” As of October 15, 2025, I have not received the “final hearing notice”. In connection with “best interests”, there is no definition, no standard, no legislative history, and no case law explaining these two (2) words. “[Proposed divorce judgment does] not provide any proof leading to and at its decision.” There is no explanation in the proposed judgment how the “finding” is made. There are no “testimon[ies]”. There are no evidence.

On the September 19, 2019, the Court stated at the outset of the “final hearing”, “ ... that disturb Buenaventura is present ... ”

“On the “final hearing” on September 19, 2025, the Court stated that “[t]he trial is when all of the evidence will be submitted.” However, at the case management conference on April 29, 2025 “[t]he Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.””

Purported “Proposed Divorce Judgment” states “After hearing, and finding that it is in the best interest of the minor child, it is hereby ORDERED and ADJUDGED as follows ... ” This is a documentary evidence that “[t]he Court can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.” It is ascertainable it is “bias in favor of plaintiff, divorce, and breaking up a family. (Source : Maine Code Judicial Conduct)””

““[T]he full right to be heard” 6

A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the full right to be heard according to law.

Here, I told the Court “I have, like, a vague understanding of how mediation works. And from a layperson's perspective, it seems like the marriage is — cannot be saved. On that point, the marriage could be saved. The family does not need to be broken up.” “ ... there are no irreconcilable differences, and we are having dialog[ue]s. So my answer to mediation is -- I'm not sure how to answer that.”

I told the Court, “I would like to request time to find out the implications of both two options, if — if you don't mind, Your Honor. And I can — because I'm not sure how to answer that.””

““Coercive” - “Conduct”

“A judge may engage in extrajudicial activities, except as prohibited by law or this Code. However, when engaging in extrajudicial activities, a judge shall not ...

Participate in activities that would appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality;
Engage in conduct that would appear to a reasonable person to be coercive[.]”

Here, “[a]n Order of the Court issued on May 5, 2025 confirmed that “[t]his Motion shall be addressed by a judge at or prior to a final hearing but not before the parties participate in

mediation". In the intervening time, I am forced to litigate an action that has no merit. I am coerced to agree to mediation where fees range between of \$3,000 to \$8,000. I am compelled to agree that our marriage can not be saved even when there are no "irreconcilable marital differences". I am forced to agree to the destruction of my family.'"

"Life or liberty and infringement of constitutional rights are at stake (Source : Thompson v Bell)

The Supreme Court admonished "finality of litigation" has no place where "life or liberty is at stake" and "infringement of constitutional rights is alleged". (Source : Sanders v US)

The Supreme Court said "[c]onventional notions of finality of litigation have no place where life or liberty is at stake and infringement of constitutional rights is alleged." (Source : Id.) Courts addressing Rule 60(b) motions must consider equities and the "incessant command of the court's conscience that justice be done in light of all the facts." (Source : Blue Diamond Coal Co. v Trustees of UMWA Combined Benefits Fund). Rule 60(b) "confers broad discretion on the trial court to grant relief when appropriate to accomplish justice; it constitutes a grand reservoir of equitable power to do justice in a particular case...and should be liberally construed when substantial justice will thus be served.'"

"[My family] ha[s] a constitutional right and human right to life."

"Ramifications of a no-fault divorce are "financial[], emotional[], and physical[] devastation to divorced families with increases in poverty, suicide, depression, drug and alcohol abuse, and more. Adultery has been normalized."["

"These errors "ignore[]" that "[t]he retaliation methods being deployed against me and my family members are voluminous, various, vicious, violent, and depraved. In light of the nature, extent, duration, and depth of the misconduct, at a minimum it is strong circumstantial evidence that the adverse actions in their totality are carried out with retaliatory intent.'"

"Activities such as injuring [our child] are undertaken in furtherance of preventing participation.'"

"The structured operations are harming [our child's] person, name, chattels, real property, and prospective advantage to discourage debate.'"

"Channels of interstate and foreign commerce are affected as the person, reputation, personal properties, real properties, and prospective advantage of [our child] were and are being injured.'"

"These errors "ignore[]" that "[our child] could not reasonably be expected to defend herself.'"

"These errors "ignore[]" that our child could not reasonably be expected to prosecute her case against the enterprise."

"These errors "ignore[]" that "[t]he defamation of [her] name and casting [her] name in a false light can not be stopped until someone who is inextricably intertwined with [her] such as ... [her father] stands up for [her], defends [her] name, and pursues justice for [her].""

"I am forced to agree [by the Court] to the destruction of my family.""

""[U]nbounded jurisdiction" - "superceding" " rights" - "arising from natural law" - "gigantic" "sway" ⁷

"Even when sitting as a court in equity, we have no authority to craft a "nuclear weapon" of the law like the one advocated here.

Joseph Story made the point many years ago:

"If, indeed, a Court of Equity in England did possess the unbounded jurisdiction, which has been thus generally ascribed to it, of correcting, controlling, moderating, and even superceding the law, and of enforcing all the rights, as well as the charities, arising from natural law and justice, and of freeing itself from all regard to former rules and precedents, it would be the most gigantic in its sway, and the most formidable instrument of arbitrary power, that could well be devised. It would literally place the whole rights and property of the community under the arbitrary will of the Judge, acting, if you please, arbitrio boni judicis, and it may be, ex aequo et bono, according to his own notions and conscience; but still acting with a despotic and sovereign authority.""

""Natur[al]" law - "universal"

"Macbeth and Merchant of Venice are books written by William Shakespeare.

"[I]f you tickle us, do we not laugh?"

"[I]f you poison us, do we not die?"

"Gainst nature still[.] Thriftless ambition, that will ravin up [t]hine own life's means[.]"

"... [P]ower" [u]proot[s] the universal peace[.]"

"All causes shall give way" to "vaulting ambition."

With "no compunctious visitings of nature", it "confound[s] [a]ll Unity on earth".

With no remorse, "water clears" "unnatural deeds".

"Ill" "has no fear who knows it, when none can call power to accompt ... "

"Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill."

There are "graces".

Examples are "verity", "devotion", "courage", "stability", "fortitude", "justice", "unity on earth", and "universal peace".

But, these "must appear in other ways than words ... ""

“Impartial Decision Maker” ⁸

“The Supreme Court has explained that the neutrality requirement helps to guarantee that life, liberty, or property will not be taken on the basis of an erroneous or distorted conception of the facts or the law and preserves both the appearance and reality of fairness . . . by ensuring that no person will be deprived of his interests in the absence of a proceeding in which he may present his case with assurance that the arbiter is not predisposed to find against him.”

□

Please see discussion under “Error[s] as a matter of law” infra.”

“Impermissible bias” - “accuser” - “adjudicator” ⁹

“The Court based its holding, in part, on earlier cases that had found impermissible bias occurs when the same person serves as both accuser and adjudicator in a case.”

Please see discussion under Promoting Public Confidence.”

“Jurisdiction - “in excess of statutory jurisdiction”

“Title 4, Chapter 5, § 183 confers jurisdiction to the family law magistrates. This is the basis of authority in providing a system of justice in service of families. Family division is expected to be responsive to the needs of the families. My family does not need to be broken. My family needs to be saved. Family division is expected to be responsive to the needs of children. My child does not need divorced parents and a broken family. My child needs to be saved from the impacts of a divorce. It was error not to dismiss the action with prejudice.

It was error not to dismiss the action with prejudice.”

“The Court's authority is based on a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of the families and the support of their children.” “ ... [O]nce the court is weaponized ... it has no

authority.”

Purported “proposed Divorce judgment” contains a “Child Support” section. Included in the electronic mail was a purported “Child Support Worksheet”.

It is ascertainable from the papers that plaintiff is using a “legally nonviable claim and factually nonviable one” to “harass” “the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment[, 5th amendment, 8th amendment, 13th amendment]) and human rights (eg., article 19[, article 3, article 5, article 4]).””

““[U]surpation of power”

“But when a court has no judicial power to do what it purports to do—when its action is not mere error but usurpation of power—the situation falls precisely within the allowable use of § 262.”””

““Error[s] as a matter of law”

“[W]ithout observance of procedure required by law”

“A court-ordered mediation rather than exercising jurisdiction over the Special Anti-SLAPP motion is an effective denial of the Special Anti-SLAPP motion. It is no different from stating there is no authority to hear the motion.”

This is an error.”

““[I]n light of the jurisdiction” – “given to” - “Family Division”

“Title 4, Chapter 5, § 183 states that it is “established within the District Court a Family Division that has jurisdiction over family matters filed in District Court. The Family Division shall provide a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of families and the support of their children.””

“Family division stated that the “[motion] would [be] reserve[d] ... for a final hearing with the District Court judge.” However, family division as part of the district court has jurisdiction to provide a system of justice.”

“It is an error for the family division not to exercise jurisdiction over the Special Anti-SLAPP motion.””

““[P]rocedural features” - “protects” - “substantive” - “rights”

““Although the Act operates in a procedural manner—specifically, by altering the typical procedure parties follow at the outset of litigation—the rights the act protects are most certainly substantive in nature. [] (applying California's anti-SLAPP law to diversity actions in federal court because the statute was "crafted to serve an interest not directly addressed by the Federal

Rules: the protection of 'the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and petition for redress of grievances.'"). Otherwise stated, the Act's procedural features are designed to prevent substantive consequences: the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit. [] As stated by one California court, "[t]he point of the anti-SLAPP statute is that you have a right not to be dragged through the courts because you exercised your constitutional rights." []"

"Legal basis for claims in my petition are the U.S. constitution, Freedom of Information Act, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Administrative Procedure Act, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Federal Tort Claim Act, Racketeering Influence Corrupt Organization Act, [The Convention Against Torture,] and Geneva Conventions."

"Basis for the divorce violates laws such as the United States constitution (eg., 1st amendment, 4th amendment, 5th amendment, 7th amendment, 8th amendment, 13th amendment, 14th amendment, ex post facto law, and bill of attainder), violates human rights, and United States statutes (eg., Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization Act)."

"U.S. constitution - Freedom of speech – vagueness – void on its face

"Irreconcilable marital differences" as a ground for divorce does not give notice to a reasonable person of what specifically is prohibited in a marriage. There are no text and context where an individual can determine what "irreconcilable marital differences" mean. There is no text and context where an ordinary person can determine what the state legislative body intended with the language "irreconcilable marital differences" as a ground for divorce.

It is the only ground for a no-fault divorce. Yet, it says "irreconcilable marital differences". It is contradictory and makes no sense. It is ambiguous.

A divorce is allowed to be filed, proceed, and heard as a no-fault divorce without any cause of action, "essential elements" that are to be pleaded and proven, factual background, and evidentiary support. A defendant is left guessing what the law authorizing "irreconcilable marital differences" as a ground for divorce means. "Upon asking plaintiff what the "differences" were, she stated we disagree on things. She mentioned three (3) items we disagree on. One is my job search." "I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living "on my own". This stemmed from my airing my view. It is ongoing for years. She is aware that I am retaliated on." "Two are the lawsuits I filed. She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits." "I filed petitions in order to put a stoppage to the retaliation and to seek substantial justice." "Three is the education of our minor child." "Her education is a delicate balance moreso with its destabilization and weaponization which is being "coordinated" for years." "I can not disagree with her on interests impacting me, my family members (eg., alive and deceased), and the public." "She tells me to stop talking about certain topics such as retaliation [and corruption]." I can not discuss there is no commitment to the U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to conscience. One result of an oath that is minimized was a United States President was installed. But, plaintiff can discuss her political preference (eg., democrat party) without different views. "[Complaint] was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19)."

"Irreconcilable marital differences" as a ground of divorce is vague. It is void on its face."

"U.S. constitution – Freedom of religion

"I have a responsibility to raise our child according to my religious beliefs (eg., 5th commandment, 6th commandment, 8th commandment)."

"Substantive due process (Source : 5th and 14th amendments)

Legal basis of "irreconcilable marital differences" violates substantive due process.

It deprives a spouse of his/her fundamental rights to marriage, as a spouse, and as a parent. These include but are not limited to "security", "stability", "permanency", "safeguarding [our child]", "rais[ing] our child according to my religious beliefs" (eg., 5th commandment, 6th commandment, 8th commandment), educating our child, speaking to my child, imparting values to our child, and defending our child from camouflaged activities by the "deep state". Examples of these activities deployed against our child are "assault, battery, conversion, defamation, false imprisonment, fraud, invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional distress, interference with prospective advantage, kidnapping, nuisance, trespass to chattel ... trespass to land[,] and racketeering activities (eg., obstruction of justice, attempted murder).

[Taking]

[Purported "proposed Divorce judgment" states that "violation of this order may result in a finding of contempt and imposition of sanctions ... which may include one or more of the following: (1) require additional or more specific terms and conditions consistent with this order; (2) order that additional visitation be provided for a parent to take the place of visitation that was wrongfully denied; and (3) order a parent found in contempt to pay a fine of at least \$100.00."

Purported "proposed Divorce judgment" contains Division of Personal Property, Spousal Support, Debts, and Attorney's Fees.

Purported "proposed Divorce judgment" states "Each of the parties shall execute and deliver to the other party any documents which may be reasonably required to accomplish the intention of this Judgment and shall do all other things necessary to that end. If either party fails to comply with the provisions of this paragraph, this agreement shall constitute an actual grant, assignment and conveyance of rights and property in such manner, and with such force and effect, as shall be necessary to effectuate the terms of this agreement."

"She is aware that I am retaliated on." "I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living "on my own". This stemmed from my airing my view. It is ongoing for [nearly (9)] years."

This is an example of a SLAPP "brought by ... individuals, corporate entities, ... or government officials" to "chill[s] society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity."

[Invasion of privacy]

[Purported "proposed Divorce judgment" states that "Plaintiff and Defendant must have equal and unrestricted access to the child's records, including, but not limited to, medical, dental and school records, whether or not the child resides with the parent seeking such records and information."

"She is aware that I am retaliated on." "There are manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities." "Seizure [], preview of communications [], secret arrests [], closed judicial proceedings [] (eg., ex parte communications []), secret trials [], secret punishment[], infecting media[], and funneling a forum transpire.""

This is another example of a SLAPP "brought by ... individuals, corporate entities, ... or government officials" to "chill[s] society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity."

"[R]ight to marriage - childrearing - familial rights"

[Purported "proposed Divorce judgment" states that "A parent who intends to relocate the residence of the child subject to this Order must provide the other parent prior notice at least 30 days before the intended relocation. If the relocation must occur in less than 30 days, the parent who is relocating shall provide notice as soon as possible to the other parent. If the parent who is relocating believes notifying the other parent will cause danger to the parent or the child, the parent shall notify the District Court of the intended relocation, and the District Court shall provide appropriate notice to the other parent in a manner determined to provide safety for the relocating parent and child."

"She is aware that I am retaliated on." "Concealment of misconduct, omission, and wrongful behavior are dutifully deployed." "My private residence, past and present, had/has sources, methods, devices, activities, and/or mechanisms that invaded/es my privacy." "I am being coerced to participate in activities." "I am being carved out from my family, friends, and society." "There was an attempt on my life." "I am being defamed that I have no regard for the rule of law. Another example of injury to my name is that I have a mental illness. I am being depicted as a member of a family involved in criminal activity." "I am being excluded to prevent from participation in a hearing, production of evidence, and communication of misconduct." "I am being brainwashed." "In May 9, 2023, my personal laptop was functioning seamlessly through close to midnight. It was rendered inoperable on May 10, 2023. In the morning, Lenovo laptop did not open up. There was no screen log-in. All documents, files, and electronically stored informed were destroyed without my permission. The laptop had to be replaced." "Bribery, economic duress, and/or extortion, to name a few racketeering activities, affect a financial institution." " ... I do not believe in "bidder[s]". "Retaliating at person whose viewpoint is covertly circumscribed is deceitful." "Pertinent communications are concealed by the abuse of privilege/s, confidentiality agreement/s, claim/s of immunity, and/or exemptions. Thus, predicate acts (eg., bribery) are multiplied." "Meanwhile, wrongdoing, omission, and misconduct are walled off. Plus, defense/s are manufactured through insight obtained by eavesdropping. My information and data are appropriated without authorization to

knowingly prevent a point of view from being public.”

Purported “proposed Divorce judgment” states that “In accordance with 19-A M.R.S.A. § 2006, the Court has made certain findings of fact concerning the current parental support obligation as computed under the presumptive application of the guidelines. Those findings are contained within the Child Support Order and Child Support Worksheet which are attached hereto and incorporated within this Divorce Judgment. The Defendant is presently unemployed, and Plaintiff did not request that income be imputed to him at this time given that the parties recently relocated to Texas and that Defendant would be in need of finding a new apartment and establishing himself in the area.

Plaintiff may claim the child for all income tax related purposes.”

“She is aware that I am retaliated on.” “I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living "on my own".”

This is another example of a SLAPP "brought by ... individuals, corporate entities, ... or government officials" to "chill[s] society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.”]

["Closed judicial proceedings [] (eg., ex parte communications[])"]

[Purported “Proposed Divorce Judgment” states “After hearing, and finding that it is in the best interest of the minor child, it is hereby ORDERED and ADJUDGED as follows ... ” This is a documentary evidence that “[t]he Court can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.” It is ascertainable it is “bias in favor of plaintiff, divorce, and breaking up a family. (Source : Maine Code Judicial Conduct)”

As of October 15, 2025, I have not received “purported” “finding”, “testimon[ies]”, evidence, and full transcript, if any, at the August 22, 2025 hearing[.]”, “schedule of discovery, if any”, “the definition of “best interests” ... and standard of the definition, if any.” In connection with “best interests”, there is no definition, no standard, no legislative history, and no case law explaining these two (2) words. “[Proposed divorce judgment does] not provide any proof leading to and at its decision.” There is no explanation in the proposed judgment how the “finding” is made. There are no “testimon[ies]”. There are no evidence.

This is another example of a SLAPP "brought by ... individuals, corporate entities, ... or government officials" to "chill[s] society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.”]

Defense against - abuse of processes – targeting our child

The state can not reasonably expect our child to defend herself.

Purported “proposed divorce judgment” states “Plaintiff shall have primary residency of the minor child.”

“The Defendant is awarded reasonable and regular rights of contact with the

minor child, to be at the discretion of the minor child.”

This is another infringement of my privacy rights (eg., marriage, childrearing, familial rights).

““Expressing my views to my family in private about our child's education is within my 1st amendment right. Imposing an unipolar environment wherein competing views on the education of our child are deterred does not look like a compelling interest. Communications concerning the education of our child is also within my fundamental rights (eg., familial rights). When I discussed with plaintiff the "irreconcilable marital differences" she stated that we disagree on the education of our child. I keep vigil so that her education is not destabilized further and it is growing. Divorce action is a clear animus towards different ideas.””

“Purported “proposed Divorce judgment” states “Defendant shall remove his items within 30 days.””

“Purported “proposed divorce judgment” states “Plaintiff shall have primary residency of the minor child.”

“The Defendant is awarded reasonable and regular rights of contact with the minor child, to be at the discretion of the minor child.””

Due process – notice – opportunity to be heard (Source : Response to the Order of Court, United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit No. 24-1718)

“Activities that deprive constitutional rights and human rights are advertent waiver or abandonment of issues (eg., first amendment, due process, human rights) by public servants who do not hold the waiver in regards to rights of others nor do they represent my family and I. An opportunity to be heard was not provided when the life of my father was taken, he is being defamed, and his name is being painted in a false light. When the due process rights of my father were denied, he is being defamed, he is being painted in a false light, and he is unable to defend himself, no family member can defend him. However, when statutes are passed in a government where nobody represents us, we do not have a chance to have our voices heard. When statutes are executed that infringe our constitutional and human rights, we do not have an opportunity to make our side known. When statutes injure my family and I, we are not given a moment to petition for redress without reprisal. When unconstitutional statutes successively impact my family and I causing a swelling and a multiplicity of injuries to suppress my expression, we are not given a window to obtain justice. This appears to be unequal protection under the law.”

“The United States is no respecter of persons or law when such persons or laws run counter to its needs and desires.” (Source : Bond v Floyd cited in Libby v Fecteau)

Julian Bond spoke against incitements. He was retaliated on since by his colleagues.

"After Julian Bond was elected to the Georgia House, he said in a radio interview that he didn't "believe in" the Vietnam War and that it was "hypocritical" to fight for liberty "in other places" but "not guarantee[] liberty to citizens inside the continental United States[.]" ¹⁰ " ...[H]e endorsed a statement that "[t]he murder of Samuel Young in Tuskegee" was "no different than the murder of peasants in Viet Nam". ¹¹ "The United States is no respecter of persons or law when such persons or laws run counter to its needs and desires." ¹² "Before Bond was seated, 75 legislators petitioned that his statements made him unfit for office, including because they brought "discredit and disrespect on the House." ¹³ "When Bond came to the House to be sworn in, "the clerk refused to administer the oath." ¹⁴ "And the Georgia House, by vote of 184 to 12, adopted a resolution prohibiting Bond from taking the oath and serving as his district's representative." ¹⁵

Maine – "outlier" – "an island" (Source : Libby et. al. v Fecteau et. al.)

"Maine is an outlier among the U.S. House and other legislatures, recognizing the "constitutional impediments" to depriving a sitting member of her right to vote. 3 *Deschler's Precedents* Ch.12 §§15-15.1."

Here, "[Ms. Doe 3] is being carved out."

"Travel is [being] impaired by tampering (eg., violent car crash, obstruct safe operation) of family vehicles."

"Her education is being destabilized."

"She was falsely imprisoned in a School 3 [at Lewiston, Maine]. Under the guise of discipline, she was held in a room with an individual doubling as an agent of a school while her parents were not by her side. It was an intimidation method."

"She was exposed to a structure laden with asbestos."

"She is being defamed."

"She receives insults."

"Ms. Doe 3 participated in a "ballet recital". When she and her group were performing, there was laughter from the "rear and left" section of the auditorium "as the group performed". Before and after their "tu[rn]", there was no laughter while participants were performing at the venue. She, her peers, and their teacher prepared for "several months" for the recital."

"Debilitating my ability to earn a livelihood "on my own" affects the stability, strength, and independence of [Ms. Doe 3]. [Her] choices as to shelter, food, health, nutrition ... travel, clothes ... [and] college choices for our child ... will be

incessantly be a handicapped so long as my search to find a livelihood "on my own" is disrupted."

"There were two (2) attempts on the life of Ms. Doe 3."

"Periodical attention to be given to her medical, dental, and vision needs are disrupted."

"She is defamed at masses."

"[Ms. Doe 3's] privacy in her previous and current abodes were and is presently invaded. Her private abode has sources, methods, devices, activities, and/or mechanisms that invade her privacy."

"She is coerced to participate in activities."

"Undue influence [is used] in forcing her to write. A document was manufactured in her computer. She did not create it nor anybody else in our residence."

"Surveillance knows that Ms. Doe 3 is afraid of dogs. Two occasions, at least, a dog was used to intimidate her."

"[U]nconstitutional state [divorce] rules" ¹⁶

"[E]nforcement' of unconstitutional state [divorce] rules was not immunized even if decision to adopt those rules was legislative[.]"

"[I]ndependent authority" - "initiate proceedings" ¹⁷

"As already indicated, § 54-74 gives the Virginia Court independent authority of its own to initiate proceedings against attorneys."

Here, "I am a regular lay person."

"[J]udicial immunity" - does not "absolutely insulate[]" - from "declaratory or injunctive relief" ¹⁸

"[The U.S. Supreme Court] ha[s] never held that judicial immunity absolutely insulates judges from declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to their judicial acts."

"§ 1983 served to pierce" - "the shield of 28 U.S.C. § 2283" - "enforce" - "Fourteenth Amendment against all state action" - "to harass and injure citizens" - "bent upon abrogating federally protected rights" ¹⁹

“Although we did not address the issue, a state judge was among the defendants in *Mitchum v. Foster*, 407 U.S. 225, 92 S.Ct. 2151, 32 L.Ed.2d 705 (1972), where the Court held that § 1983 served to pierce the shield of 28 U.S.C. § 2283 against a federal court enjoining state-court proceedings.”

“The Court did say, quoting from *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, 346, 25 L.Ed. 676 (1880), to this effect, that § 1983 was designed to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment against all state action, whether that action be executive, legislative, or judicial.”

“The Court also noted that the proponents of § 1983 at the time it was enacted insisted that state courts were being used to harass and injure citizens, perhaps because they were powerless to stop deprivations or were in league with those who were bent upon abrogating federally protected rights. 407 U.S., at 242, 92 S.Ct., at 2162.”

Here, “[Ms. Doe 3] was arbitrarily detained in a room[.]” number 5 in Lewiston, Maine.”

“ ... [T]here are no “irreconcilable marital differences”. I indicated during the conference that I am not sure what mediation meant. I intended to get back with an answer after I research what it means. However, it was stated that the court will decide for me whether it will be before the move or after the move. Without full knowledge what mediation meant, I informed the Court that I preferred the mediation after the move.

After having some understanding of what mediation means, I disagree to mediation. I am not in favor of breaking up our marriage, our relationship, and our family. Our marriage can be saved. Our family can be saved.”

“[E]nforcement capacities” ²⁰

“We need not decide whether judicial immunity would bar prospective relief, for we believe that the Virginia Court and its chief justice properly were held liable in their enforcement capacities.”

“ ... [O]nce the court is weaponized ... it has no authority.”

“Virginia Court”, “its members”, “enforcement officers”, “agencies” - “proper defendants” ²¹

“For this reason the Virginia Court and its members were proper defendants in a suit for declaratory and injunctive relief, just as other enforcement officers and agencies were.[.]”

“[I]nherent and statutory enforcement powers” - “immunity” - “does not shield” ²²

“This is not the way the law has developed, and, because of its own inherent and statutory enforcement powers, immunity does not shield the Virginia Court and its chief justice from suit in this case.[.]”

“[D]eclaring unconstitutional” - “enjoining the enforcement” - “of certain state statutes”

"Gerstein v. Pugh, 420 U.S. 103, 95 S.Ct. 854, 43 L.Ed.2d 54 (1975), involved a judgment against state-court judges and a prosecuting official declaring unconstitutional and enjoining the enforcement of certain state statutes."

Here, "I request to have the surveillance be declared unconstitutional.

Any and all regulations, on a local, municipal, state, federal, and international level, citing the foundation upon which the surveillance relies be expressly described void ab initio.

A grant of a request to publish notice in all domestic and international news media outlets, online and physical, that the surveillance is unconstitutional.

Publication will occur for the next 100 years on a daily frequency."

"I request for a permanent injunction on the surveillance. This immediately stops the injuries and a tool of harm."

"[U]nconstitutional" "Florida procedures at issue" - "did not bar" - "injunctive relief" ²⁴

"We affirmed the declaration that the Florida procedures at issue were unconstitutional and held that Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 91 S.Ct. 746, 27 L.Ed.2d 669 (1971), did not bar injunctive relief in the circumstances of the case."

"The Constitution protects all individuals, male or female, married or unmarried, from the abuse of governmental power, even where that power is employed for the supposed benefit of a member of the individual's family." ²⁵

"As a citizen of the Republic of the Philippines, I have human rights. So do my family members.[.]"

"My constitutional and human rights are substantial. My life is substantial regardless of my affluence, influence, features, approved expression, or my belief in "bidder[s]"."

"I am being carved out from my family ... "

"I am being carved out from the Buenaventura family."

"My mother was prevented from speaking to me."

"[Mrs. Buenaventura] was deprived of her due process rights."

"I am being carved out from the Reyes family."

"Protected liberty" "includes" "marriage", "family relationships", "child rearing[,] and

education[.]” “without unjustified government interference” like “coerc[ing]” “a minor” and “inducing” by “misrepresentation”.²⁶

“Protected liberty” “includes 'the interest in independence in making certain kinds of important decisions[.]’” and “personal decisions 'relating to marriage ... family relationships, and child rearing and education.’” “without unjustified government interference” like “coerc[ing]” “a minor” and “inducing [a] teenage girl” by “misrepresentation”.

Attorney Buenaventura was “deprived of his life in [the Philippines], dispossessed of property, and being defamed and painted in false light with the abuse of public resources.”

“My mother was coerced by her Caretaker.” “[Mrs. Buenaventura] was subjected to torture. My mother was coerced to write.” “A video of my mother being insulted, in her undergarments, and sent through a device subject to surveillance shows no regard for her honor.” “Mrs. Buenaventura was manipulated by one whom she trusted to “primum non nocere.” My mother was injured to blackmail me into silence.

“[Ms. Doe 3] is [being] coerced to participate in activities.” “[Ms. Doe 3] is being defrauded.” “Soon after she begun, political undercurrent flowed from [School 4].” “Cyberattack undertaken by a ransomware attacker was a public facade. Surveillance knows who was behind it.” “Agencies built for owners exploit those very same individuals of an education pristine from propaganda.”

“Ms. Doe 2 was defrauded by a businessman.

She was subjected to involuntary servitude [by this businessman].

Surveillance knows Ms. Doe 2 was subjected to forced labor, defrauded, and is being defrauded.

After seeking assistance, nothing was done.”

“Ms. Doe 1 was defrauded. The amount was \$50,000.

She filed for bankruptcy after this event.

Surveillance knows Ms. Doe 1 was defrauded, who defrauded her, and is being defrauded.”

“I am being coerced to participate in activities.” “I am being defrauded.” “My education was (eg., Examsoft) and is being destabilized.” “I am being defamed to the Buenaventura family.” “I am being defamed to the Reyes family.” “I am being carved out from my family, friends, and society.” “My mother was prevented from speaking to me.”

“As my family life is being fractured, I am defrauded to be a front. Being used as utility without valid consent shows no regard for my honor.”

"As these agencies' symbols lead people to believe it serves the public when it does not, these false statements are not corrected."

"Communities created for everyone makes obtaining accurate and complete information unintelligible and elusive to the very same people paying for their salaries, benefits, and economic security."

"The toll on human lives by unreliable intelligence is irreparable. At its hilt, it is lethal."

"... [D]uty requires it to decide a case in conformance with the Constitution ..." ²⁷

"From the obligation of this promise this Court cannot and should not assume any exemption when duty requires it to decide a case in conformance with the Constitution. A willing breach of it would be nothing less than a breach of faith, and no Court that broke its faith with the people could sensibly expect credit for principle in the decision by which it did that."

"... [S]urveillance is an inherently dangerous activity not to mention it is imbued with a far greater capacity for harm (eg., suppression of speech, injuries caused by a car crash, deprivation of due process)."

"Surveillance are authorized by § 1881 (a), 702, and/or other authority. The statutory conditions do not meet constitutional muster. Where judicial authorization may be required, reviewing the factual and documentary genesis of court approval and subsequent processes, conduct, and actions disregard due process. When events mandate Congressional oversight, supervision and directives by the legislature are diminished, if not dismissed."

"Language in the statutory authorities (e.g., "an appropriate[ly] classified matter", "any person known to be in the United States", "any United States person reasonably believed to be located abroad", "authorized intelligence purposes", "connection or interest", "contracts or arrangements for provision of goods or services", "employed by or acting on behalf", "foreign influence", "foreign power", "foreign intelligence", "human experimentation", "intelligence records", "in the interest of national defense or foreign relations", "in the interest of national security", "national security, national defense, and foreign relations", "reasonably believed to be acting on behalf of a foreign power", "research on human subjects", "reveal", and/or "sponsorship of contracts or arrangements") is amorphous and elastic."

"The toll on human lives by unreliable intelligence is irreparable. At its hilt, it is lethal."

"[R]eporting requirements" as to "who the funds are benefiting and what services the funds are supporting." ²⁸

"As the Court of Appeals [for the Third Circuit] observed, "[w]hen a state provides money to a private commercial enterprise, there is a legitimate public interest in informing taxpayers who the funds are benefiting and what services the funds are supporting." "These reporting requirements rationally further this legitimate state interest."

"Destroying a relationship, a marriage, and a family is antithetical to a family division

providing a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of the families. A divorce breaks a family. Needs of families after a divorce no longer exist. Simply there is no longer a family after a divorce. Breaking a relationship, a marriage, and a family is counterintuitive to a family division providing a system of justice that is responsive to the support of their children. Divorce causes substantial expenses (eg., mediation expenses, litigation expenses), damages, and injuries such as irreversible and deleterious effects on individuals, relationships, couples, families, and on children.”

Included in my communication to the Maine Judicial Branch was that “§183. Family Division of District Court of Title 4 : Judiciary Chapter 5 : District Court says in part that "The State Court Administrator shall keep statistical records relating to the cases handled by the Family Division and report this information to the Supreme Judicial Court annually and to the joint standing committee of the Legislature having jurisdiction over judiciary matters by February 15th of each odd-numbered calendar year.”"

“It says that statistical records of cases in the Family Division are reported to the Supreme Judicial Court and the law making body of Maine. I tried looking for these data elsewhere but it looks like it is not available to the general public.”

I inquired if there “[were] statistical records of cases (eg. divorce) in Maine, not subject to federal and state privacy laws, available to the general public? My family members and I suffer "great, immediate, and irreparable loss" from laws and rules that violate our constitutional rights and human rights "even [for] minimal periods of time".”

There was no response.

“Federal government is engaged in racketeering, drug trade, lies, misrepresentations, surveillance, foreign espionage, war crimes, psychological warfare, psychological abuse, torture, terrorism, assassinations, bribery, sexual crimes, hostile activities, weapons of mass destruction, and retaliation at speakers.”

“ ... [G]overnment relied upon by the public to provide defense from hostile activities, international organized crime, terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and foreign espionage, instead "[designs], coordinates, and carries out" these threats. Government trusted by the public to administer justice instead does not warn about, stop immediately, and prevent losses such as "2,977 lives ... lost in the 9/11 attacks"; "415,000 casualties in the Iraq and Afghanistan operations"; "[t]housands of children abused by a religious denomination"; "16,760 women abused by a university in southern California"; "[t]hose with influence and/or their proxy work overtime for adverse interests"; "7,035,337 lives lost due to Covid-19", and deprivation of due process (eg., lives) rights. Government is neither known nor expected to provide a product or service or product and service to solve a quandary in the marketplace, instead "orchestrates" crisis, chaos, confusion, conflicts, and conflagrations to ignite an arms race. Government that expressly states it defends, outwardly symbolizes it administers justice, and has no known product, or service, or product service to solve a deficiency in the market, instead "manipulat[es]" opinion of the public by using resources belonging to the very same employers. This seems a "bizarre" way to govern and earn public trust.”

"Riling up the public, peoples, countries, and regions leads to conflicts and not peace. Conflicts stoking fears foment an arms race."

"Working hard is not selling weapons or influence at the expense of life and limb. Working hard is not selling weapons or influence at the expense of life and limb. It is not part of my [and my family members'] religion to work hard sowing division, rousing fissures in society, and destabilizing to pad a stock (eg., Pfizer, Lockheed Martin) portfolios."

"Theatrics of roles portray a valiant vanquishing a villain and saving a victim. But, behind a curtain of public safety, the U.S. constitution, universal declaration of human rights, and conscience play no role. Credits meanwhile covertly go to piracy, plunder, and pillage to the prejudice of the people."

"[There is a] ... swelling---estimated to be \$ 180 billion by 2010---yearly government-contracted surveillance industry."

"As Congress investigated the torture of Iraqis, the administration "obstructed [the] investigations" for "nearly two months". The executive branch "stonewalled" senators "over dozens of Red Cross reports that document the horrible treatment of Iraqis at American military prisons".

"A newspaper published "detailed report of CIA torture training". Congress was "unwilling to expose" the "human rights violations" of the agency."

"Descriptions of torture were chilling". "Congress did not react".

"March 2003 Working Group memo became policy". Memo shows "an interest" in "using torture" and "evade the criminal consequences of doing so". This was the belief of an observer from Human Rights Watch."

"Budget" of CIA "continued to grow".

"A grant of a request to publish notice in all domestic and international news media outlets, online and physical, that the surveillance is unconstitutional."

"Publication will occur for the next 100 years on a daily frequency."

"I request that the U.S. government publishes and updates daily in all media outlets domestic and international a current list of individuals, legal entities, and foreign nations it employs, contracts, recruits, and/or deceives to deprive constitutional (eg., first amendment, due process) and human rights."

"The executive branch employs and contracts with industries, institutions, legal entities, and individuals. The sectors these are found are in private corporations, entertainment, media, education, and governments."

"When a claim is premised on *legal services* by a licensed attorney that results in

an *injury*, the statute begins from the date of the act or omission.”

“A three (3) year filing limitation applies to an action based on a criminal offense. Criminal offense is defined where there is a victim. [] The action against the offender can be brought by the victim or on behalf of the victim. The running of the statute begins when the victim *discovers* or *reasonably* should have *discovered any profits* from the crime, whichever is later. [] Profits may be property, income, gain, and/or assets derived by committing the crime. It may be property, income, or gain from the sale, conversion, or exchange of proceeds of a crime. Profits may be assets obtained through the use of the unique knowledge garnered during the commission of the crime or in preparation for commission. It includes any property, income, gain, and assets generated from the sale, conversion, or exchange of the proceeds of the crime.”

“I request that the U.S. government publishes and updates daily in all media outlets domestic and international a current total of "ill-gotten wealth" it obtains, retains, and converts from activities where one right of one individual under the U.S. constitution and declaration of human rights is not valued.”

“[R]easonable access to legal materials” - “reasonable opportunity to prepare legal documents.” ²⁹

“Mr. Sillis has raised a viable claim that he is not receiving the "same" treatment. Based on the above-mentioned facts, appellant also has an arguable claim that the Bureau of Prisons has not provided "appropriate resources" for his needs, see 28 C.F.R. Sec. 527.10(a) (1984), and has not provided "reasonable access to legal materials ... and reasonable opportunity to prepare legal documents.””

On June 20, 2025, “ ... [I] request[ed] for an online legal research materials resource without “constitutional impediments” containing the constitution and all laws including but not limited to statutes (eg., legislative history of a statute), rules, regulations, procedures, and local ordinances of the state of Maine. Further, this is to request for an online legal research materials resource without economic and logistical blocks containing all case law in the state courts such as the Superior Courts, District Courts (eg., Family Division), and Supreme Judicial Court.” [Request was denied.] “My family members and I suffer “great, immediate, and irreparable loss” from laws and rules that violate our constitutional rights and human rights “even [for] minimal periods of time”. ””

7th amendment

“The amount of damages exceeds \$20.” “[I] request[ed] for a jury trial.”

8th amendment

“I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living “on my own”. [³⁰] This stemmed from my airing my view. It is ongoing for [nearly (9)] years.” “When I was not retaliated on, "I could find work in two weeks time and the latest one month from the start of a job search. I would select the

better offer. This was in a congested Los Angeles, California job market.”

“I received on October 7, 2025 a “Scheduling Notice” at a “Final Hearing”. It states “[I] must appear” in person.”

“United States government intends to torture”

“Purported “proposed Divorce judgment” states “Defendant shall remove his items within 30 days.””

11th amendment

“Racketeering activities (eg., economic duress, extortion) are administered at me and my family members. Enterprise paid to [“provide a system of justice that is responsive to the needs of families and the support of their children[.]”] [is] commandeered to [silence and extort].”

13th amendment

““[Ms. Doe 3] is subjected to involuntary servitude while she is being deceived.” [][³¹]

“I am being subjected to involuntary servitude while I am being deceived. No consent can be given in forced labor.”

Separation of powers

“United States government tortures that includes physical and psychological coercion.” “A newspaper published “detailed report of CIA torture training”. Congress was “unwilling to expose” the “human rights violations” of the agency.” “Descriptions of torture were chilling”. “Congress did not react”. ““March 2003 Working Group memo became policy”. Memo shows “an interest” in “using torture” and “evade the criminal consequences of doing so”. This was the belief of an observer from Human Rights Watch.” ““Budget” of CIA “continued to grow”.”

“[Peace Corps] striving to spread peace created by the late President John F. Kennedy whose due process (eg., 1st amendment, 5th amendment) rights and human (eg., article 3, article 19) rights were deprived by the intelligence community which has an oath to defend the constitution, an allegiance to preserve the United States, and a duty to protect the commander-in-chief, says it does not trust and has no confidence in the intelligence community.”

““Article 1 of the [C]onvention [against Torture]” says that “torture” as “any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purpose as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession.”

The broad definition of torture “adopted” by the United Nations General Assembly was “narrowed down” by the U.S. government.

“Psychological torture” became “a crime only if”

- a) "there is a specific intent to cause";
- b) "prolonged mental ... such as post traumatic stress disorder solely by";
- c) "committing one of the four forms of mental torture (with threats or drugs) specified in the 1994 law."

"Government uses "rendition" to move human beings where they are tortured. These locations are in Morocco, Jordan, Thailand, Diego Garcia Island, Bagram air base, and other secret CIA interrogation locations.

Geneva Conventions require "registration numbers" to be assigned to detainees. Registration numbers were not given to "ghost detainees". It was a request by a director of an agency. The Secretary of Defense granted it. Without the "registration numbers", the International Committee of the Red Cross could not "reach" these "ghost detainees".

"Here, Mrs. Buenaventura was a teacher. She was a wife. She was my mother. She was tortured. It occurred in her own home.

My father's name is being defamed. His name is being cast in a false light. "[Ms. Doe 3's] education is being destabilized. She lost School 2 that she loved. It was to threaten expression not liked." "An attempt was made on my life. A vehicle was used." "My mother was prevented from speaking to me." "On March 2022, my mother's due process rights (eg., life) was denied. A few days after, Ms. Doe 3 and I went to a supermarket to get flowers for her. Psychological warfare activity was administered through a conduit as soon as we arrived at the location [of Walmart in Auburn, Maine]." "I was given a vaccine without full, funding, timely, and transparent disclosures of the origin of the virus." "My family and I are exposed to racketeering activities (eg. bribery, economic duress[, extortion])." "Threats are made to dissuade speech."

"I receive threats." "... [R]acketeering ... begun in earnest years before one paper was submitted." "On November 7, 2021, a message on my iPhone flashed saying "... to commit suicide ...". "I received a message from a "source" who said "... you are dead ...". Some recent examples of blackmail are : "I will soon be homeless." I will soon be living in a region of "warm" weather. "[Bar license] was [again] converted to extort silence[.]" by a counsel." Threat of changing Ms. Doe 3's name was made before a hearing conducted through an alternative method started.

"In the intervening time, I am forced to litigate an action that has no merit. I am coerced to agree to mediation where fees range between of \$3,000 to \$8,000. I am compelled to agree that our marriage can not be saved even when there are no "irreconcilable marital differences". I am forced to agree to the destruction of my family."

"Family unity is being held hostage to impede the vindication of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment, 5th amendment, 8th amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19, article 3, article 5) and that of my family members."

Bill of attainder

"I spoke against overtime shaving. I am retaliated on since."

“ ... United States government retaliates at those who report on government “failures”.”

“Administrative Procedure Act

“It is not clear how specifically Congress authorized the regulation of speech.”

“Should there be any delegation of such authority, there is no notice as to who are conferred with the authority to suppress speech.” “Curtailling expression has a magnitude of consequences that crosses not only state lines but jurisdictions of other sovereign nations.”

“Massaging messages opposes truth.” “Suppression of speech is outside of any expertise found in governance.”

“Managing families is not inside the bounds of agency/ies. Permitting component/s to drive where families are involved results in violence [] to silence (e.g., violent car crash where my family was in). [] Subterfuge activities with altruistic fronts fracture families. Care for children is not in the sphere of knowledge of agencies especially those who are supposed to protect. With extraordinary power of surveillance, children are abused by a religious denomination for decades. [] Additionally, knowing my family members were occupants of my vehicle, a car crashed violently unto mine. Watching for the welfare of women is not within the parameters of civil service. While sovereign nations and 34 other foreign leaders are surveilled [], at least 16,760 patients [] were abused for nearly thirty (30) years [] at a university by a campus gynecologist. [] Balance is not part of the spokes of skills within a public sector and that which is expected to be blind to favors, fears, funds [or affluence, influence, favored speech, belief in bidders], and immutable features. Seizure [], preview of communications [], secret arrests [], closed judicial proceedings [] (eg., ex parte communications []), secret trials [], secret punishment [], infecting media [], and funneling a forum transpire.”

“Major questions doctrine requires laws to be unambiguous.”

“It prevents exploitation of “... some gap, ambiguity, or doubtful expression in Congress'[s] statutes to assume responsibilities far beyond those the people's representatives actually conferred on them.” [] It is doubtful duties such as restrictions on expression, press, and/or the 'right to know' cohere with the U.S. constitution, Geneva Conventions, and international laws.”

Here, “[i]t is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference.” It is error to dismiss the appeal].

“There has been no [writ of certiorari] before the [] US Supreme Court in which [“irreconcilable marital differences” (hereinafter called the law)] is being exploited by a “public sector” that “is expected to be blind” and “balance[d]”. There is substantial impact on humanity when there are administrations of “secret trials” and imposition of “secret punishment[s]”. [][Dismissal] of the appeal [] is “not fungible” under our [US] Constitution [(eg., 1st, 5th)]”. Whenever the [law] is harnessed to “orchestrate” a racketeering activity (eg., economic duress[, extort]), it is [a] weighty question of law. At the instance when a[civil] process is being used to [extort], the [Court] is without jurisdiction. There was no hearing before the appeal was d[ismissed]. [Dismissal] of the appeal was not supported by the weight of the evidence. The [Supreme Judicial Court] did not provide any proof leading to and at its [dismissal]. [Dismissal] was not proper in light of entire record.

[Law] being deployed to “create” racketeering activities (eg., extortion) is without stoppage. [] There were no facts and/or documents provided by the [Supreme Judicial Court] in its [dismissal]. [Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when there is “deception of deleting the Response, Complaint, and file storage [that] happened before any discovery[.]”, denied me a meaningful opportunity to be heard. [Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when “[s]urveillance, suppression, schemes of reprisal (eg., racketeering), and concealment begun in earnest years before one paper was submitted[.]”, denied a “fair chance to be heard on the question[s]”. [Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when “[a] person who decides to go through these activities more likely than not is hiding a basket full of balls from the Court[.]” resulting into “justice [not be] served[.]”, denied me a meaningful opportunity to be heard. [] Results of the [dismissal] are unjust. []”

““[N]ecessary” - “understanding” – “case” – “ruling”

Legible copies of documents and information that are necessary for the complete understanding of my [my appeal were submitted to [the Supreme Judicial Court]. Whereas, there was only a [dismissal] from the [Court]. It was not accompanied with documents and information that are necessary for my complete understanding of the case. I did not find any documents and information included that are necessary for my complete understanding of the [dismissal].

A [“Special anti-SLAPP motion”] was submitted to the [Lewiston District Court]. It was [“effectively denied”]. A[n “Appeal as of Right – Special Anti-SLAPP Motion”] was submitted [on “May 27, 2025].

[]”

“Hearing

But, not one (1) hearing [on “Special Anti-SLAPP motion”] occurred.”

“Transcript

Since there was no hearing [on “Special Anti-SLAPP motion”], there could be no transcript of the proceedings.”

“Obstruction of justice

There are “[m]anufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities [(eg., “theater of” “crisis, chaos, confusion, conflicts, and conflagrations)]... ” These are to “cover up negligent[, or] wrongful act or omission.” It is part of an enterprise-wide “ ... dilatory activities hindering the orderly prosecution of claims and obstructing arrival at a decision aim[ing] to statutorily bar the claims of those retaliated on and their families.”

[]

[]

[]”

“Federal subject matter jurisdiction

Federal Tort Claim Act claims

“My communications devices should not be subjected to trespass.”

“Typically, an employer has no liability for his/her independent contractor. However, surveillance is an inherently dangerous activity not to mention it is imbued with a far greater capacity for harm (eg., suppression of speech, injuries caused by a car crash, deprivation of due process).” “A federal official's act of suppression of speech and retaliatory activities for dissenting is outside of the scope of responsibilities of any government employee.”

“I have a legally protected interest to be free from assault, battery, conversion ... interference with prospective advantage ... nuisance, trespass to chattel ... These claims invoke federal question jurisdiction.[]”

Breach of fiduciary duty

“The impact of the violations are more significant because these are being committed by those who have a fiduciary duty to the beneficiaries of the public resources who entrusted them for legitimate use. The disregard for the U.S. constitution and other foreign nations' sovereignty binds participants in the U.S. jurisdiction and extraterritorial jurisdictions.” “Yet, the dilatory activities hindering the orderly prosecution of claims and obstructing arrival at a decision aim to statutorily bar the claims of those retaliated on and their families. Those who have a statutory duty to abide by the U.S. constitution among others do not adhere to these laws to the extent of creating the perils (eg., infringement of rights, racketeering, conflagrations, attempts on lives of others) they have a duty to prevent and protect the people from. Consequences of the disregard for the constitution do not affect one company. Rather, the magnitude of effects cascades across a nation they have a duty to defend and preserve.”

Trespass to chattel

“My laptops, computers, and/or cellular phones as well as laptops, computers, and/or cellular phones I use are subjected to hacking, eavesdropping, bugging, wiretapping, video surveillance, and/or audio surveillance.”

Trespass to land

“My private residence, past and present, had/has sources, methods, devices, activities, and/or mechanisms that invaded/es my privacy.” “My residence, past and present, was and is subject to trespass.”

Intentional infliction of emotional distress

"My best interests (eg., whole human development) are held hostage to conceal misconduct."

"Working hard is not selling weapons or influence at the expense of life and limb. It is not part of my religion to work hard sowing division, rousing fissures in society, and destabilizing to pad a stock (eg., Pfizer, Lockheed Martin) portfolios. It is not part of my routine to zealously work at being an instrument of incitement in a family, other families, a community, other communities, a country, other countries, and planet to distract from wrongdoing. My religious and family life value life."

"I went to New York with family in August 2017. While we were in a subway to catch a train, a gentleman whom I did not know came up to me. He said, "Watch your back.""

On November 7, 2021, a message on my iPhone flashed saying "... to commit suicide ..."

"On November 12, 2021, caretaker of my mother told me via Viber that police went to my mother's house. They asked for my father. They were looking for a gun that my father purportedly owned. According to them, the gun is active. She told them that my father passed away. People were curious in my mother's neighborhood why police was in her home. This is an example of defamation to my father's name. There is no decency in retaliating at a deceased family member, an octogenarian family member, and her household to suppress my speech."

"Week following November 12, 2021, I sent inquiries."

"Surveillance knew about inquiries that were to be sent the week after."

"On March 2022, my mother's due process rights (eg., life) was denied. A few days after, Ms. Doe 3 and I went to [Walmart at Auburn, Maine] to get flowers for her. Psychological warfare activity was administered through a conduit as soon as we arrived at the location."

"Even though a human being has a right to expression (eg., against overtime shaving), I am being punished. Fracturing my family and injuring them is a form of punishment more so when feigned as magnanimity by an enterprise that flourishes in discord."

"Ms. Doe 3 could elect to be in honors class in Mathematics, English, Science, and History because of her qualifying grades in a previous year. Upon conferring, we decided that Ms. Doe 3 would be enrolled in honors class. Directions on July 16, 2023 were electronically mailed to School 4 that Mathematics, English, Science, and History are to be taken as honors. She was enrolled in History (honors) only. She was excluded from the honors class in the subjects of Mathematics, English, and Science. She was only included in honors by School 4 on November 17, 2023. It is 93 days late from August 16, 2023. This leaves her with 27 calendar days to complete projects in Mathematics, English, and Science. These projects directly impact final grades. It is likely other students in the honors classes who started on August 16, 2023 have

120 calendar days, a fair opportunity, to submit their projects.”

“As a result of my communications being chilled, I bought an IBM Personal Wheelwriter in [March] 2021. The electric typewriter cost \$ 481.90. The product was returned for a partial refund of \$275. When I was providing my payment information, I was given a message that my name will be 'trashed'.”

“On May 21, 2021, I received a voicemail from a Stogiang. The automated message said it was a collect call originating from men's central jail. The caller was an inmate.”

“On the same day, I received another voicemail. The automated message stated it was a collect call from a correctional facility. The caller was an offender.”

“On July 26, 2021, a caretaker sent a video to me via Viber. She was talking down to my mother in the video. She said “ ... supalpal ng ubas ... ” while feeding my mother with grapes.”

“Some Viber texts sent from caretaker were deleted.” “Viber application of Caretaker is not available as the device is no longer operable. Her [(Caretaker's)] phone number changed.”

“My home, past and present, is subject to trespass. My communications devices are subject to surveillance.”

“In November 5, 2021, my laptop was damaged. Right, rear corner was torn off.”

“Handwritten, electronic mailed, and/or typewritten correspondences are forged and/or manufactured.”

“One example is that “[a]n electronic mail was manufactured in my email buenaventura888@sbcglobal.net. It contained the word “egoy”.”

“An electronic mail was manufactured dated July 17, 2017. It supposedly originated from my mother and addressed to me. She received a brown envelope. I did not send any package.”

“An electronic mail was manufactured. It was asking for assistance in installing Meeple. I did not inquire about a Meeple.”

“An electronic mail was manufactured. It was asking for assistance in terms of Animal Jam Club membership. I did not inquire about a membership.”

“An account was opened in Adobe using my personal electronic mail. A document was manufactured in it.”

“I am being carved out from my family, friends, and society.”

“My mother was prevented from speaking to me.”

“I am being carved out from my community.”

“Economic duress is being applied. I have been unable to find a job “on my own”. This impairs a complete, well-rounded, and personal development that includes a good education.”

“Ms. Doe 3 is being brainwashed.”

“An example is that she would become an orphan. This occurred in School 2.”

“[Second] example is that this country is for “peace and justice”. [] [32] It is a skit so “stocks” “surge”. “US military equipment sales” increased to “\$318.7 billion”, by “29%”, “in 2024”. [] [33] [Third] example is that this country is “mov[ing] toward a world in which all people are at last free to determine their own destiny”. [] [34] It is a show to gain trust and confidence of its citizens, people, and sovereign nations to exploit their resources (eg., lives, constitutional rights, human rights, territorial integrity).”

Fraud

“There was a seizure of data of School 4 that occurred in 2020. Ms. Doe 3 was attending School 4 in 2020. Cyberattack undertaken by a ransomware attacker was a public facade. Surveillance knows who was behind it.”

“Ms. Doe 2 was defrauded by a businessman.”

“She was subjected to involuntary servitude.”

“Surveillance knows Ms. Doe 2 was subjected to forced labor, defrauded, and is being defrauded.”

“After seeking assistance, nothing was done.”

“Ms. Doe 1 was defrauded. The amount was \$50,000.”

“She filed for bankruptcy after this event.”

“Surveillance knows Ms. Doe 1 was defrauded, who defrauded her, and is being defrauded.”

“123 countries are parties to the Rome statute.”

“Governments of the United States, Russia, and China are not state parties.”

“The persona the United States government portrays itself in the domestic and international theatre is inapposite to its decision to be a non-party to the Rome statute

and its clear outcome.”

“The statute grants jurisdiction over citizens of member states for allegations of “genocide”, “war crimes”, “crimes against humanity” (eg., large-scale attacks against civilian populations including murder, rape, imprisonment, slavery, torture), and “crimes of aggression”.”

“Enterprising self-enrichment from resources belonging to others perpetuated in perpetuity is palpable in the prejudice (eg., terrorism) to people across the planet. It's proclivity in publicity road shows is a reflection of its being above the law (eg., U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, sovereignty of nations).

[]

Example two (2) is a United Nations resolution. Title was “Combating the Glorification of Nazism, Neo-Nazism, and other Practices that Contribute to Fueling Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance.” One hundred sixteen (116) countries “supported” the resolution. Fifty-four (54) countries “rejected” the resolution. Eleven (11) countries “abstained”. Government of this country was against it. Resolution “strongly condemns the use in educational settings of educational materials and rhetoric that promulgate racism, discrimination, hatred and violence on the basis of ethnic origin, nationality, religion, and belief[.]” Document “rejects the glorification and propaganda of Nazism.” It seeks to accomplish “preserv[ation]” of “historical truth”, calls for “concrete measures” against the “denial of the crimes against humanity” and “to prevent the revisionism in respect to the Second World War.” [] [³⁵]

Abuse of process

“Communication devices I used and I am using are surveilled. My residence, past and current, was and is subject to trespass to land.” “My education and growth are actively being damaged. I am unable to find a livelihood “on my own”. “Threats [(eg., I will soon be living in a region of “warm” weather.)] are being made. There was an attempt on my life.” “It is intentional because the activities are intended to damage my personal development and having solid economic stability.” “It is intentional because the activities are to administer racketeering activities.”

“Manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities sully the integrity thereof is/are not legitimate use of public property. Assets that belong to the public are not meant to be misused to cover up negligent[, or] wrongful act or omission. Dilatory activities, on personal and/or political grounds, were not intended in acquisition of tools belonging to an employer.”

Here, [“[i]t is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference.” It is error to dismiss the appeal].

There has been no [writ of certiorari] before [] the US Supreme Court in which [“irreconcilable marital differences” (hereinafter called the law)] is being abused to actively damage my [constitutional rights

and human rights]. There is significant effect on human beings when tools belonging to an employer are misused for dilatory activities to impinge on constitutional rights. [] [Dismissal] of the appeal [] conflicts with the US constitution (eg., 8th amendment). Whenever a [law] is employed to “coordinate” a racketeering activity (eg., extortion), it is a complicated question of law. At the moment when a[civil] process is being used to [extort], the [Court] is without jurisdiction. A hearing did not occur before the appeal was d[ismissed]. [Dismissal] of the appeal was not supported by the weight of evidence. The [Supreme Judicial Court] did not provide any support leading to and at its [dismissal]. [Dismissal] was not proper in light of the record as a whole.

[Law] being launched to “create” racketeering activities (eg., extortion) is without stoppage. [] There were no facts and/or documents provided by the [Supreme Judicial Court] in its [dismissal]. [Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when “[i]ndividuals enter my private residence, past and present, without consent[.]”, my laptop was not broken when we left our dwelling on August 11, 2025, upon our return its “[r]ight, rear corner was [found] torn off[.]”, and the part that was destroyed was similar to “my laptop [that] was damaged[.]” on “November 5, 2021”, effectively excluded me from the Court and from obtaining timely relief. [] Consequences of [dismissal] are unjust. []

“[N]ecessary” - “understanding” - “case” - “ruling”

Please see discussion under “[N]ecessary” - “understanding” - “case” - “ruling” supra.

Hearing

Please see discussion under Hearing supra.

Transcript

Please see discussion under Transcript supra.

Obstruction of justice

Please see discussion under Obstruction of Justice supra.

[]

[]

[]”

“Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) - 5 U.S.C. § 552

“Documents and/or information were improperly withheld. Recourse available has been exhausted.”

Here, “[i]t is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference.” It is error to dismiss the appeal].

There has been no [writ of certiorari] before [] the US Supreme Court in which the [law] is being weaponized against a[n individual and his family], whose father was deprived his due process (eg., life) rights, and whose deceased father's name is being defamed and painted in a false light. There has been no [writ of certiorari] before [] the US Supreme Court in which the [law] is being instrumentalized against an [individual and his family], “[c]hronology of events supports an inference of retaliation[.]”, and a typewritten letter was sent to Natalie Wood dated June 11, 2021 stating that “my family and I” “are [being] retaliated on” “for more than 5 years.” There is substantial impact on humanity when resources publicly owned are misused “to advance and promote interests that are personal, pecuniary, pillaging, and/or political [.][(eg., bribery, economic duress)]” and to harm others (eg., constitutional rights and human rights).” There is significant impact on humanity when an “apparatus created for the people who own it is used to deprive those very same employers of their lives.” [] In defending myself and my family, I requested “for an online “legal research materials” resource without “constitutional impediments” containing the constitution and all laws including but not limited to statutes (eg., legislative history of statutes), rules, regulations, procedures, and local ordinances of the state of Maine.” “Further, [I] request[ed] for an online “legal research materials” resource without economic and logistical blocks containing all case law in the state courts such as the Superior Courts, District Courts (eg., Family Division), and Supreme Judicial Court.” [Request was denied.] [] [Dismissal] of the appeal [] conflicts with US constitution (eg., bill of attainder). Whenever a rule is deployed to “carry out” a racketeering activity (eg., economic duress), it is an important question of law. At the instance when a[civil] process is being used to [extort], the [Court] is without jurisdiction. No hearing occurred before the appeal was [dismissed]. [Dismissal] of the appeal was not supported by the weight of the evidence. The [Supreme Judicial Court] did not provide a support leading to its [dismissal]. [Dismissal] was not proper in light of the whole record.

[Law] being enlisted to “coordinate” racketeering activities (eg., extortion) is without cessation. [] There were no facts and/or documents provided by the [Court] in its [dismissal]. [Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when “[s]urveillance, suppression, schemes of reprisal (eg., racketeering), and concealment begun in earnest years before one paper was submitted[.]”, left me with no “adequate vehicle for the complete and prompt resolution of the issues”. [Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when “[a]n activity [that] occurred between December 2016 and January 2017, while we were out-of-town ... was made to appear as “burglary”[.]”, denied my day to be heard. [] Effects of [dismissal] are unjust. []

“[N]ecessary” - “understanding” – “case” – “ruling”

Please see discussion under “[N]ecessary” - “understanding” – “case” – “ruling” supra.

Hearing

Please see discussion under Hearing supra.

Transcript

Please see discussion under Transcript supra.

Obstruction of justice

There are “[m]anufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities [(eg., “[f]ormulating [] manufactured emergency as policy”)]... ” “[Ms. Doe 3] was arbitrarily detained in a room[.]” number 5 in Lewiston, Maine. These are to “cover up negligent[, or] wrongful act or omission.” It is part of an enterprise-wide “ ... dilatory activities hindering the orderly prosecution of claims and obstructing arrival at a decision aim[ing] to statutorily bar the claims of those retaliated on and their families.”

[]

[]

[]”

“Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) - 50 U.S.C. §§ 1801-1813

“These phrases [(eg., “foreign power”, “agent of foreign power”)] may give a person carte blanche with unrestrained discretion to ascribe any definition. Preview of communications precludes prior publication of perspectives in contrast.”

Here, “[i]t is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference.” It is error to dismiss the appeal].

There has been no [writ of certiorari] before [] the US Supreme Court in which the [law] is being abused against me as an [individual], my family and I are under “surveillance ... authorized by § 1881 (a), 702, and/or other authority[.]”, the statutory conditions of which “do not meet constitutional muster[.]”, and “concealment is one of the objects of the surveillance.” There is substantial impact on humanity when “[c]ommunities created for everyone makes obtaining accurate and complete information unintelligible and elusive to the very same people paying for their salaries, benefits, and economic security.” [] In defending myself and my family, I requested “for an online “legal research materials” resource without “constitutional impediments” containing the constitution and all laws including but not limited to statutes (eg., legislative history of statutes), rules, regulations, procedures, and local ordinances of the state of Maine.” “Further, [I] request[ed] for an online “legal research materials” resource without economic and logistical blocks containing all case law in the state courts such as the Superior Courts, District Courts (eg., Family Division), and Supreme Judicial Court.” [Request was denied.] [Dismissal] of the appeal [],[] conflicts with US constitution (eg., 4th amendment). “An activity occurred [in our abode in California] between December 2016 and January 2017, while we were out-of-town. It was made to appear as 'burglary'.” “My education was (eg., Examsoft) and is being destabilized.” Whenever a [law] is deployed to “carry out” a racketeering activity (eg., economic duress), it is an important question of law. At a time when a[civil] process is being used to [extort], the [Court] is without jurisdiction. A hearing did not occur before the appeal was [dismissed]. The [Supreme Judicial Court] did not provide a support leading to its decision. [Dismissal] was not proper in light of the record as a whole.

[Law] being covertly used to “[orchestrate]” racketeering activities (eg., extortion) by an enterprise is without cessation. Government “is expect[ed] to comply with its heightened duty of candor in ex parte proceedings at all times.” But, “frequent[ly]” it makes “unsupported” “representations”, makes “representations” “contradicted by information in their possession”, “withh[o]ld[s] information

detrimental to their case[.]” to the extent it “exaggerated” the “corroborat[ion]” of a “report[.]”, and “falsely represented” a “report[.]” “had been used in criminal proceedings”, in “proceedings” “in which the government does not face an adverse party.” [Dismissal of the appeal] had no legal basis. There were no facts and/or documents provided by the [Supreme Judicial Court] in its [dismissal].

[Dismissal] recorded no concern that the [dismissal] of the appeal, when I am being tortured wherein “[my and each of my family member's] choices (eg. shelter, food, health, nutrition, car repairs, travel, clothes, school choice, university choices, self-improvement, ability to save for a rainy day, retirement) [are] continuously be[ing] debilitated as ... my search to earn a livelihood is [being] disrupted[.]” “indefinitely”³⁶, I have been receiving threats (eg., “ ... as long as [Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura was] healthy ... ”, deprived me of my right to petition the government for grievances. [] Effects of [dismissal] are unjust. []

“[N]ecessary” - “understanding” - “case” - “ruling”

Please see discussion under “[N]ecessary” - “understanding” - “case” - “ruling” supra.

Hearing

Please see discussion under Hearing supra.

Transcript

Please see discussion under Transcript supra.

Obstruction of justice

“[D]efendants know by use of surveillance my family members and I are not national security threats. They know by utilizing surveillance that my family members and I are not involved in foreign and/or domestic espionage, terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, international organized crime, and other hostile activities. Yet, with this knowledge defendants manufacture and spoliage documents, activities, tangibles articles, and electronically stored information.” “One of the purposes of the manufacturing and/or spoliation activities is to cover up the civil torts, crimes, civil conspiracies, criminal conspiracies, statutory rights violations, constitutional rights violations, Geneva Convention violations, and/or human rights violations being committed and/or committed against me and my family members.” “Abuse of power (eg., racketeering activities) is dutifully marshalled to “conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error”; “prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency” or “prevent or delay the release of information that does not require protection in the interest of national security”.”

[]

[]

[]”

“Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization Act (RICO)”

"Enterprise exists consisting of individuals, legal entities, educational institutions, institutions, companies, contractors, components, agencies, departments, and/or governments. Prescribing speech is not a lawful goal. Retaliating at [a] person whose viewpoint is covertly circumscribed is deceitful. A human being has an inalienable right to express a side to a topic. Activities such as injuring me are undertaken in furtherance of preventing participation.

Racketeering activity such as attempted murder (violent car crash); threat of murder; an act of murder; arson; bribery; extortion; dealing in obscene matter; fraud and related activity in connection with access devices; wire fraud; obstruction of justice; tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant; retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant; forgery; slavery; economic espionage and theft of trade secrets; interference with commerce; use of interstate commerce facilities in murder-for-hire; sexual exploitation of children; biological weapons; and/or chemical weapons injure my family. The structured operations are harming my person, name, chattels, real property, and prospective advantage to discourage debate."

18 U.S.C. § 1512 - Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant

"18 U.S.C. § 1512 prohibits the use of intimidation, harassment, threats [eg., "... to commit suicide ...", I will soon be homeless)] or physical force, including killing or attempts to kill, that is aimed at affecting the presentation of evidence in official proceedings or at impeding the communications of information to law enforcement officers."

"Defamation of my name, painting my name in a false light, trespass to my property, conversion of my chattels, trespass to my residence, my residence subject to a nuisance, execution of intentional infliction of emotional distress on my person, economic duress, battery on my person, assault on my person, my arbitrary detention, my rendition to another state, my involuntary servitude, damaging my personal development, threats on me, defrauding me, an attempt on my life, and violations of my constitutional rights are retaliatory methods in preventing my expression."

"An act of attempted murder is a racketeering activity."

"Documents, electronically stored information, tangible articles, and/or activities are knowingly and deliberately altered, mutilated, concealed, manufactured, and/or destroyed."

"Agencies whose symbols impress it is about public service harm the public. The harm is severe, if not deadly, when discussions differ. When negligence, omission, wrongful conduct, and/or misconduct occur, "secret silence" [] is the solution. "Public misinformation" [] occurs simultaneously or shortly after. There is service but it is not to the public. These symbols are false statements."

"An enterprise of at least two individuals has a meeting of the minds to commit acts. These acts range from and in no way limited to surveillance, stifling dialogue, suppression in subterfuge, and racketeering operations. Overt acts being done in military precision and timing are in furtherance of vilifying varying viewpoints. Concrete steps are made to advance misprision." "The government need not know that each conspirator knew of or had contact with all other members." ³⁷

Activities under this provision involves extraterritorial federal jurisdiction."

18 U.S.C. § 1832 -Theft of trade secrets

"I am seeking redress for the activities that are being "[choreographed], coordinated, and carried out" to injure."

"There is an intent to convert and thereafter alter, destroy, replicate, transmit, and communicate information about me. My name being defamed and painted in a false light, my personal property being subjected to trespass, my chattels being converted, my real property being subjected to trespass, my abode being subjected to nuisance, my person being subjected to intentional infliction of emotional distress, my constitutional rights being violated, my false imprisonment, my being defrauded, my prospective advantage being interfered with, my kidnapping, my surveillance, threats on me, and my involuntary servitude do not provide economic benefit to my name. None of which, I gave authorization to. Rather, pecuniary gain goes to the enterprise. Pecuniary gain converts to exchange of proceeds, sale, exchanges, income, and/or transmuted to a different asset courtesy of the unique knowledge afforded by surveillance. Meanwhile, wrongdoing, omission, and misconduct are walled off. Plus, defense/s are manufactured through insight obtained by eavesdropping.

My information and data are appropriated without authorization to knowingly prevent a point of view from being public."

18 U.S.C. § 1343 - Fraud by wire, radio, or television

"The enterprise transmits representations, payments, and/or receipts by [internet], wire, radio, and/or television. All of which are channels of interstate and foreign commerce. Bribery, economic duress, and/or extortion, to name a few racketeering activities, affect a financial institution.

Pertinent communications are concealed by the abuse of privilege/s, confidentiality agreement/s, claim/s of immunity, and/or exemptions. Thus, predicate acts (eg., bribery) are multiplied."

Here, "[i]t is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference." It is error to dismiss the appeal].

Please see discussion under Administrative Procedure Act supra.

"[N]ecessary" - "understanding" - "case" - "ruling"

Please see discussion under "[N]ecessary" - "understanding" - "case" - "ruling" supra.

Hearing

Please see discussion under Hearing supra.

Transcript

Please see discussion under Transcript supra.

Obstruction of justice

“There is surveillance on me and my family members.” “ ... [G]overnment contracts [awarded] [“to Lockheed Martin”] totaling \$485.5 billion...” for surveillance. “Pecuniary gain [to enterprise] converts to exchange of proceeds, sale, exchanges, income, and/or transmuted to a different asset courtesy of the unique knowledge afforded by surveillance. Meanwhile, wrongdoing, omission, and misconduct are walled off. Plus, defense/s are manufactured through insight obtained by eavesdropping.”

“Documents, electronically stored information, tangible articles, and/or activities are knowingly and deliberately altered, mutilated, concealed, manufactured, and/or destroyed.”

[]

[]

[]”

“Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964 -Title VI, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq.

“Departments are federally funded.”

“Carving out my family and I by way of flushing forums with falsities is not inclusion in an activity. Subjecting my communication devices to surveillance to subvert my right to express myself and my right to receive timely, complete, and accurate information discriminates against a race.” “Extreme and outrageous activities clinically causing severe emotional distress for the purpose of nullifying my human right to opine on my own discriminates against those who came from an archipelago.” “Deprivation of a well-rounded personal development with no destabilization to constrain an outlook from being seen in the horizon is not acceptance of a perspective from the Philippines.” “Applying economic duress on me to compel conformity to a secret script is not inclusive of differences of opinion. Cacophony of threats “[conceptualized], coordinated, and carried” out to chill communications excludes a human being from participating. Subjecting me to involuntary servitude to subdue a contrast in speech is not fulfilling “equal justice under law”. “Marketplace of views is federally permeated.”

Perfect statement of legal theory not required

“A complaint does not require a “perfect ‘statement of the legal theory supporting the claim[s] asserted’.” ³⁸

Heightened pleading rule not required

“Invoking § 1983 in a complaint does not require a plaintiff seeking redress for violations of constitutional rights to hurdle a “heightened pleading”. ³⁹

42 U.S.C. § 1988

“Confers jurisdiction on district Courts for the protection, vindication, and enforcement of civil

rights of all persons in the United States in conformity with laws of the United States. Gapfillers for deficiencies will be provided by common law. Common law must be consistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States.”

Here, I spoke against overtime shaving. I am retaliated on since. Expression is a civil right. Since my speech, my family and I are retaliated on. My family and I are subjected to surveillance (eg., first amendment). Retribution consists of deprivation of constitutional (eg., due process, first amendment, livelihood) and human rights of my family members, both living and deceased. Racketeering (eg., bribery) is part and parcel of activities to silence. United States adheres to the human rights declaration and Geneva Conventions.

42 U.S.C. § 1983

“Every person who under color of any statute [eg., FISA, divorce law]...of any State...subjects, or causes...any citizen of the United States or [the] other person within the jurisdiction thereof to deprivation of any rights...secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress.”

Here, I expressed a side to a directive to shave overtime. I am retaliated on since. I am a subject of surveillance. So are my family members. It is an activity that deprives my and family members' rights under the constitution and declaration of human rights. We are being injured. I am seeking redress at law and in equity.

42 U.S.C. § 1985

(2)

“If two or more persons in any State conspire to deter, by force, intimidation, or threat, any party of witness in any court of the United States from attending such Court freely, fully, and truthfully or if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of the laws or to injure him or his property for lawfully enforcing or attempting to enforce, the right of any person, or class of persons to the equal protection of the laws...[and] if one or more persons engage therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercised any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against one or more of the conspirators.”

Here, the nature, extent, duration, and depth of the threats demonstrate there are at least two individuals carrying out the activities to silence speech. Activities to suppress began in earnest years before a complaint was penned. Impediments to my seeking relief for myself and family are voluminous, various, vicious, violent, and depraved (eg., due process). Taken together the events show an intent to deny constitutional rights (eg., carving out expression, exclusion from family, unequal treatment) and human rights. When I looked up contact information of an agency, an attempt on my life and family members' lives was executed. A vehicle was used.

(3)

If two or more persons in any state or territory conspire or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons [eg., suppression of speech] of equal protection of the laws...[and] if one or more persons engage therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercised any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against one or more of the conspirators.

Here, my family and I belong to a group of persons whose equal protection under the constitution (eg., first amendment, carved out, exclusion, unequal treatment) and declaration of human rights are deprived (eg., article 7, article 18, article 19). We are being injured as a result of my expression. I am not a U.S. citizen. As a citizen of the Republic of the Philippines, I have human rights. So do my family members.

Further, "[i]t is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference." It is error to dismiss the appeal].

Please see discussion under Administrative Procedure Act supra.

"[N]ecessary" - "understanding" - "case" - "ruling"

Please see discussion under "[N]ecessary" - "understanding" - "case" - "ruling" supra.

"Hearing"

But, not one (1) hearing [on "Special Anti-SLAPP motion"] occurred."

"Transcript"

Since there was no hearing [on "Special Anti-SLAPP motion"], there could be no transcript of the proceedings."

Obstruction of justice

"Speech which is disfavored results in retaliation. The reprisal is a pattern. It is industrial in scale.

The manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities sully/ies the integrity thereof.

One of the purposes of the manufacturing and/or spoliation activities is to cover up the civil torts, crimes, civil conspiracies, criminal conspiracies, statutory rights violations, constitutional rights violations, Geneva Convention violations, and/or human rights violations being committed and/or committed against me and my family members."

[]

[]

[]”

“War Crimes Act

“Federal government is engaged in racketeering, drug trade, lies, misrepresentations, surveillance, foreign espionage, [genocide,] war crimes, [crimes against humanity, crimes of aggression,] psychological warfare, psychological abuse, torture, terrorism, assassinations, bribery, sexual crimes, hostile activities, weapons of mass destruction, [other hostile activities] and retaliation at speakers.”

A U.S. government “counselor” argued for a “formal waiver of the [Geneva] Convention” in a discussion with a “Secretary of State”. He continued “render[ing]” international law inapplicable “substantially reduces the threat of criminal prosecution under the [U.S.] War Crimes Act,” particularly for violations of Geneva's ban on “outrages against personal dignity” and “inhuman treatment.”[]”

“ ... [The United States government] takes lives of innocent, defenseless civilians including elderly, women, and children with no regard for the Geneva Conventions and Uniform Code of Military Justice. []”

“ ... United States citizens who commit “genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity” will not be investigated or prosecuted unless a claim of “immunity” in the International Criminal Court has failed and pressure and outrage in the international theater have increased.” “Protocol is to utilize immunity to avoid accountability for misconduct (eg., suppression, surveillance) while steering public opinion through deceit. Contravention of the constitution and human rights is without stoppage.”

“A case is not “admissible” in the International Criminal Court if the case is “being investigated or prosecuted by the state” that has “jurisdiction over the matter”. However, it may accept it if the state is “unable or unwilling to genuinely prosecute or investigate”.”

“If the federal government is a racketeering enterprise, is above the law domestically (eg., constitution) and internationally (human rights), and has no respect for the territorial integrity and right of self-determination of sovereign nations (eg., the Philippines), it's name is misleading.”

“United States elected not to be a signatory to [the Rome Statute] that grants jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.”

“[N]one” - “call” “power to accompt” - for “so much blood”(Source : Macbeth by William Shakespeare)

Lady Macbeth: “Fie, my lord, fie! a soldier, and afeard? What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to accompt? Yet who would have thought the old man to have had so much blood in him?”

“Standard of review - arbitrary and capricious - “Advancing ... merely litigation position” (Source : United States v Trident Seafoods Corp.)”

“Agency is merely advancing litigation position, not an official interpretation of its regulation.”

“On the “final hearing” on September 19, 2025, the Court stated that “[t]he trial is when all of the evidence will be submitted.” However, at the case management conference on April 29, 2025 “[t]he Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.””

“Scope of review – [did not “preserve or record” “all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms” -]“unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed” “[d]ismissal with prejudice” -] arbitrary and capricious - [“an abuse of discretion”-] “not in accordance with law”, “contrary to constitutional right” [- “in excess of statutory jurisdiction” -][- “without observance of procedure required by law” -] [“unsupported by substantial evidence” -][“unwarranted by the facts” -] (Source : 5 U.S. Code § 706)”

“To the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action. The reviewing court shall—

- (1) compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and
- (2) hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be—

- (A)arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;
- (B)contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;
- (C)in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right;
- (D)without observance of procedure required by law;
- (E)unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject to sections 556 and 557 of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; or
- (F)unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court. In making the foregoing determinations, the court shall review the whole record or those parts of it cited by a party, and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error.”

Evidence to be uncovered through discovery (Source : ABA Model Rule 3.1, comment 2)

“It is not frivolous to assert a position knowing that vital evidence can be uncovered only through discovery proceeding.”

““American Servicemembers Protection Act of 2002” [otherwise known as “Hague Invasion Act”] was passed by the legislature and signed into law by the executive branch. Practical effects evince it is a statutory authority for the United States government, U.S. citizens, and its allies to commit “genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity” with impunity. It documents the “inten[t]” of the government to “intimidate countries that ratify the treaty creating the International Criminal Court.” It “provides for the withdrawal” of its “military assistance from countries” that “ratif[ied] the ICC treaty.” It “restricts” its “participation in United Nations peacekeeping efforts unless” it “obtains immunity from prosecution”. Global “campaign” was orchestrated to “obtain bilateral agreements” that “grant immunity” for its citizens. It “authorizes” “military force” to be deployed against a tribunal that grants jurisdiction over allegations of “genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity”. [.]”

Here, “[Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura] was subjected to insults. A video of her in her undergarments while being insulted was sent to me through her cellular phone.” “The name of my mother is being defamed and painted in a false light.””

“Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“Articles 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, and 27” are being violated.”

“Article 3

“The right to life, liberty, and security as a person is being deprived from me when an attempt was made on my life. I was not informed nor given a forum to present my side before the attempt was executed.

I have a right to life.””

“[My family] ha[s] a constitutional right and human right to life.”

“Article 12

“My reputation is assailed with impunity to coerce compliance with coordinated communications. My family and I was not advised that my name will be besmirched. My chattels (eg., communication devices) are subjected to surveillance. My place of residence is subject to trespass to land. There is nuisance in my private home. Activities that go beyond the bounds of decency and dignity are being deployed with deliberation. There was no opportunity to air a position. Historically similar conduct to suppress is not protection of the law from such attacks.

An individual, even if my family and I are from another part of the world, has an interest in not having my name smeared, my communication devices wiretapped, my real property subject to invasion, and my due process rights disregarded.””

“Article 17

"Pillage fronted magnanimously is taking away my right to own my property alone and in association with my family. This deprivation is being executed without notice and a chance to object. Abundant resources generally plunder those with much less and without any defense across the planet under the guise of benevolence.

There is dignity to each person no matter the color of his and family's passport. A person who come from another face of the earth has a right to his property."

"Article 30

"Activities multiplying falsities conceal. None of these operations preserves the right to life, liberty, and security of a person. Rather, the unceasing behavior shows a depraved and malignant heart towards another. To stupefy my views, injuries to my person, property, prospective advantage, and family members are being applied. Exponential frauds on the public are covertly sustained. Piracy partners with pillaging to deprive not only property rights and security but lives of others."

"[R]esolve cases and controversies without systemic bias in the government's favor." (Source : Lopez Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce)

A concurring opinion was written by the Honorable Supreme Court Justice Neil M. Gorsuch. Part of it stated, "And all today's decision means is that, going forward, federal courts will do exactly as this Court has since 2016, exactly as it did before the mid-1980s, and exactly as it had done since the founding: resolve cases and controversies without any systemic bias in the government's favor."

Please see discussion under Article III.

"Language in the statutory authorities (e.g., "an appropriate[ly] classified matter", "any person known to be in the United States", "any United States person reasonably believed to be located abroad", "authorized intelligence purposes", "connection or interest", "contracts or arrangements for provision of goods or services", "employed by or acting on behalf", "foreign influence", "foreign power", "foreign intelligence", "human experimentation", "intelligence records", "in the interest of national defense or foreign relations", "in the interest of national security", "national security, national defense, and foreign relations", "reasonably believed to be acting on behalf of a foreign power", "research on human subjects", "reveal", and/or "sponsorship of contracts or arrangements") is amorphous and elastic."

Please see discussion under Administrative Procedure Act.

"Balance is not part of the spokes of skills within a public sector and that which is expected to be blind to favors, fears, funds, and immutable features. Seizure [], preview of communications [], secret arrests [], closed judicial proceedings [] (eg., ex parte communications []), secret trials [], secret punishment [], infecting media [], and funneling a forum transpire."

Please see discussion under Ultra Vires.

"Acts that are outside of any statutory grant of power permits the judiciary to realign the proper lanes."

Please see discussion under Significant public interest.

“2,977 lives were lost in the 9/11 attacks. [] 415,000 casualties in the Iraq and Afghanistan operations. [] Thousands of children abused by a religious denomination. 16,760 women abused by a university in southern California. Those with influence and/or their proxy work overtime for adverse interests. 7,[108,587] lives lost due to Covid-19. [] These losses could easily have been prevented with the legitimate use of public resources.”

“An in camera review does not include testing. The counsel of the plaintiff or plaintiff is disallowed from participating. Only one side presents assertions of exemptions. While the opposing side is precluded from hearing the nature of claim/s and objecting. In effect, the adversarial process is circumvented.”

Please see discussion under Frivolity.

“When an attempt on my life and family members' lives was made, I was present. I was the one driving. I experienced the violence. I saw the harm on my family members. I saw the fear in their eyes. Those who speak of misconduct are defamed to distract. Racketeering activities (eg., defamation, invasion of privacy) are carried out to attack the reputation of a speaker to impugn competency. These operations instead underscores bias against expression about wrongdoing.”

Please see discussion under Subject matter jurisdiction (Source: Steel Co v Citizens for Better Environment)

“My life and rights are substantial regardless of my affluence, influence, immutable features, approved expression, or belief in "bidder[s]".”

“Ex parte representations [were] not ... subjected to testing.”

“No full factual inquiry occur[ed]. No discovery happen[ed].”

Fundamental justice (Source : Hormel v Helvering)

“Orderly rules of procedure do not require sacrifice of the rules of fundamental justice.”

“Harmony” with “promot[ing] the ends of justice” (Source : Hormel v Helvering)

The Supreme Court said in 1941 that “[r]ules of practice and procedure are devised to promote the ends of justice, not to defeat them. A rigid and undeviating judicially declared practice under which courts of review would invariably and under all circumstances decline to consider all questions which had not previously been specifically urged would be out of harmony with this policy.”

Substantive due process – fundamental rights (Source : 5th amendment and 14th amendment)

Under the 5th amendment extended through the states through the 14th amendment, fundamental rights are protected. First amendment rights are fundamental rights. Privacy rights (eg., marriage,

childrearing, familial rights) are fundamental rights.

Regulations affecting fundamental rights (eg., surveillance, right to live) are reviewed under the strict scrutiny standard.

Strict scrutiny standard

Laws (eg., surveillance, right to live) infringing upon fundamental rights are invalid unless these are found to be necessary to a compelling government interest.

Narrowly tailored

It must be shown that the regulation is narrowly tailored to promote a compelling interest.

Technique (Source: McCullen v Coakley)

"Ask first if it is narrowly tailored. Second question is whether it is substantially overbroad.

Laws not narrowly tailoring can be struck down as unconstitutional on this sole basis. Overbreadth, does not have to be queried."

Equal protection (Source: Village of Willowbrook Olech)

"[The United States Supreme Court] explained that "the purpose [120 S.Ct. 1075] of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is to secure every person within the State's jurisdiction against intentional and arbitrary discrimination, whether occasioned by express terms of a statute or by its improper execution through duly constituted agents.""

"[S]piteful effort" - "reasons" - "wholly unrelated" - "any legitimate state objective"

"Relying on Circuit precedent, the Court of Appeals for the Seventh [528 U.S. 564] Circuit reversed, holding that a plaintiff can allege an equal protection violation by asserting that state action was motivated solely by a "spiteful effort to "get" him for reasons wholly unrelated to any legitimate state objective.""

"[V]indictive action" - "illegitimate animus"- "ill will"

"That is because the Court of Appeals found that in this case respondent [528 U.S. 566] had alleged an extra factor as well -- a factor that the Court of Appeals called "vindictive action," "illegitimate animus," or "ill will." 160 F.3d 386,388 (CA7 1998). And, in that respect, the court said this case resembled Esmail v. Macrane, 53 F.3d 176 (CA7 1995), because the Esmail plaintiff had alleged that the municipality's differential treatment "was the result not of prosecutorial discretion honestly (even if ineptly -- even if arbitrarily) exercised but of an illegitimate desire to 'get' him." 160 F.3d at 388."

Here, "I spoke against overtime shaving." "I am retaliated on since."

" ... United States government retaliates at those who report on government "failures".

"The name of [Attorney Buenaventura] is being defamed and painted in a false light."

"[Mrs. Buenaventura] was tortured." "Her due process (eg., life) rights were deprived. She was denied her day in Court."

"[Ms. Doe 3's] best interests(eg., whole human development) are held hostage to conceal misconduct."

"Ms. Doe 2 lost a job she loved in California, where she was valued, and where she had a work-life balance."

"My best interests (eg., whole human development) are held hostage to conceal misconduct."

Response to "Reply to Defendant's "Appeal as of Right""

1. §§ 731-42 includes divorce.

"[B]roadest degree of protection protection"

§ 741 says "must be broadly construed and applied to protect the exercise of the right of freedom of speech and of the press, the right to assemble and petition and the right of association guaranteed by the United States Constitution or by the Constitution of Maine." ⁴⁰ "That the Legislature added its broad construction proviso . . . plainly indicates these decisions were mistaken in their narrow view of the relevant legislative intent." ⁴¹ "Section 2(b)(3) [] provides the broadest degree of protection protection; it applies to any exercise of the right of free speech or press, free association, or assembly or petition, so long as that exercise is on a matter of public concern." ⁴²

2. A SLAPP "masquerade[s]" as "irreconcilable differences. Actually, "weaponize[d]" as sword, it "impos[ing] externally" "burdens of litigation" and "abusive tactics" "to silence, dissuade, [coerce, intimidate,] and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights and human rights.". "[P]rocedural features [] designed to prevent substantive consequences : the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit[.]" are ignored. The "designed" outcome of irreversible ramifications on "rights" "substantive [in] nature" such as "I will remain in isolation and incommunicado for the remainder of [my] life", "imminent threat to my life, healthy, and safety", and "shredding my constitutional rights and human rights" were not presented in the orders.

“[W]eaponize[d]”

“[A] civil process” is “weaponize[d]” to inflict economic duress in the form of “costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.” ⁴³

“[U]nifying features” - “a dangerous force”

“But for all the ways in which SLAPPs may clothe themselves, their unifying features make them a dangerous force: Their purpose is to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.” ⁴⁴ “An Anti-SLAPP law, at its core” “is one by which a legislature imposes external change upon judicial procedure” “to deal with” “abusive litigation”. ⁴⁵

“[R]evers[al]” - “not [a] remedy” - “a meritless claim brought to chill rights of free expression”

“Section 4 furthers the purpose of the Act by protecting a moving party from the burdens of litigation—which include not only discovery, but responding to motions and other potentially abusive tactics—until the court adjudicates the motion and the moving party's appellate rights with respect to the motion are exhausted.” ⁴⁶ “If the defendant were required to wait until final judgment to appeal the denial of a meritorious anti-SLAPP motion, a decision by this court reversing the district court's denial of the motion would not remedy the fact that the defendant had been compelled to defend against a meritless claim brought to chill rights of free expression.” ⁴⁷ “... [T]he ultimate purpose of the Act: to allow a party to avoid the expense and burden of frivolous litigation until the court can determine that the claims are not frivolous. In that connection, a court should be free to hear any motion that does not affect the moving party's right to be free from an abusive cause of action, including a motion to conduct discovery on causes of action unrelated to the cause of action being challenged under the Act, and motions for preliminary injunctive relief seeking to protect against an imminent threat to public health or safety.” ⁴⁸ “State law and local customs of the jurisdiction should dictate the consequences for a court failing to comply with the timelines set forth in this section.” ⁴⁹ “... [T]he Act recognizes that a SLAPP plaintiff can just as easily harass a defendant with a legally nonviable claim as it can with a factually nonviable one.” ⁵⁰ “... [T]he Act's procedural features are designed to prevent substantive consequences: the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit.” ⁵¹

Here, “[plaintiff] knows when the retribution started.” ⁵² “Plaintiff knows that I have been unable to find a livelihood “on my own”. ⁵³ “If the defendant were required to wait until final judgment to appeal the denial of a meritorious anti-SLAPP motion, a decision by this court reversing the district court's denial of the motion would not remedy the fact that the defendant had been compelled to defend against a meritless claim brought to chill rights of free expression.” ⁵⁴

“There are no irreconcilable marital differences.” ⁵⁵ “Glaring deficiencies (eg., United States constitution, Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), Bell Atlantic Corp v Twombly cited in Ashcroft v Iqbal[, Haines v Kerner]) exist in the complaint. There was no attempt to satisfy the burden of a non movant in responding to a Special Anti-SLAPP motion.” ⁵⁶ A civil process is a “garden variety” ⁵⁷ “disguise”. ⁵⁸ “They are often cloaked as otherwise standard claims of defamation, civil conspiracy, tortious interference, nuisance, and invasion of privacy, just to name a few. But for all the ways in which SLAPPs may clothe themselves, their unifying

features make them a dangerous force: Their purpose is to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.”⁵⁹ “[W]hile SLAPP suits ‘masquerade as ordinary lawsuits’ the conceptual features which reveal them as SLAPP’s are that they are generally meritless suits brought by large private interests to deter common citizens from exercising their political or legal rights or to punish them for doing so.”⁶⁰ “... [T]he Act’s procedural features are designed to prevent substantive consequences: the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit.” “Even if a responding party makes a prima-facie showing under Section 36 7(a)(3)(A), the moving party may still prevail if it shows that the responding party failed to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted or that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law—in other words, that the cause of action is not legally sound.”⁶¹

“The responding party fails to establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of the cause of action ...”⁶² SLAPPs’ “unifying features make them a dangerous force ...”⁶³ It is “cloaked” this time as “irreconcilable marital differences”. “... [T]here was no legal basis mentioned ...”⁶⁴ “‘State [] instrumentalize[s] [abuse of process and the inherent dangers thereto]’”⁶⁵ “compell[ing me] to defend against a meritless claim brought to chill rights of free expression.”⁶⁶

“The [‘An Act to Strengthen Freedom of Speech Protections by Enacting the Uniform Public Expression Protection Act’] expands” “protections” for individuals rights. Included in the scope of protection is the “[e]xercise of the right of freedom of speech or of the press, the right to assemble or petition or the right of association, guaranteed by the United States Constitution or by the Constitution of Maine, on a matter of public concern[.]”⁶⁷ “... [T]he rights the act protects are most certainly substantive in nature.”⁶⁸ “... [T]he Act’s procedural features are designed to prevent substantive consequences: the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit.”⁶⁹ “As stated by one California court, “[t]he point of the anti-SLAPP statute is that you have a right not to be dragged through the courts because you exercised your constitutional rights.””⁷⁰ “An action under this subchapter may be advanced on the docket and receive priority over other cases when the court determines that the interests of justice so require.”⁷¹ “State law and local customs of the jurisdiction should dictate the consequences for a court failing to comply with the timelines set forth in this section.”⁷² “A party may rely on an opposing party’s pleadings as substantive evidence, consistent with the general rule that an opposing party’s pleadings constitute admissible admissions.”⁷³

3. There were no legal basis and case law provided. “[SLAPPs] can address a wide variety of issues—from zoning, to the environment, to politics, to education. They are often cloaked as otherwise standard claims of defamation, civil conspiracy, tortious interference, nuisance, and invasion of privacy, just to name a few.”⁷⁴ “To use the Act, a movant need not prove that the responding party has violated a constitutional right—only that the responding party’s suit arises from the movant’s constitutionally protected activity.”⁷⁵ “In short, the Act’s “definitional focus is not the form of the [non-movant’s] cause of action but, rather, the [movant’s] activity that gives rise to his or her asserted liability—and whether that activity constitutes protected speech or petitioning.””⁷⁶ “That is why the First Amendment expressly targets the operation of the laws- i.e., the “abridg[ement] of speech”- rather than merely the motives of those who enacted

them. U.S. Const., Amdt. 1.”⁷⁷ “The vice of content-based legislation ... is not that it is always used for invidious, thought-control purposes, but that it lends itself to use for those purposes.”⁷⁸

UPEPA grants no exemption

Divorce action is not unique. There is no exemption in UPEPA. Right to petition is not the only right shielded. Scope is expanded to secure the “[e]xercise of the right of freedom of speech or of the press, the right to assemble or petition or the right of association, guaranteed by the United States Constitution or by the Constitution of Maine, on a matter of public concern[.]”⁷⁹

“[S]ubstantive rights”

Divorce action affects substantive rights. “Although the Act operates in a procedural manner—specifically, by altering the typical procedure parties follow at the outset of litigation—the rights the act protects are most certainly substantive in nature.”⁸⁰ “Otherwise stated, the Act’s procedural features are designed to prevent substantive consequences: the impairment of First Amendment rights and the time and expense of defending against litigation that has no demonstrable merit.”⁸¹ “As stated by one California court, “[t]he point of the anti-SLAPP statute is that you have a right not to be dragged through the courts because you exercised your constitutional rights.””⁸² “As other California courts have noted, “it is not enough that the statement refer to a subject of widespread public interest; the statement must in some manner itself contribute to the public debate.””⁸³

“[B]roadest degree of protection”

“Section 2(b)(3) operates differently than (1) and (2) and provides the broadest degree of protection; it applies to any exercise of the right of free speech or press, free association, or assembly or petition, so long as that exercise is on a matter of public concern.”⁸⁴

“[A]busive cause of action” - “abusive tactics”

“Section 4 furthers the purpose of the Act by protecting a moving party from the burdens of litigation—which include not only discovery, but responding to motions and other potentially abusive tactics—until the court adjudicates the motion and the moving party’s appellate rights with respect to the motion are exhausted.”⁸⁵ “Section 4(g) serves the ultimate purpose of the Act: to allow a party to avoid the expense and burden of frivolous litigation until the court can determine that the claims are not frivolous. In that connection, a court should be free to hear any motion that does not affect the moving party’s right to be free from an abusive cause of action, including a motion to conduct discovery on causes of action unrelated to the cause of action being challenged under the Act, and motions for preliminary injunctive relief seeking to protect against an imminent threat to public health or safety”⁸⁶

“[M]any forms of abusive [SLAPP] litigation”

“This amendment repeals the State’s law against strategic lawsuits against public participation, or the anti-SLAPP law, and replaces it with the Uniform Law Commission’s Uniform Public Expression Protection Act.”⁸⁷

“[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation”

“Many early anti-SLAPP statutes were narrowly drawn by limiting their use to particular types of parties or cases—for example, to lawsuits brought by public applicants or permittees, or to lawsuits brought against defendants speaking in a particular forum or on a particular topic. More recently, however, legislatures have recognized that narrow anti-SLAPP laws are ineffectual in curbing the many forms of abusive litigation that SLAPPs can take. To that end, most modern statutory enactments have been broad with respect to the parties that may use the acts and the kinds of cases to which the acts apply.

The recent trend further evidences a shift toward statutes that achieve their goals by generally employing at least five mechanisms:

1. Creating specific vehicles for filing motions to dismiss or strike early in the litigation process;
2. Requiring the expedited hearing of these motions, coupled with a stay or limitation of discovery until after they're heard;
3. Requiring the plaintiff to demonstrate the case has some degree of merit;
4. Imposing cost-shifting sanctions that award attorney's fees and other costs when the plaintiff is unable to carry its burden; and
5. Allowing for an interlocutory appeal of a decision to deny the defendant's motion.”⁸⁸

“SLAPPs defy simple definition” - “unifying features” - “purpose” - “ensnare their targets” - “costly litigation” - “chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity”

“SLAPPs defy simple definition. They can be brought by and against individuals, corporate entities, or government officials across all points of the political or social spectrum. They can address a wide variety of issues—from zoning, to the environment, to politics, to education. They are often cloaked as otherwise standard claims of defamation, civil conspiracy, tortious interference, nuisance, and invasion of privacy, just to name a few. But for all the ways in which SLAPPs may clothe themselves, their unifying features make them a dangerous force: Their purpose is to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.”⁸⁹

“Not having been raised at the trial level, the issue of the constitutionality of the “irreconcilable marital differences” amendment to 19 M.R.S.A. § 691 is not ripe for appellate review.”⁹⁰ “It was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19).”⁹¹ To use the Act, a movant need not prove that the responding party has violated a constitutional right—only that the responding party's suit arises from the movant's constitutionally protected activity.”⁹² “In short, the Act's “definitional focus is not the form of the [non-movant's] cause of action but, rather, the [movant's] activity that gives rise to his or her asserted liability—and whether that activity constitutes protected speech or petitioning.””⁹³

“A divorce is allowed to be filed, proceed, and heard as a no-fault divorce without any cause of action, “essential elements” that are to be pleaded and proven, factual background, and evidentiary support. A defendant is left guessing what the law authorizing “irreconcilable marital differences” as a ground for divorce means. “Upon asking plaintiff what the “differences” were, she stated we disagree on things. She mentioned three (3) items we disagree on. One is my job search.” “I am retaliated on whereby I am

being deprived from earning a living "on my own". This stemmed from my airing my view [about overtime shaving at University of Southern California]. It is ongoing for years. She is aware that I am retaliated on." "Two are the lawsuits I filed. She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits." "[P]laintiff is aware of the petitions before she filed the divorce action. She never mentioned she did not want these petitions to be submitted. She did not indicate that these petitions should not be pursued before she filed the complaint on January 13, 2025. Only time she told me she did not want me to pursue these was when I asked about the "irreconcilable marital differences". "I filed petitions in order to put a stoppage to the retaliation and to seek substantial justice." "Three is the education of our minor child." "Her education is a delicate balance moreso with its destabilization and weaponization which is being "coordinated" for years." "I can not disagree with her on interests impacting me, my family members (eg., alive and deceased), and the public." "She tells me to stop talking about certain topics such as retaliation [and corruption]." "I can not discuss there is no commitment to the U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to conscience. One result of an oath that is minimized was a United States President was installed. But, plaintiff can discuss her political preference (eg., democrat party) without different views." "[Complaint] was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19)." ⁹⁴ There were no facts and no elements (eg., causation) in the complaint and communicated in the case management conference. The Court stated, " ... [It] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences." ⁹⁵ It added, "So it's not, you know, specific that both parties would agree to the divorce or even to the terms of the divorce if the Court ultimately has to make the decision." ⁹⁶ "Magically", "leading" ⁹⁷ was stated in the "Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's 'Appeal as of Right'" (hereinafter called Reply). This move is objectionable. It causes prejudice as no elements were argued in the complaint and during the case management conference. "A party may rely on an opposing party's pleadings as substantive evidence, consistent with the general rule that an opposing party's pleadings constitute admissible admissions." ⁹⁸ Insertion of the word "leading" in the Reply is an admission by plaintiff of the necessity of causation as an element. I can only speculate about the motive behind raising an issue of nexus when [] the "[c]omplaint has no legal basis, [essential elements], factual basis, reasoning, and evidence supporting its claim." What is certain though it is highly prejudicial.

"Ground for divorce was "[i]rreconcilable marital differences". Complaint contained no details. When I asked about what the "differences" were, she mentioned we disagree. These were on my job search, lawsuits filed, and the education of our child. But for the retaliation, I could find a livelihood "on my own" in two (2) weeks. One of the purposes for my petition is to stop the retaliation which will lead to my ability to find a livelihood "on my own". I guide our child. I express what are necessary for her continued academic growth." ⁹⁹ "Plaintiff knows that I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own". She knows that there were petitions I filed. She knows that I guide our child in her education."

¹⁰⁰

"Divorce papers were submitted to the Court on January 13, 2025. On March 11, 2025, plaintiff texted wanting to speak when I got home. Upon arrival, she told me she was filing for divorce. It shocks the conscience that the complaint was sprung up after many years I have been going through retaliation. There were no dialogues between plaintiff and I about our identified "differences" before she filed for divorce." ¹⁰¹ To use the Act, a movant need not prove that the responding party has violated a constitutional right—only that the responding party's suit arises from the movant's constitutionally protected activity." ¹⁰²

"[A]ctivity" - "gives rise" - "asserted liability" - "protected speech or petitioning"

"In short, the Act's "definitional focus is not the form of the [non-movant's] cause of action but, rather, the [movant's] activity that gives rise to his or her asserted liability—and whether that activity constitutes protected speech or petitioning."”¹⁰³

“There were no facts mentioned.”¹⁰⁴ “There were no affidavits. There were no discovery materials. There was no reasoning. There was no testimony. There was no evidence.”¹⁰⁵

“Not a sine qua non of a first amendment violation”

“[I]llicit legislative intent is not the sine qua non of a violation of the First Amendment[.]”¹⁰⁶

“Proof [-] evidence”

“[A] party opposing the government “need adduce 'no evidence of an improper censorial motive.'”

“Here, there is substantial evidence.”¹⁰⁷

“Facially content-based statute – operation of law”

“That is why the First Amendment expressly targets the operation of the laws- i.e., the “abridg[ement] of speech”- rather than merely the motives of those who enacted them. U.S. Const., Amdt. 1.” “The vice of content-based legislation ... is not that it is always used for invidious, thought-control purposes, but that it lends itself to use for those purposes.”¹⁰⁸

Here, “I spoke against overtime shaving. I am retaliated on since.” “I have been unable to find a livelihood “on my own”.” Plaintiff indicated that we disagree about my job search. I told her that I am going through retribution because I spoke up against overtime shaving. I am unable to find a livelihood “on my own”. Inception of the retaliation was on 2016. She knows when the retribution started. She knows that before I was subjected to reprisal I could find work in two (2) weeks. When I was not retaliated on, I am able to find a livelihood “on my own”. Soon after the commencement of the retribution, she lost a job she loved and she would be in right now but for the reprisal. None of the twenty two (22) pages that were served contained a legal basis, factual background, and rationale, and proof underlying the ground for the divorce. To a lay person such as myself, “irreconcilable marital differences” mean differences were identified. There were no details what the identified “irreconcilable marital differences”. “Irreconcilable” means that attempts were diligently made to reconcile identified differences. There were no details when exactly the attempts were diligently made to reconcile the identified “irreconcilable marital differences”. Before the papers were filed, there were no earlier dialogues with me and our child related to the identified differences much less any efforts to reconcile the differences. Yet, the ground for the divorce is labeled “irreconcilable marital differences”. Divorce action where the ground is “irreconcilable marital differences” is without merit. It is meant to punish the exercise of my first amendment rights.”¹⁰⁹ To use the Act, a movant need not prove that the responding party has violated a constitutional right—only that the responding party's suit arises from the movant's constitutionally protected activity.”¹¹⁰ “In short, the Act's "definitional focus is not the form of the [non-movant's] cause of action but, rather, the [movant's] activity that gives rise to his or her asserted liability—and whether that

activity constitutes protected speech or petitioning.”¹¹¹ “Denials in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : Maine Rule 11)”¹¹²

“[E]xpressive conduct”

“But the Act is intended to protect expressive conduct. For example, a person's work on behalf of a political campaign might include constitutionally protected expressive conduct, such as putting up campaign signs or organizing a rally.”¹¹³

“Causation” - prejudicial

Plaintiff states that “[d]issolution often arises out of parties' conduct and communication within and surrounding the marriage leading to irreconcilable differences.” A feigned interest in causation is prejudicial. “The Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.”¹¹⁴ It added, “So it's not, you know, specific that both parties would agree to the divorce or even to the terms of the divorce if the Court ultimately has to make the decision.”¹¹⁵ As these statements were made by the Court the Plaintiff made “no explanation” in her “strategy” in “stand[ing] mute”. Stating “leading” in her Reply contradicted her complaint which contained no “essential elements”. Mentioning “leading” in her Reply contradicted her implied adoption of the Court's enunciation “what the Constitution is, according to [her] own views of what it ought to mean[.]” in connection to “irreconcilable marital differences”.

“SLAPPs” – “unique” - “unifying” - “to deter” - “punish” - “exercising their political or legal rights”

A civil process is a “garden variety”¹¹⁶ “disguise”.¹¹⁷ “They are often cloaked as otherwise standard claims of defamation, civil conspiracy, tortious interference, nuisance, and invasion of privacy, just to name a few. But for all the ways in which SLAPPs may clothe themselves, their unifying features make them a dangerous force: Their purpose is to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.”¹¹⁸ “[W]hile SLAPP suits 'masquerade as ordinary lawsuits' the conceptual features which reveal them as SLAPP's are that they are generally meritless suits brought by large private interests to deter common citizens from exercising their political or legal rights or to punish them for doing so.”¹¹⁹

“[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation”

Please see discussion under “[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation” supra.

4. § 556 was improved by UPEPA. When there is a conflict between a statute and the US constitution, the latter prevails. An error of procedure affecting fundamental and substantive rights contravenes the US constitution.

“These communications to a tribunal are within the scope of Section 556.” “UPEPA “repeals” the “narrow” 1995 law.” “It has been “significantly expand[ed]” by the “Uniform Public Expression

Protection Act". Effective date of UPEPA was January 1, 2025." "§741. Construction" ¹²⁰ states that "[t]his subchapter must be broadly construed and applied to protect the exercise of the right of freedom of speech and of the press, the right to assemble and petition and the right of association guaranteed by the United States Constitution or by the Constitution of Maine." ¹²¹

5. "Uniform Public Expression Protection Act, Section 2, 4" applies in courts of Maine and the federal district courts in Maine.

Nowhere did it state that Section 556 and/or UPEPA applies only to United States district Court. The legislature did not precisely state it is not applicable to Maine district Courts.

Section 556 "repeal[ed]" by UPEPA were passed by the Maine legislature. It is substantive law of the state of Maine. It applies to courts of Maine and federal district courts in Maine.

States court are of general jurisdiction. These courts apply both federal laws and state laws.

"[Mookini v USA] dated 1938 is fifty (57) years before 1995. The effective date of a predecessor of UPEPA was 1995. Citation is eighty-seven (87) years before 2025. Effective date of UPEPA is January 1, 2025."

6. "I spoke against overtime shaving. I am retaliated on since." "I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own". "I filed petitions in order to put a stoppage to the retaliation and to seek substantial justice." "I guide our child in her education. Her education is a delicate balance moreso with its destabilization and weaponization which is being "coordinated" for years."

"Upon asking plaintiff what the "differences" were, she stated we disagree on things. She mentioned three (3) items we disagree on. One is my job search." "I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living "on my own". This stemmed from my airing my view. It is ongoing for years. She is aware that I am retaliated on." "Two are the lawsuits I filed. She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits." "I filed petitions in order to put a stoppage to the retaliation and to seek substantial justice." "Three is the education of our minor child." "Her education is a delicate balance moreso with its destabilization and weaponization which is being "coordinated" for years." "I can not disagree with her on interests impacting me, my family members (eg., alive and deceased), and the public." "She tells me to stop talking about certain topics such as retaliation [and corruption]." I can not discuss there is no commitment to the U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to conscience. One result of an oath that is minimized was a United States President was installed. But, plaintiff can discuss her political preference (eg., democrat party) without different views. "[Complaint] was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19)."

"... [Reply to "Plaintiff's [Response] to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment"] incorporates all pleadings (eg., Special Anti-SLAPP Motion, Appeal as of Right – Special Anti-SLAPP Motion, Motion for Summary Judgment) and papers I submitted along with all citations.

Plaintiff failed to rebut any fact with contradictory evidence. Plaintiff failed to rebut all the facts with contradictory evidence. As such these facts are undisputed."

"Denials in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : Maine Rule 11)"

7. i. "Denials in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : **Maine Rule 11)**"

ii. Objection contained no law. It contained no facts. It contained no reasoning. It contained no proof.

"The divorce action has no legal basis, factual basis, rationale, and proof. It is meant as a coercive instrument to prevent me from asserting my constitutional rights and human rights."

8. "She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits." "Plaintiff failed to rebut any fact with contradictory evidence. Plaintiff failed to rebut all the facts with contradictory evidence. As such these facts are undisputed."

"Upon asking plaintiff what the "differences" were, she stated we disagree on things. She mentioned three (3) items we disagree on. One is my job search." "I am retaliated on whereby I am being deprived from earning a living "on my own". This stemmed from my airing my view. It is ongoing for years. She is aware that I am retaliated on." "Two are the lawsuits I filed. She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits." "I filed petitions in order to put a stoppage to the retaliation and to seek substantial justice." "Three is the education of our minor child." "Her education is a delicate balance moreso with its destabilization and weaponization which is being "coordinated" for years." "I can not disagree with her on interests impacting me, my family members (eg., alive and deceased), and the public." "She tells me to stop talking about certain topics such as retaliation [and corruption]." "I can not discuss there is no commitment to the U.S. constitution, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to conscience. One result of an oath that is minimized was a United States President was installed. But, plaintiff can discuss her political preference (eg., democrat party) without different views. "[Complaint] was filed to silence, dissuade, and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19)."

"First amendment – not being able to find a livelihood "on my own" - retaliation

"Content-based on its face"

"A law that is content based on its face is subject to strict scrutiny regardless of the government's benign motive, content-neutral justification, or lack of 'animus toward the ideas contained' in the regulated speech." (Source : Reed v Town of Gilbert)

"There is not merely some adverse action. The retaliation methods being deployed against me and my family members are voluminous, various, vicious, violent, and depraved. In light of the nature, extent, duration, and depth of the misconduct, at a minimum it is strong circumstantial evidence that the adverse actions in their totality are carried out with retaliatory intent. The immediate and unredacted disclosures of documents/information responsive to Freedom of Information Act inquiries will likely provide additional and substantial support (eg., direct evidence, circumstantial evidence). Chronology of events supports an inference of retaliation."

"The adverse actions are caused by the exercise of constitutional rights. (Source : Chambers v Eppolito)"

"Not a sine qua non of a first amendment violation (Source : Reed v Town of Gilbert)"

"[I]llicit legislative intent is not the sine qua non of a violation of the First Amendment[.]"

"Proof evidence (Source : Reed v Town of Gilbert)"

"[A] party opposing the government "need adduce 'no evidence of an improper censorial motive.'"

"Here, there is substantial evidence."

"Facially content-based statute - operation of law (Source : Reed v Town of Gilbert)"

"That is why the First Amendment expressly targets the operation of the laws- i.e., the "abridg[ement] of speech"- rather than merely the motives of those who enacted them. U.S. Const., Amdt. 1." 'The vice of content-based legislation ... is not that it is always used for invidious, thought-control purposes, but that it lends itself to use for those purposes.'"

Here, "I spoke against overtime shaving. I am retaliated on since." "I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own"."

Plaintiff indicated that we disagree about my job search. I told her that I am going through retribution because I spoke up against overtime shaving. I am unable to find a livelihood "on my own". Inception of the retaliation was on 2016. She knows when the retribution started. She knows that before I was subjected to reprisal I could find work in two (2) weeks. When I was not retaliated on, I am able to find a livelihood "on my own". Soon after the commencement of the retribution, she lost a job she loved and she would be in right now but for the reprisal.

None of the twenty two (22) pages that were served contained a legal basis, factual background, and rationale, and proof underlying the ground for the divorce. To a lay person such as myself, "irreconcilable marital differences" mean differences were identified. There were no details what the identified "irreconcilable marital differences". "Irreconcilable" means that attempts were diligently made to reconcile identified differences. There were no details when exactly the attempts were diligently made to reconcile the identified "irreconcilable marital differences". Before the papers were filed, there were no earlier dialogues with me and our child related to the identified differences much less any efforts to reconcile the differences. Yet, the ground for the divorce is labeled "irreconcilable marital differences".

Divorce action where the ground is "irreconcilable marital differences" is without merit. It is meant to punish the exercise of my first amendment rights."

"[U]nifying features" - "purpose" - "ensnare [] targets" - "chills" - "constitutionally protected

activity”

“That’s because a creative plaintiff can disguise what is actually a SLAPP as a “garden variety” tort action.”¹²² “But for all the ways in which SLAPPs may clothe themselves, their unifying features make them a dangerous force: Their purpose is to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity.”¹²³

9. i. “Complaint” - “No fact”

“Complaint had no factual background.” “Complaint had no evidentiary support.” In the “Response to the [Anti-SLAPP] motion], “[n]o fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights caused plaintiff actual injury.” “No support was provided.” “In the case management conference, like the complaint and response to the motion, no specific facts were provided. When asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion “merits [no] further response” which is another confirmation that it had no specific facts.”

ii. “[C]omplaint” - “Glaring deficiencies”

“Irreconcilable marital differences” is not even one (1) sentence.

“Glaring deficiencies (eg., United States constitution, Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), [Haines v Kerner,] Bell Atlantic Corp v Twombly cited in Ashcroft v Iqbal) exist in the complaint. There was no attempt to satisfy the burden of a non movant in responding to a Special Anti-SLAPP motion. Motion stated legal basis, factual basis, rationale, and proof. One of the laws stated in the motion was that under the 14 M.R.S. § 556 a “Court shall grant the special motion.””

““[Plaintiff] made “no explanation” in its “strategy” in “stand[ing] mute” as to the root, a “tree” and to the “forest” (eg., abuse of process). ”

“[I]rreconcilable marital differences” is unconstitutional.

“Complaint is without merit. There are no “irreconcilable marital differences”. It was filed to silence, dissuade, [coerce, intimidate,] and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights (eg., 1st amendment) and human rights (eg., article 19).”

“ ... [C]omplaint had no legal basis. [There was no assertion.] Complaint had no factual background. [There was no pleading.] Complaint had no reasoning. Complaint had no evidentiary support. Response to the [Anti-SLAPP] motion did not state any legal basis. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights caused plaintiff actual injury. No reasoning was stated. No support was provided. In the case management conference, like the complaint and response to the motion, no specific facts were provided. When asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion “merits [no] further response” which is another confirmation that it had no specific facts.”

"I was informed on September 16, 2025 through a phone call that a "final hearing notice" was mailed out. This connotes a decision was going to be made in the absence of the other party. "[F]inal hearing notice" scheduled on September 19, 2025 was mailed out on August 29, 2025. Twenty (21) days after it's mailing, September 19, 2025, I have not received it in regular mail."

"To top it all, the Court stated in the final hearing on September 19, 2025 that "[t]he trial is when all of the evidence will be submitted". This an example why the "unifying features" of SLAPPs make them a "dangerous force". "Their purpose is to ensnare their targets in costly litigation that chills society from engaging in constitutionally protected activity."

"I asked the Court on September 16, 2025, if I can "request a copy via email". It can only "do regular mail".

"On the "final hearing" on September 19, 2025, the Court stated that "[t]he trial is when all of the evidence will be submitted." However, at the case management conference on April 29, 2025 "[t]he Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences." Further, I received a "proposed judgment purportedly sent on August 29, 2025."

"Substantive due process (Source : 5th and 14th amendments)"

Legal basis of "irreconcilable marital differences" violates substantive due process.

It deprives a spouse of his/her fundamental rights to marriage, as a spouse, and as a parent. These include but are not limited to "security", "stability", "permanency", "safeguarding [our child]", "rais[ing] our child according to my religious beliefs" (eg., 5th commandment, 6th commandment, 8th commandment), educating our child, speaking to my child, imparting values to our child, and defending our child from camouflaged activities by the "deep state". Examples of these activities deployed against our child are "assault, battery, conversion, defamation, false imprisonment [(eg., in a state building in Lewiston, Maine; private school in Lewiston, Maine), fraud, invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional distress, interference with prospective advantage, kidnapping, nuisance, trespass to chattel ... trespass to land[,]" and racketeering activities (eg., obstruction of justice, attempted murder)."

Summary judgment

"Because the response [to the motion for summary judgment] did not state specific facts, there is no genuine issue for trial. There were no facts, no affidavits, and no discovery materials.

Thus, the [motion for summary judgment] must be granted."

" ... [C]omplaint had no legal basis. [] Response to the [Anti-SLAPP] motion did not state any legal basis."

"Motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted (Source : Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6))"

Complaint is legally insufficient.”

““Legal basis for the divorce action is” “not fungible under our Constitution.””

10. Maine law – divorce law - “unconstitutional”

“[C]onstitutionality of the 'irreconcilable marital differences'” - “ripe” (Source : Mattson v Mattson)

“Not having been raised at the trial level, the issue of the constitutionality of the "irreconcilable marital differences" amendment to 19 M.R.S.A. § 691 is not ripe for appellate review.”

Here, “[l]egal basis for the divorce action is unconstitutional.”

“Intolerable” - “cohabitation” - “mere unhappiness” - “can not be granted” (Source : Mattson v Mattson)

“In order to grant a decree for divorce on this basis, the court must find that in the particular case the marital differences cause cohabitation to become intolerable.” “Such differences contemplate a greater degree of disparity between husband and wife than mere unhappiness, for which a divorce cannot be granted.”

“§737.Proof

“In ruling on a motion under section 734, the court shall consider the pleadings, the motion, any reply or response to the motion and any evidence that could be considered in ruling on a motion for summary judgment under Rule 56 of the Maine Rules of Civil Procedure.

Here, “[t]he Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.”

But, complaint did not contain a legal basis. There was no assertion. There was no factual background. There was no pleading. There were no affidavits. There were no discovery materials. There was no reasoning. There was no testimony. There was no evidence.

Plaintiff has no burden. She was excused without justification from bearing the burden of proving her case in court. Action is to silence, dissuade, coerce, intimidate, and punish me for exercising my rights. Instead, the burden is shifted to the defendant.

“Ex parte representation should be subjected to testing of its assertions.” “Testing of affidavits (eg., accuracy, bad faith) did not occur.” “There had not been any testing. Since there was no testing, there were no appropriate findings of facts. There had been no examination of an affiant (eg., bias). There had been no full factual inquiry.” “Reviewing the factual and documentary genesis of court approval and subsequent process, conduct, and actions disregard due process.”

The ground stated on a form was "irreconcilable marital differences exist between the parties". There are no "irreconcilable marital differences" that exist.

When I asked what these irreconcilable marital differences were, I was told by plaintiff that we disagree. These were on the my job search, my filing petitions, and the education of our child.

Motion stated that there are no "irreconcilable marital differences". "It was filed to silence, dissuade,[coerce, intimidate,] and punish the exercise of my constitutional rights and human rights."

The Court did not grant my motion at the case management conference. I cited the legal basis. I stated a factual background. I provided reasoning. I gave proof.

One proof is that "Plaintiff confirmed, "Who wants to be surveilled?"

Second proof is that "I spoke against overtime shaving. I am retaliated on since." "I have been unable to find a livelihood "on my own".

Third proof is that I submitted petitions.

Fourth proof is that "I guide our child in her education."

Fifth proof is that "[u]pon asking plaintiff what the "differences" were, she stated we disagree on things."

Sixth proof is "[s]he mentioned three (3) items we disagree on. One is my job search. Two are the lawsuits I filed. She wanted me not to pursue the lawsuits. Three is the education of our minor child."

Response to the motion did not show my right to petition for grievances was devoid of any reasonable factual support or any arguable basis in law and that my acts caused actual injury to the non movant.

No different from the complaint, response to the motion contained no legal basis. No different from the complaint, there was no fact in the response to the motion. No different from the complaint, there was no rationale in the response to the motion. No different from the complaint, there was no proof in the response to the motion.

Yet, even when there is no proof in the complaint, there are no irreconcilable differences, action is to coerce me from exercising my rights, there is proof in my motion, no proof in the response to the motion, our marriage can be saved, our family can be saved, and our child can grow with both models by her side, the Court ordered mediation. There was no attempted justification for ordering mediation and its consequences to our marriage, our relationship, our child, and our family.

Complaint contained no legal basis, a fact, an explanation, and evidence. Ditto for the response to the motion. There were no affidavits and discovery materials included in the response.

Meantime, there are no irreconcilable differences. Motion contained legal basis, factual background, rationale, and proof. Nonetheless, the case was not dismissed with prejudice at the case management conference and mediation was even ordered. Motion was effectively denied "over the objection of one of the parties[.]" who was the plaintiff.

In other words, divorce proceedings move forward even over my objection that there are "irreconcilable marital differences". Mediation is ordered even over my objection that "the marriage" "can not be saved", our marriage will break up, our family will be broken, and our child will grow up in a broken family. Divorce is not dismissed with prejudice even over my objection to the divorce. Terms of the divorce are imposed even over my objections with the divorce, the mediation, and that the marriage and the family will be broken. However, my motion is effectively denied when a plaintiff objects without a legal basis, a fact, an explanation, proof, affidavits, and discovery materials.

This seems to be bias in favor of plaintiff, divorce, and breaking up a family. (Source : Maine Code [of Judicial Conduct])

It is an error not to dismiss with prejudice the action at the case management conference."

"Substantive due process (Source : 5th and 14th amendments)

Legal basis of "irreconcilable marital differences" violates substantive due process.

It deprives a spouse of his/her fundamental rights to marriage, as a spouse, and as a parent. These include but are not limited to "security", "stability", "permanency", "safeguarding [our child]", "rais[ing] our child according to my religious beliefs" (eg., 5th commandment, 6th commandment, 8th commandment), educating our child, speaking to my child, imparting values to our child, and defending our child from camouflaged activities by the "deep state". Examples of these activities deployed against our child are "assault, battery, conversion, defamation, false imprisonment, fraud, invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional distress, interference with prospective advantage, kidnapping, nuisance, trespass to chattel ... trespass to land[.]" and racketeering activities (eg., obstruction of justice, attempted murder).

Defense against - abuse of processes - targeting our child

The state can not reasonably expect our child to defend herself.

Weaponization - against our child

"There were two (2) attempts on [our child's] life. Her due process (eg., education) rights are being deprived. "She is being brainwashed." First example is that this country is for "peace and justice". [] It is a skit so "stocks" "surge". "US military equipment sales" increased to "\$318.7 billion", by "29%["]", "in 2024".[]

"State [] instrumentalize[s] [abuse of process and the inherent dangers thereto] in order [for the public to] believe to justify [the] horrific attack[s] on [our child's person, properties, prospective advantage (eg., education), family members (eg., Mrs.

Buenaventura), name, constitutional rights, and human rights,] from which the [person who suffers is our child].”

“Marriage [is] important to children's best interests” (Source : Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 U.S. 644 (2015))

The Honorable Associate Justice Anthony Kennedy delivered the opinion of the US Supreme Court in Obergefell. In part, it stated that “[u]nder the laws of the several States, some of marriage's protections for children and families are material. But marriage also confers more profound benefits. By giving recognition and legal structure to their parents' relationship, marriage allows children “to understand the integrity and closeness of their own family and its concord with other families in their community and in their daily lives.” [] Marriage also affords the permanency and stability important to children's best interests.[] For that reason, just as a couple vows to support each other, so does society pledge to support the couple, offering symbolic recognition and material benefits to protect and nourish the union.”]

Weaponization - California Bar licensing

“There was an attempt on my life. My due process (eg., livelihood) rights are being deprived. My continuing education, whole human development, and growth are being held hostage.”

“State [] instrumentalize[s] [abuse of process and the inherent dangers thereto] in order [for the public to] believe to justify [the] horrific attack[s] on [my person, properties, prospective advantage (eg., education), family members (eg., Attorney Buenaventura), name, constitutional rights, and human rights,] from which the [person who suffers is me].”

Weaponization - against women

“A state has instrumentalized the horrific attacks on women in order we believe to justify an attack on Gaza of which the majority suffering are other women.” []

It deprives a spouse of his fundamental right to observe his religious belief. I have lifelong vows. These are to be faithful, to love, and to honor plaintiff for the rest of my life. There are no condition precedent to these duties.

It deprives my child of her fundamental right to grow up with “model[s in their parents] to follow”. []

Merely by checking box of “irreconcilable marital differences” in “twenty two (22) pages” where “[n]one” “contained a legal basis, factual background, rationale, and proof underlying the ground for the divorce[.]” a spouse is “stripped” of his/her constitutional rights and human rights.

Legal basis for the divorce action is unconstitutional.

This is to request the action to be dismissed with prejudice.”

“[P]leadings” - “substantive evidence” - “admissions” - “[g]laring deficiencies”

Plaintiff states that “[d]issolution often arises out of parties' conduct and communication within and surrounding the marriage leading to irreconcilable differences.” A feigned interest in causation is prejudicial. “The Court [stated it] can find that based on one party's assertion, and testimony, and evidence to the Court, that there are irreconcilable marital differences.” ¹²⁴ It added, “So it's not, you know, specific that both parties would agree to the divorce or even to the terms of the divorce if the Court ultimately has to make the decision.” As these statements were made by the Court the Plaintiff made “no explanation” in her “strategy” in “stand[ing] mute”. Stating “leading” in her Reply contradicted her complaint which contained no “essential elements”. Mentioned “leading” in her Reply contradicted her implied adoption of the Court's enunciation “what the Constitution is, according to [her] own views of what it ought to mean[.]” in connection to “irreconcilable marital differences”.

Objection to the Order [by the Supreme Judicial Court] Dismissing Appeal

UPEPA - “[H]armonize” - “rights to petition and speak freely on issues of public interest” - “rights to file meritorious lawsuits for real injuries”

The Uniform Public Expression Protection Act seeks to harmonize these varying approaches by enunciating a clear process through which SLAPPs can be challenged and their merits fairly evaluated in an expedited manner. In doing so, the Act actually serves two purposes: protecting individuals' rights to petition and speak freely on issues of public interest while, at the same time, protecting the rights of people and entities to file meritorious lawsuits for real injuries.

1. Interlocutory

“§739. Appeal

A moving party may appeal as a matter of right from an order denying, in whole or in part, a motion under section 734. An appeal of a judgment or order under this subchapter is governed by the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.” ¹²⁵

“[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation”

Please see discussion under “[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation” supra.

“[S]cope” - “speech” - “press” - “assemble” - “petition” - “association” - “public concern”

“The [An Act to Strengthen Freedom of Speech Protections by Enacting the Uniform Public Expression Protection Act] expands” “protections” for individuals rights. Included in the scope of protection is the “[e]xercise of the right of freedom of speech or of the press, the right to assemble or petition or the right of association, guaranteed by the United States Constitution or by the Constitution

of Maine, on a matter of public concern[.]”¹²⁶

Petition – not – only right - shielded

Right to petition is not the only right shielded.

“Uniform Public Expression Protection Act” - “significantly expand[ed]” - “Section 556”

“These communications to a tribunal are within the scope of Section 556.” “UPEPA “repeals” the “narrow” 1995 law.” “It has been “significantly expand[ed]” by the “Uniform Public Expression Protection Act”. Effective date of UPEPA was January 1, 2025.”

“[P]urpose and intent” - “broad[] constru[ction]” - “speech” – “press” - “assemble” - “petition” – “association” - United States Constitution

“§741. Construction

This subchapter must be broadly construed and applied to protect the exercise of the right of freedom of speech and of the press, the right to assemble and petition and the right of association guaranteed by the United States Constitution or by the Constitution of Maine.”¹²⁷

“ Similar expressions of intent by states that their anti-SLAPP statutes be broadly construed have been pivotal to courts' interpretations of those statutes. See, e.g., *ExxonMobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman*, 512 S.W.3d 895, 898 (Tex. 2017) (recognizing that the Texas Legislature “has instructed that the [statute] ‘shall be construed liberally to effectuate its purpose and intent fully’”); *Briggs v. Eden Council for Hope & Opportunity*, 969 P.2d 564, 573 (Cal. 1999) (“The Legislature’s 1997 amendment of [California’s anti-SLAPP statute] to mandate that it be broadly construed apparently was prompted by judicial decisions . . . that had narrowly construed it. . . . That the Legislature added its broad construction proviso . . . plainly indicates these decisions were mistaken in their narrow view of the relevant legislative intent.”).”¹²⁸ “More recently, however, legislatures have recognized that narrow anti-SLAPP laws are ineffectual in curbing the many forms of abusive litigation that SLAPPs can take.”¹²⁹

Dismissal of the appeal is an error of law.

2. “Quinn”

“Error in fact and error of law

Part of the order stated, “ ... Quinn’s appeal is interlocutory”.

I do not know who Quinn is.

“§739. Appeal

A moving party may appeal as a matter of right from an order denying, in whole or in part, a motion under section. An appeal of a judgment or order under this subchapter is governed by

the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure[.]”¹³⁰

3. “Motion was effectively denied” - “§739” - “appeal as a matter of right”

“Motion was effectively denied “over the objection of one of the parties[.]” who was the plaintiff.”

“Refusal of the Court to exercise jurisdiction over the motion is an error as a matter of law.” “A court-ordered mediation rather than exercising jurisdiction over the Special Anti-SLAPP motion is an effective denial of the Special Anti-SLAPP motion. It is no different from stating there is no authority to hear the motion.”

“§739. Appeal

A moving party may appeal as a matter of right from an order denying, in whole or in part, a motion under section 734. An appeal of a judgment or order under this subchapter is governed by the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.”

“It is an error not to dismiss with prejudice the action at the case management conference.”

[4]. Dismissal of the appeal as interlocutory is an error of law.

“[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation”

Please see discussion under “[A]t least five mechanisms” - “curbing” - “many forms” - “abusive litigation” supra.

[5]. “Because the appeal is dismissed, the trial court need not transmit the record to the Law Court”

“Section 4 furthers the purpose of the Act by protecting a moving party from the burdens of litigation—which include not only discovery, but responding to motions and other potentially abusive tactics—until the court adjudicates the motion and the moving party's appellate rights with respect to the motion are exhausted.”

Rule 2.6

“Ensuring the Right to Be Heard

A.A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law.”¹³¹

There were no arguments. There was no opportunity “to be heard” in the District Court and the Supreme Judicial Court.

[6]. Application

I. Sanborn v Sanborn

"This [Act to Strengthen Freedom of Speech Protections by Extending Laws Against Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation] applies to a civil action filed or cause of action asserted in a civil action on or after January 1, 2025."

Errors of law

Constitutional dimensions

Here, action involves the US constitution, federal statutes (eg., Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization), and international laws.

There were no constitutional dimensions in Sanborn.

Effective date of UPEPA

Bradbury v City of Eastport was cited in the "Appeal as of Right - Special Anti-SLAPP Motion". "Maine Supreme Judicial Court held that an interlocutory appeal may be made when an order denied an anti-SLAPP motion."

§739 was cited in the "Appeal as of Right - Special Anti-SLAPP Motion". "A moving party may appeal as a matter of right from an order denying, in whole or in part, a motion under section 734."

But, Sanborn was an August 5, 2005 decision. Effective date of UPEPA was January 1, 2025. "Divorce papers were submitted to the Court on January 13, 2025." UPEPA is applicable to divorce action.

"[H]earing"

"Here, a case management conference was held on April 29, 2025. It was decided during the conference that the Special Anti-SLAPP motion submitted on April 8, 2025 was not within the Court's jurisdiction. To confirm I inquired if the refusal to exercise jurisdiction over the motion constituted as a denial. It was stated that the decision as to the resolution of the Special Anti-SLAPP motion was to be made after the mediation. Further, I asked where was I supposed to submit the motion. I was informed that it was to be submitted to a district court. An order for mediation was issued on May 5, 2025." Appellate court "dismissed" the appeal as "interlocutory".

There was no hearing on the motion in the District Court and Supreme Judicial Court.

But, in Sanborn, there was a hearing. There were briefs submitted on "July 14, 2005". Arguments were made.

Plaintiff - "no [] fact" - "no affidavits and discovery materials" - "not likely to succeed on the merits" - move forward

"Complaint contained no [] fact, an explanation, and evidence. Ditto for the response to the motion. There were no affidavits and discovery materials included in the response. Meantime, there are no irreconcilable differences. Motion contained [] factual background, rationale, and proof. Nonetheless,

the case was not dismissed with prejudice at the case management conference and mediation was even ordered. Motion was effectively denied "over the objection of one of the parties[.]" who was the plaintiff." "In other words, divorce proceedings move forward even over my objection that there are "irreconcilable marital differences". Mediation is ordered even over my objection that "the marriage" "can not be saved", our marriage will break up, our family will be broken, and our child will grow up in a broken family. Divorce is not dismissed with prejudice even over my objection to the divorce. Terms of the divorce are imposed even over my objections with the divorce, the mediation, and that the marriage and the family will be broken. However, my motion is effectively denied when a plaintiff objects without a legal basis, a fact, an explanation, proof, affidavits, and discovery materials."

I had no chance "to be heard" in the District Court and the Supreme Judicial Court. My request for dismissal with prejudice was denied. I am likely to prevail on the merits.

But, in Sanborn, movants were given a hearing. Relief sought was a preliminary injunction. Grounds for denial was that movants "were not likely to succeed on the merits".

"[U]nnecessary"

Plaintiff did not raise the final judgment rule as an issue. She did not cite a statute about final judgment rule. She did not cite case law about final judgment rule.

Final judgment rule was a nonissue. Appeal did not suggest final judgment rule was applicable. It provided a statutory basis and case law for the appeal.

"[I]ssue [of final judgment rule was] unnecessary to decide the [appeal]".

II. Nader v Me. Democratic Party

"This [Act to Strengthen Freedom of Speech Protections by Extending Laws Against Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation] applies to a civil action filed or cause of action asserted in a civil action on or after January 1, 2025." ¹³²

"[F]acts are alleged"

"Complaint did not contain one (1) fact." ¹³³

"No different from the complaint, there was no fact in the response to the motion." ¹³⁴

"In the case management conference, like the complaint and response to the motion, no specific facts were provided. When asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion "merits [no] further response" which is another confirmation that it had no specific facts." ¹³⁵

But, in Nader, "facts" were "alleged" in the "pleadings and affidavits".

Maine's anti-SLAPP statute, 14 M.R.S.A. § 556 – dismissed with prejudice

"It is error not to dismiss the action with prejudice at the case management conference."

It is error to dismiss the appeal of an order, not to vacate the order, and not to remand with instructions to dismiss the action with prejudice.

In Nader, there was a first remand by the Supreme Judicial Court. In that remand, counts I-IV were not dismissed in the Superior Court under § 556. Count I was civil conspiracy. Count II was conspiracy to commit abuse of process and wrongful use of civil proceedings / malicious prosecutions. Count III was abuse of process in Maine. Count IV was wrongful use of civil proceedings in Maine.

Counts V-VI were dismissed under Rule 12(b). Count V was abuse of process in other jurisdictions. Count VI was wrongful use of civil proceedings / malicious prosecution in other jurisdictions.

Supreme Judicial Court vacated the judgment and made a second remand with instructions to dismiss the entirety of the complaint "pursuant to § 556".

"Motion to dismiss, pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 12(b)"

"Special Anti-SLAPP motion" sought dismissal of the action with prejudice. It was "effectively denied". "An "Appeal as of Right - Special Anti-SLAPP Motion" was submitted. Appeal was denied." "Motion for Summary Judgment" was submitted. Response was submitted by plaintiff. Before a reply to the response was submitted, motion was denied. "Motion to Amend the Special anti-SLAPP Motion" was submitted. It was denied. "Motion to Renew the Special anti-SLAPP Motion" was submitted. It was denied. "Motion to dismiss - fraud on the Court and the public" was submitted. Plaintiff had no response to the motion. Motion was denied anyway. "Motion to Dismiss based on (1) lack of subject matter jurisdiction, (2) failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and (3) failure to join an indispensable party" was submitted. There has been no response. "Special anti-SLAPP motion" submitted on April 8, 2025 was denied again. "Appeal as of Right - Anti-SLAPP Motion" submitted on May 27, 2025 was denied again. An "Answer" seeking dismissal of the complaint with prejudice was submitted. There has been no response. "

Superior Court dismissed counts I-VI under § 556. On the first remand, "pursuant to the newly announced standard", counts V and VI were dismissed under 12(b). Ruling on counts I-IV were deferred under 12(b). On the second remand, counts I-IV were dismissed under § 556. Judgments on counts V-VI were affirmed.

Effective date of UPEPA

Bradbury v City of Eastport was cited in the "Appeal as of Right - Special Anti-SLAPP Motion". "Maine Supreme Judicial Court held that an interlocutory appeal may be made when an order denied an anti-SLAPP motion."

§739 was cited in the "Appeal as of Right - Special Anti-SLAPP Motion". "A moving party may appeal as a matter of right from an order denying, in whole or in part, a motion under section 734."

But, Nader was a May 23, 2013 decision. Effective date of UPEPA was January 1, 2025. "Divorce papers were submitted to the Court on January 13, 2025." UPEPA is applicable to divorce action.

“[N]ewly announced standard”

Judicial notice - mandatory

Please see discussion under Judicial notice — mandatory supra.

Civil action was filed on January 13, 2025. Effective date of UPEPA was January 1, 2025. “Amendment” “applies” “to a civil action filed or cause of action asserted in a civil action on or after January 1, 2025”. “Amendment” was before filing the civil action.

But, in Nader, “civil complaint” was filed in November 2009. “[N]ew standard for applying the anti-SLAPP statute” was “announced” “April 2012”. “[N]ew standard” was “announced” after filing the action.

Dismissal of the appeal is an error of law.

§ 556 superseded

“UPEPA “repeals” the “narrow” 1995 law.”

Procedure - § 556

“At the second step of the anti-SLAPP analysis, the court must dismiss the non-moving party's claims unless the non-moving party demonstrates, through the pleadings and affidavits, that the moving party's petitioning activity does not fall within the protection of the anti-SLAPP statute.”

Prima facie evidence - § 556

“This requires prima facie evidence that at least one of the moving party's petitioning activities was “devoid of any reasonable factual support or any arguable basis in law and ... caused actual injury to the [nonmoving party].”

Here, “[i]n the response to the motion, akin to the complaint, there was no legal basis mentioned. There were no facts mentioned. There was no rationale provided. There was no evidentiary support (eg., affidavits, discovery materials).”

“Burden of the nonmovant is to show that the moving party's exercise of his/her rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support or any arguable basis in law. Then, nonmovant has to show movant's acts caused injury. Nonmovant failed to meet her burden. Response contained no legal basis. Response did not contain any fact demonstrating the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. It did not contain any fact demonstrating the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. It did not contain any fact that the exercise of my rights caused her actual injury. There was no explication. There was no evidence.” “[D]ocuments” (eg., “transcript” , “report”, “affidavit”, or a “decision”) were not incorporated in the response. These are examples of “documents” that “might have provided prima facie evidence” that “petitioning activities” are “devoid of any reasonable factual support or any arguable basis in law and ... caused actual injury to the [nonmoving party].”

Prima facie evidence - UPEPA

Judicial notice - mandatory

Please see discussion under Judicial notice -- mandatory supra.

"The responding party fails to establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of the cause of action ... "

"Here, even if the "irreconcilable marital differences" basis for divorce is constitutional, it is not, there are no "essential elements". "To a lay person such as myself, irreconcilable marital differences mean differences were identified. There were no details what the identified "irreconcilable marital differences". "Irreconcilable" means that attempts were diligently made to reconcile identified differences. There were no details when exactly the attempts were diligently made to reconcile the identified "irreconcilable marital differences. Before the papers were filed, there were no earlier dialogues with me and our child related to the identified differences much less any efforts to reconcile the differences." There was no factual background. Response to the motion again mischaracterized the motion. This time as it related to facts. Motion stated there was no "factual background" in the complaint. Motion stated there were "no details" in the complaint. Plaintiff has "no" "factual basis" for the divorce. No rationale was given. There was no evidence. Plaintiff has no burden of proof. In the response to the motion, akin to the complaint, there was no legal basis mentioned. There were no facts mentioned. There was no rationale provided. There was no evidentiary support (eg., affidavits, discovery materials).

Denials in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : **Maine Rule 11**)

"Manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents; electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities sully the integrity thereof is/are not legitimate use of public property. Assets that belong to the public are not meant to be misused to cover up negligent[, or] wrongful act or omission. Dilatory activities, on personal and/or political grounds, were not intended in acquisition of tools belonging to an employer." ""The manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property and/or activities sully/ies the integrity thereof."

Nonmovant did not establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of a cause of action."

Summary judgment – admissible evidence

"To avoid a summary judgment, the nonmoving party must do more than state its affirmative defense; it must offer admissible evidence in support of that defense."

"Complaint had no factual background." "Complaint had no evidentiary support." In the "Response to the [Anti-SLAPP] motion], "[n]o fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights caused plaintiff actual injury." "No support was provided." "In the case management conference, like the complaint and

response to the motion, no specific facts were provided. When asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion "merits [no] further response" which is another confirmation that it had no specific facts."

"[B]urden of production"

"[T]o meet a burden of production" "a party must produce evidence "sufficient to allow a fact-finder to make a factual determination without speculating".

"There were no facts []." "There were no affidavits. There were no discovery materials. [] There was no testimony. There was no evidence."

"[U]ndisputed facts" - "violation of a statutory requirement"

"Although a petitioning activity can be so lacking in factual and legal merit that it is, as a matter of law, devoid of factual or legal support, this cannot be the case where the undisputed facts show a violation of a statutory requirement."

"... [S]urveillance is an inherently dangerous activity not to mention it is imbued with a far greater capacity for harm (eg., suppression of speech, injuries caused by a car crash, deprivation of due process)."

"Attorney Buenaventura was "deprived of his life in [the Philippines], dispossessed of property, and being defamed and painted in false light with the abuse of public resources."

"My mother was coerced by her Caretaker." "[Mrs. Buenaventura] was subjected to torture. My mother was coerced to write." "A video of my mother being insulted, in her undergarments, and sent through a device subject to surveillance shows no regard for her honor." "Mrs. Buenaventura was manipulated by one whom she trusted to "primum non nocere"."

"[Ms. Doe 3] is [being] coerced to participate in activities." "[Ms. Doe 3] is being defrauded." "Soon after she begun, political undercurrent flowed from [School 4]." "Cyberattack undertaken by a ransomware attacker was a public facade. Surveillance knows who was behind it." "Agencies built for owners exploit those very same individuals of an education pristine from propaganda."

"Ms. Doe 2 was defrauded by a businessman." "She was subjected to involuntary servitude [by this businessman]."

"Ms. Doe 1 was defrauded. The amount was \$50,000."

"I am being coerced to participate in activities." "I am being defrauded." "My education was (eg., Examsoft) and is being destabilized." "I am being defamed to the Buenaventura family." "I am being defamed to the Reyes family." "I am being carved out from my family, friends, and society." "My mother was prevented from speaking to me."

"As my family life is being fractured, I am defrauded to be a front. Being used as utility without valid consent shows no regard for my honor."

"Scope of liability – narrowing

Language of majority states "[A]bsent vicarious liability, each government office, his or her title notwithstanding is only liable for his or her own misconduct."

Here, that language declares there is no accountability in the federal government nor relief for harm it inflicts. There is no oversight on work done in the federal enterprise. Where sanctioned by the highest Court in the land, the foreseeable consequences (eg., constitutional rights, human rights) are tragic.

U.S. government conducts surveillance which is inherently dangerous. "Instances of wiretapping" are undertaken by "governmental agencies". A Florida representative added in discussion. Federal government retaliates at speakers of gross oversight. It assassinates anyone who expresses a varying view. It is involved in racketeering activities. It is engaged in drug trade. It bribes. A Secretary of State confirmed. It lies. An official from the Department of Defense stated so. It misrepresents itself. It committed sexual crimes. It commits psychological abuse. It deprives due process to enemy combatants. Torture techniques are official U.S. doctrine. It trains armies of foreign nations (eg., the Philippines) to torture. It intends to torture. "Budget" of that agency "continued to grow." It decided to narrow the broader definition of torture as defined in Article I of the Convention against Torture. It uses rendition to torture. It violates medical ethics in its adoption of torture techniques and applying it on individuals. It uses sensory deprivation, stress positions, dogs, and nudity to torture. It uses psychological and physical coercion in torture. It administers psychological warfare in industrial scale. "CIA personnel revealed" in a "July 2002 cable" it "would eliminate evidence." "If subject dies, [CIA] plan[s] on seeking assistance for the cremation of subject." "[T]orturers were worried that, if the prisoner survived he might reveal one day" he/she was tortured. Should the individual survive, "torturers" "demanded 'reasonable assurances' that the prisoner 'will remain in isolation and incommunicado for the remainder of his life.'" "Headquarters" "agreed that the prisoner 'will never be placed in a situation where he has any significant contact with others.'" It has a narcissistic personality disorder. It arrests people by mistake. It carries out terrorism in its own jurisdiction and outside. It requests for immunity after commission of willful killing, torture, and inhumane treatment. It intentionally evades liability for its war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity by seeking immunity and waits for international outrage to increase before holding itself accountable by prosecuting a contractor. These are occurring with timely and thorough knowledge afforded by surveillance. Despite the dangers inherent in surveillance, to name an example, there is no stoppage

"Eliminat[ion]" of "liability entirely"

The Honorable Supreme Court Justice David H. Souter wrote in his dissent, "Lest there be any mistake, in these words the majority is not narrowing the scope of supervisory liability; it is eliminating Bivens supervisory liability entirely."

Here, this is consistent with U.S. policy of no accountability by the federal government. 34 of 51 jurisdictions have an anti-SLAPP statute. There is no federal anti-SLAPP statute. Scrupulous candor, ethics (eg., Model Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4), and comporting to the U.S. constitution, statutes, and treaties required from attorneys in private practice are not required from counsels in public service. Ethics required from physicians in private practice are

not required from physicians in the federal government. Psychological abuse is a crime in other foreign countries. Psychological abuse (eg., gaslighting) is not a crime in the U.S. It is employed by the federal government against speakers. Transparency (eg., balance sheet, budget) required from corporations are not required from the federal government. Oversight required in private corporations are non existent in the federal government (eg., "... official ... is only liable for his or her own misconduct.") Accountability that is applicable to private corporations is not applicable to the federal government. Res ipsa loquitur is applicable to private corporations and private individuals but seems to be inapplicable to the federal government. Rules prohibiting obstruction (eg., spoliation of privileged materials) of justice are applicable to all but are not applicable to the federal government. Prohibition against racketeering activities that are applicable to everyone is not applicable to the federal government. Rule prohibiting torture in broad language is applicable to other nations but is not applicable to the federal government. Fidelity to the U.S. constitution and universal declaration of human rights people pledge to are not applicable to the federal government. Jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity (eg., pandemic), genocide, and crimes of aggression committed by a nation's citizenry are applicable to 123 countries but it is not applicable to the United States government and its citizenry. This looks like a well developed policy by the federal government to avoid liability entirely rendering the ideal of "Equal Justice Under Law" less genuine and more illusory.

415,000 casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan operations. Thousands of children abused by religious denomination. At least 16,760 women abused by a university in southern California. 7,[103,253] deaths due to Covid-19 as of October [2]6, 202[5]. Those with influence and/or their proxy work overtime for adverse interests. If there is legitimate use of public resources, not one of these losses would have occurred. If the federal government orchestrates racketeering activities, provides defensive briefings to conceal its misconduct, conducts surveillance, surveils sovereign countries, influence events in other countries (eg., torture), carries out surveillance on 34 foreign leaders, and has actual knowledge of all its misconduct (eg., racketeering activities), omission, wrongdoing, and negligence before, during, and after these occur, it is a reasonable expectation for it to provide at a minimum a warning before an injury and loss is inflicted on a private person. Absence of sufficient and timely warnings (eg., pandemic) to the public, no detailed measures to stop an injury disseminated domestically, and a lack of step-by-step process as to how an individual can mitigate the harm to himself/herself and his/her family member broadcasted internationally show a malignant heart towards injuries to and loss of lives of others.

If the federal government is a racketeering enterprise, is above the law domestically (eg., constitution) and internationally (human rights), and has no respect for the territorial integrity and right of self-determination of sovereign nations (eg., the Philippines), it's name is misleading. "

"Respectfully, I request [the First Circuit Court of Appeals] that the Motion for Summary Disposition be denied. It is a circumnavigation device. Ten (10) reasons support why it is avoidance of significant stages of proceedings.

One, it is "self-help" to circumnavigate "submission" of a "timely brief". Two, "same arguments" "could have made" "in a brief". Then, a request could have been made to "waive oral arguments if [movants] felt" "argument would be unhelpful". (Source : U.S. v Fortner) [] Three, it is "self-

servi[ce]" to circumnavigate a remand. Four, it is "self-help" to circumnavigate a submitted answer. Five, it is "self-servi[ce]" to circumnavigate a 26(f) conference. Six, it is "self-help" to circumnavigate discovery. Seven, it is "self-servi[ce]" to circumnavigate summary judgment. Eight, it is "self-help" to circumnavigate sanctions (eg., for "creat[ion] of unjustified delays"; "serve the public interest in the expeditious resolution of litigation"). Nine, it is "self-servi[ce]" to circumnavigate a jury trial. Ten, it is "self-help" to "ultimately" circumnavigate timely accountability for repeated abuses of processes."

"Appellees in their Motion to Extend Time, Motion for Summary Disposition, and Motion to Stay made "no explanation" in its "strategy" in "stand[ing] mute" as to a "tree" and to the "forest". "

UPEPA

" (1) The responding party fails to establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of the cause of action; or

Here, even if the "irreconcilable marital differences" basis for divorce is constitutional, it is not, there are no "essential elements". "To a lay person such as myself, irreconcilable marital differences mean differences were identified. There were no details what the identified "irreconcilable marital differences". "Irreconcilable" means that attempts were diligently made to reconcile identified differences. There were no details when exactly the attempts were diligently made to reconcile the identified "irreconcilable marital differences. Before the papers were filed, there were no earlier dialogues with me and our child related to the identified differences much less any efforts to reconcile the differences." There was no factual background. Response to the motion again mischaracterized the motion. This time as it related to facts. Motion stated there was no "factual background" in the complaint. Motion stated there were "no details" in the complaint. Plaintiff has "no" "factual basis" for the divorce. No rationale was given. There was no evidence. Plaintiff has no burden of proof. In the response to the motion, akin to the complaint, there was no legal basis mentioned. There were no facts mentioned. There was no rationale provided. There was no evidentiary support (eg., affidavits, discovery materials).

Denials in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : Maine Rule 11)

"Manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents; electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities sully[ing] the integrity thereof is/are not legitimate use of public property. Assets that belong to the public are not meant to be misused to cover up negligent[, or] wrongful act or omission. Dilatory activities, on personal and/or political grounds, were not intended in acquisition of tools belonging to an employer." ""The manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property and/or activities sully/ies the integrity thereof."

Nonmovant did not establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of a cause of action.

(2) The moving party establishes that:

(a) The responding party failed to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted; or

Here, also, nonmovant failed to establish her cause of action, "irreconcilable marital differences". Basis for the divorce violates laws such as the United States constitution (eg., 1st amendment, 4th amendment, 5th amendment, 7th amendment, 8th amendment, 13th amendment, 14th amendment, ex post facto law, and bill of attainder), violates human rights, and United States statutes (eg., Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization Act). There are no "essential elements". One example, in tort law, there is harmful conduct that is required to be proven. In a no fault divorce, no harmful conduct is required to be proven. Second example, in tort law, there is causation that is required to be proven. In a no-fault divorce, no causation is required to be proven. Third example, in [] contract law, breach is required to be proven. In a no-fault divorce, no breach is required to be proven. Plaintiff has no burden of proof.

Factual contention was made by plaintiff. "I [would] infring[e] on anyone's Constitutional rights[.]", "if the Court" did not "allow the divorce to proceed". This statement is not warranted by existing law. This is statement is not warranted by the evidence. (Source : **Maine Rule 11**)

Denials in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : **Maine Rule 11**)

"Manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents; electronically stored information, tangible property, and/or activities sully[ing] the integrity thereof is/are not legitimate use of public property. Assets that belong to the public are not meant to be misused to cover up negligent[, or] wrongful act or omission. Dilatory activities, on personal and/or political grounds, were not intended in acquisition of tools belonging to an employer."
""The manufacturing and/or spoliation of documents, electronically stored information, tangible property and/or activities sully/ies the integrity thereof."

Nonmovant failed to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted.

(b) There is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on the cause of action or part of the cause of action.

Here, complaint had no legal basis. Complaint had no factual background. Complaint had no reasoning. Complaint had no evidentiary support. Response to the motion did not state any legal basis. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any reasonable factual support. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights was devoid of any arguable basis in law. No fact was stated showing the exercise of my rights caused plaintiff actual injury. No reasoning was stated. No support was provided. In the case management conference, like the complaint and response to the motion, no specific facts were provided. When asked by the Court if plaintiff had a response to the motion, paid trained legal assistance stated the motion "merits [no] further response" which is another confirmation that it had no specific facts.

"[D]enials" in the response are unwarranted by the evidence. (Source : **Maine Rule 11**)

Because the response did not state specific facts, there is no genuine issue for trial. There were no facts, no affidavits, and no discovery materials.

Thus, the action must be dismissed with prejudice."

"12(b) motion to dismiss"

On October 29, 2025, a "Motion to Dismiss based on (1) lack of subject matter jurisdiction, (2) failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and (3) failure to join an indispensable party" was submitted.

There has been no response.

"Significant public interest – constitution" ¹³⁶

"[W]hen a strict interpretation of the Constitution, according to the fixed rules which govern the interpretation of laws, is abandoned, and the theoretical opinions of individuals are allowed to control its meaning, we have no longer a Constitution; we are under the government of individual men, who for the time being have power to declare what the Constitution is, according to their own views of what it ought to mean."

"'Truth is great and will prevail if left to herself,' Thomas Jefferson shared."

"Surveillance are authorized by § 1881 (a), 702, and/or other authority. The statutory conditions do not meet constitutional muster."

"... [S]urveillance is an inherently dangerous activity not to mention it is imbued with a far greater capacity for harm (eg., suppression of speech, injuries caused by a car crash, deprivation of due process)." "The toll on human lives by unreliable intelligence is irreparable. At its hilt, it is lethal."

"Language in the statutory authorities (e.g., "an appropriate[ly] classified matter", "any person known to be in the United States", "any United States person reasonably believed to be located abroad", "authorized intelligence purposes", "connection or interest", "contracts or arrangements for provision of goods or services", "employed by or acting on behalf", "foreign influence", "foreign power", "foreign intelligence", "human experimentation", "intelligence records", "in the interest of national defense or foreign relations", "in the interest of national security", "national security, national defense, and foreign relations", "reasonably believed to be acting on behalf of a foreign power", "research on human subjects", "reveal", and/or "sponsorship of contracts or arrangements") is amorphous and elastic."

"National security is not a significant government interest. It is shorthand for buying and selling of governments as the lowest bidder and to the highest bidder, respectively."

"Section 28 U.S.C. § 1654 is unconstitutional[.]"

"[T]here is no consideration of the facts present that there are economic duress; financial hardships; threats; spoliation and manufacture of documents, activities, tangible things, and electronic stored information; dilatory activities; and my [and my family members] being 'carved out'." Requiring counsel will lead to an order of a dismissal. An opportunity to be heard is denied. Redress, legal and equitable, is not made available. Meantime, documents, activities, tangible articles, and electronically stored information are spoliated and manufactured. These spoliation activities are executed in military

precision by use of public resources. Requirement of counsel looks like a sanction. Erasure (eg., statute of limitations) of claims occurs. Perpetual perpetration of abuse of powers targeting my family members become more severe."

"A dismissal of the complaint submitted on ... behalf [of The Estate of Attorney Simon M. Buenaventura, The Estate of Mrs. Eva R. Buenaventura, and Ms. Jane Doe 3] will result into an irreversible (eg., statute of limitations), expanding, and multiplication of injuries with no cessation. Dismissing a complaint is equal to a denial of a day in court since there will be no answer from defendants; no discovery; no trial; no jury deliberation; claims extinguished; injuries unabated; and no equitable and legal redress. This excludes a human being. It is a substantial injustice to [Attorney Buenaventura, Mrs. Buenaventura, and Ms. Doe 3]."

"... [F]inality of litigation [has] no place where life or liberty is at stake" and there are "constitutional" violations. When these two elements are present the finality of the judgment must be "balanced" with the "irreversible finality" of activities that infringe constitutional rights. The loss of [Attorney Buenaventura's and Mrs. Buenaventura's] "li[v]e[s] or libert[ies]" are irreversible. The ongoing loss of [Ms. Doe 3's] "life or liberty" [are] irreversible. Damages that are being caused to [Attorney Buenaventura's, Mrs. Buenaventura's, and Ms. Doe 3's] ... name[s] by defamation and depiction of [their] name[s] in a false light disrupt dialogue. The ramifications are manifest. Although this could be stopped immediately by the "grand reservoir of equitable power" it is foreclosed. Dismissal of the complaint disallows [The Estate of Attorney Buenaventura, The Estate of Mrs. Buenaventura, and Ms. Doe 3] from being heard on the merits and of availing relief."

"The 11th Circuit [Honorable] Judge Johnson's obiter dictum included '[t]o countenance any review less probing is inconsistent with the dictates of the statute[, "28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(a)"]'." "Citing a Supreme Court decision in Steffler v United States], he added "[o]n appeal we will not normally prescribe the particular method by which a trial [C]ourt will undertake this determination, but we are nonetheless bound to compel the trial [C]ourt to exercise some particularized review." "Reed v Town of Gilbert in part noted, "That is why the First Amendment expressly targets the operation of the laws- i.e., the "abridg[ement] of speech"- rather than merely the motives of those who enacted them. U.S. Const., Amdt. 1." 'The vice of content-based legislation ... is not that it is always used for invidious, thought-control purposes, but that it lends itself to use for those purposes.'"

"Technique [137]"

Ask first if it is narrowly tailored. Second question is whether it is substantially overbroad.

Laws not narrowly tailoring can be struck down as unconstitutional on this sole basis. Overbreadth, does not have to be queried."

"Our peculiar security," Thomas Jefferson said, "is in the possession of a written constitution."

"Damages"

"I am being injured. I have a legally protected interest in defending my rights, personal, and property interests. Harm directly flow from violations. One of these violations of the federal government is the 4th amendment of the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Supreme Court held in Bivens v Six Unknown

Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics] money damages are appropriate in order to redress the disregard for the constitution.”

“I have a responsibility to defend my father[, my mother, Ms. Doe 3, Ms. Doe 2] and [all of] my family members [(eg., deceased, alive)].”

“Unlike in Simon (v Hartford Life Inc.), I spoke against overtime shaving (a constitutional right and a human right) and thereafter I am retaliated on. There has been racketeering, harassment, forum funneling, and driving me and family out to puncture the subpoena bubble. My and my family rights (alive and deceased) were shredded and are being trampled. We are being carved out. I do not have my own source of livelihood [“for nearly nine (9) years. ”]. I can not afford to pay \$248 per hour for professional legal services. Reprisal on me significantly impacts the rest of my family. My father who is the real party in interest in [a] complaint has the legal rights to be enforced. However, he passed away. The defamation of his name and casting his name in a false light can not be stopped until someone who is inextricably intertwined with him such as a spouse, child, sister, or brother stands up for him, defends his name, and pursues justice for him.”

“I seek compensatory damages, punitive damages (modification of existing law), treble damages, court costs (where applicable), prejudgment interest (where applicable), expenses (modification of existing law), and attorney fees.”

Joint and Several Liability

“There are two or more individuals and/or legal entities causing proximately injuries. Each tortfeasor is liable for the entire harm done. It is of no consequence whether the action is independent. In actions in concert between tortfeasors, the question if the damage is divisible and identifiable is not important. Each tortfeasor is liable for the full amount of liability.”

Accordingly, this is to submit a writ of certiorari. This document consists of three (3) requests.

1st

First request is to hear the case on June 8, 2026 to address all the issues in this petition for review.

2nd

Second request is to declare that the divorce law of Maine (eg., “irreconcilable marital differences”), procedures of Maine (eg., “online legal research materials resource without “constitutional impediments”, “no receipt of orders”), and structural bias (eg., “I was described as “ ... disturb Buenaventura ... ” [by the Court]”) violate the US constitution, federal statutes, and international laws by June 9, 2026.

3rd

Third request is to send to the Lewiston District Court an expedient instruction by June 9, 2026. Instruction consists of three (3) items. Item one is to dismiss the divorce action with prejudice.

Item two is to instruct plaintiff to immediately cease weaponizing public resources to infringe on my constitutional and human rights. Item three is to instruct plaintiff to immediately cease from "creating, coordinating, and carrying out" racketeering activities (eg., obstruction of justice, extortion).

Conclusion

Respectfully, this is to submit a writ of certiorari. The petition should be granted.

Please see attached Appendix.

I am appreciative of the time of the Court.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date : August 21, 2026.

²¹⁸
Ian R. Buenaventura