

No. _____

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

—————◆—————
ROBERT J. GALLAGHER,

Pro Se Petitioner,

v.

CLERK-MAGISTRATE JOSEPH KATTAR, JR
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JAMES D. BARRETTO
CLERK KEITH MCDONOUGH
STEPHEN D'ANGELO, ESQ.
MARY MC CAULEY-MANZI, ESQ
CATHERINE W. WNEK, REALTOR
(COCO, EARLY, ASSOC),

Respondents.

—————◆—————
**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court**

—————◆—————
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

—————◆—————
ROBERT J. GALLAGHER, *pro se*
528 North End Blvd. N-1
Salisbury, MA 01952
RevDrBob@aol.com
978-255-4595

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the so-called *Progressive* Massachusetts Courts, whose Commonwealth has received a National Report Card Evaluation of *F* for *Public Records*, *C-* for *State Ethics Commission*, *C+* for *Judicial Accountability* and *D+* for *Legislative Accountability*, have become so politically corrupt and so intertwined with the MA Attorney General's Office that even its Highest Court can no longer efficaciously and independently superintend its Lower Courts via Separation of Powers/Checks and Balances – unable to *administer* justice but rather inclined to *obstruct justice* re a false and frivolous *Restraining Order Petition*, undermining collateral issues and rights re: *18 USC par 2261, 2262, 2265, Federal Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation (S.L.A.P.P)*, *Fed Const 1st Amend Free Speech, Fed Const 1st Amend Right to Appeal, Fed Const 4th and 14th Amendments Due Process*.

(*SEE "F" REPORT CARD RE CORRUPTION RISK FOR MASSACHUSETTS PUBLIC RECORDS ACCESSIBILITY* <http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807> in APPENDIX).

II. Whether *Totality of the Circumstances Test*, via Fed Const 4th and 14th Amend or otherwise, begs Expansion and Review by the USSC under the extraordinary circumstances in which a State Court

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

affirms, enables, facilitates, and even promotes dangerous precedent that undermine collateral Federal Statutes and Articles named in Question 1.

III. Whether the MA SJC acted erroneously, capriciously, and arbitrarily by affirming, enabling, facilitating and even promoting in the courts below, dangerous precedents re collateral Statutes and Articles named in Question 1.

IV. Whether the MA SJC collaborated with the Attorney General's covert, *ex parte* legal representation of *non-state* actor defendants who themselves did not respond to Plaintiff's Affidavit Complaint in any fashion – leading the Court to grant *non-state* actor defendants *carte blanche sovereign immunity* reserved for state actors, undermining collateral issues and rights re collateral Federal Statutes and Articles named in Question 1.

V. Whether the MA SJC belabored the Plaintiff's *Procedure* at the expense of its own *Substance* to the advantage of its political colleagues in the courts, businesses, and law offices below, precluding a level playing field and failing to discipline, correct, and avoid setting dangerous precedents re collateral *Federal S.L.A.P.P. Statutes* and *Fed Const Rights*, i.e., whether MA SJC used alleged flaws in Plaintiff's *procedures* to distract from its own *substantive* flaws/omissions as *overseers* of courts, businesses, attorneys.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

VI. Whether Massachusetts Small Claims Courts dispenses two-edged sword instructions re appeal, i.e., the statement *Judgment in favor of defendant means that the defendant does not have to pay the plaintiff any part of the claim or costs in this claim. This plaintiff does not have any right to appeal from this judgment* and reference to *Rule 8* are contradicted by other language which reads (partially in all caps): *IF YOU LOST THE CASE BEFORE THE MAGISTRATE . . . You may not appeal from the magistrate's decision against you.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	vi
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	12
CONCLUSION.....	14
APPENDIX	
Opinion, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachu- setts, dated November 28, 2014	App. 1
Docket Entry Order, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, entered January 31, 2014.....	App. 4
Judgment, Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County, Massachusetts, entered November 8, 2013	App. 8
Judgment, Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County, Massachusetts, entered January 6, 2015	App. 10

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
Findings, Rulings and Order, District Court, Lawrence Division, dated March 25, 2013....	App. 11
Judgment, Trial Court of Massachusetts, District Court Department, Small Claims Session, entered [illegible].....	App. 19
Public Betrayal in the Bay State, Massachu- setts Anti-Corruption Gaps Fueled Public Servant Misconduct	App. 21
Mary McCauly-Manzi, Esq., Records on Ap- peals (3 pages).....	App. 26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

FED CASE LAW/STATUTES/
U.S. CONST BILL OF RIGHTS/CODES

DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN CONDO ASSNS, http://neighborhoodlink.com/article/association/directors_officers,and_conflicts_interest_and_code_of_ethics_and_standards_of_practice_of_the_national_assn_of_realtors ; http://srcar.org/info/rules-regs/code-of-ethics-and-standards-of-practice-of-the-national-association-of-realtors/ ; EXHIBITS D and E in Original Complaint	
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE 18 USC, par 2261, 2262, 2265	3, 12
FEDERAL STATUTES RE <i>STRATEGIC LITIGATION AGAINST PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</i>	<i>passim</i>
FIRST AMENDMENT – U.S. CONSTITUTION – EXPRESSION/FREE SPEECH, INVOKED AND AFFIRMED IN LAWRENCE DISTRICT COURT RULING.....	2, 3, 9, 10, 13
FIRST AMENDMENT – U.S. CONSTITUTION – RIGHT TO PETITION.....	2, 4, 10, 13
FOURTH AMENDMENT U.S. CONSTITUTION, TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES TEST.....	3, 4, 13
HAMMONDS V. AETNA CAS. & SUR. CO., D.C. OHIO, 243 F. SUPP, 793, 796 (1965). COMMUNITY COMMON SENSE AND COMMON CONSCIENCE; ALSO, RE PUBLIC POLICY	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

ILLINOIS v. GATES, 462 U.S. 213 (1983: http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=462&invol=213 , TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES TEST	
MAPP V. OHIO, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), THERE IS NO WAR BETWEEN THE CONSTITUTION AND COMMON SENSE! . . . NOTHING CAN DESTROY A GOVT MORE QUICKLY THAN FAILURE TO OBSERVE ITS OWN LAWS, OR WORSE, ITS DISREGARD OF THE CHARTER OF ITS OWN EXISTENCE.....	5
SJC MISSION STATEMENT – SEE APPENDIX.....	4
OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, 18 U.S. Code Chapter 73	
UNITED STATES V. ARVIZU, 534 U.S. 266 (2002), RE TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES TEST	

MASSACHUSETTS CASES

BROOKS AUTOMATION, INC., V. BLUE-SHIFT TECHNOLOGIES, INC. PENALTY AWARDS FOR FRIVOLOUS, BAD FAITH LITIGATION – http://www.bulkley.com/bulletins/spring-2006/aggressive-employer/	
--	--

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

DMITRIY TILMAN ET ALII V. DAVID O. BRINK ET ALII, 74 MASS. APP.CT. 845, FEBRUARY 4, 2009 – AUGUST 18, 2009, ATTORNEY FEES IMPOSED ON COUNSEL FOR PURSUING FRIVOLOUS CASE TO COURTS	
GALLAGHER V KATTAR et alii, SJC 11592 and Related Case SJC 2013-034, The Cases on Petition for Writ of Certiorari.....	1, 2, 12
GALLAGHER V WNEK COUNTER-SUIT, LAWRENCE DISTRICT COURT #1318 RO 0118, February 1, 2013	1
GALLAGHER V WNEK, NEWBURYPORT SMALL CLAIMS #1322 SC 000306	1
“HONORABLE” MARY MCCAULEY-MANZI RECORD ON APPEALS, ATTORNEY (NOT JUDGE) IN THIS PETITION OF WRIT FOR CERTIORARI, SEE APPENDIX http://behindthescene.weebly.com/judge-mary-manzi.html	
JAMES KELLY vs. JAMES R. KELLY, 2010 Mass. App. Div. 262, December 13, 2010 ABUSE OF DISCRETION	
LOPES et alii vs. COMMONWEALTH, 442 Mass. 170, March 5, 2004 – July 9	
2004 – SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY FOR STATE ACTORS BUT NOT FOR NON-STATE ACTORS	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
MASSACHUSETTS v. EPA (No. 05-1120), 415 F.3d 50, reversed and remanded, ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS	
MC GUINNESS V. COMMONWEALTH, 420 MASS. 495, 497 (1995), quoting Planned Parenthood League of Mass., Inc. v. Operation Rescue, 406 Mass. 701, 706 (1990). Planned Parenthood League of Mass., Inc. v. Opera- tion Rescue, supra, quoting Dunbrack v. Commonwealth, 398 Mass. 502, 504 (1986)	
MILTON V. CITY OF BOSTON, 427 Mass. 1016, 1016-1017 (1998). CLEAR ERROR OF LAW	
WNEK V. GALLAGHER, LAWRENCE DIS- TRICT COURT 258E, s 3, COMPLAINT FOR PROTECTION FROM HARASSMENT – #1318 RO 0118, February 1, 2013	
MASSACHUSETTS STATUTES	
CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, MGL 93A	
MGL 231, 6f, 6g, BAD FAITH, FRIVOLOUS SUITS	
MGL c. 231, s. 59H STRATEGIC LITIGATION AGAINST PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	
M.G.L. c. 258E PETITION FOR RESTRAIN- ING ORDER.....	3, 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT M.G.L. c. 211,
s 3, SUPERINTENDENCE POWERS MIS-
SION STATEMENT – SEE APPENDIX

COURT RULES

MA CANONS OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT:
8, 15, 16, 18, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 44, in-
cluding Fraud on the Court and conspiring
with client to violate Federal ANTI-SLAPP
Statute and MGL 231, 6F, 6G via Bad Faith
suit

MA RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT:
3.1, 3.3, 3.4

MA RULE 11 FRIVOLOUS LAW SUITS
LEADING TO ATTORNEY FEES [www.
lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=3c2654ad-
db51-4689](http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=3c2654ad-db51-4689) . . . – *Similar* to Frivolous lawsuit
leads to attorneys’ fees – Lexology Jun 13,
2012 . . . Frivolous lawsuit leads to attorneys’
fees . . . sanction against a Massachusetts
attorney for filing a frivolous lawsuit. The
case serves as a reminder that the Rule 11
prohibition against frivolous lawsuits is not a
toothless one

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

MA SMALL CLAIMS COURT, NEWBURY-
PORT): “DECISION IS FINAL; YOU MAY
NOT APPEAL” EXHIBIT ZZ-1, ZZ-2 ORIGI-
NAL DOC. (N.B. – Rule 8 of the Trial Court’s
Uniform Small Claims Rules contradicts
the language of accompanying doc. SJC
(APPELLATE) PROCEDURE

SJC RULE 11: DIRECT APPELLATE REVIEW
. . . questions presented by the appeal are:
(1) *questions of first impression or novel ques-
tions of law* which should be submitted for
final determination to the Supreme Judicial
Court; (2) questions of law . . . concerning the
Constitution of the United States which have
been raised in a court of the Commonwealth;
or (3) questions of such public interest that
justice requires a final determination by the
full Supreme Judicial Court. SJC MISSION
STATEMENT, [http://www.mass.gov/courts/
court-info/sjc/about/](http://www.mass.gov/courts/court-info/sjc/about/)

SJC RULE 3:09 CODE OF JUDICIAL CON-
DUCT

PROFESSIONAL WRITINGS

ABA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT
[http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/
migrated/judicialethics/ABA_MCJC_approved.
authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/judicialethics/ABA_MCJC_approved.authcheckdam.pdf)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY Appearance ofImpropry.authcheckdam.pdf; <http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807>

APPEARANCE OF PROFESSIONAL WRONG-DOING, DANIEL KOFFSKY, SR COUNSEL FOR U.S. DEPT OF JUSTICE <http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/judicialethics/resources/TPL>; <http://www.vsb.org/docs/LEO/1718.pdf>; <http://heinonline.org/hol/landingpage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/>

BROOKS AUTOMATION PENALTY FOR FRIVOLOUS SUIT <http://masslawblog.com/business-lit-session/massachusetts-business-court-sanctions-company-for-pursuing-frivolous-case-to-enforce-noncomplete-agreement/>

CORRUPTION RISK IN MASSACHUSETTS <http://www.stateintegrity.org/massachusetts>

EQUITABLE AWARD OF ATTORNEY FEES, DANIELS, PALUZZI, ALLIO <http://equityisswell.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/equitable-attorney-fees.pdf>

ETHICAL LAWYERING IN MASSACHUSETTS – <http://www.mcle.org/mappedpdfstore/2100103WAU.PDF>; <http://www.magazine.com/commonwealthmagazine.org/The-Download/178-C-on-integrity-report-nothing-to-write-home-about.aspx><http://www.capecodtimes.com/article/20120401/News/204010343>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

“F” REPORT CARD RE CORRUPTION RISK FOR MASSACHUSETTS PUBLIC RECORDS ACCESSIBILITY <http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807>; <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2012/10/22/11589/public-betrayal-bay-state>. See also: <http://www.magazinewww.commonwealthmagazine.org/The-Download/178-C-on-integrity-report-nothing-to-write-home-about.aspx>, <http://www.capecodtimes.com/article/20120401/News/204010343>, <http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807>

IMPACT OF ILLINOIS V. GATES: THE STATES CONSIDER THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES; Impact of Illinois v. Gates: The States Consider the Totality of the Circumstances Test, by Avergun, Jodi Levin, published in: 52 Brook. L. Rev. 1127 (1986-1987)

LEGAL AND EQUITABLE REMEDIES UNDER FRIVOLOUS, BAD FAITH LITIGATION, <http://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/attorney-fees-does-losing-side-30337.html>

LEGAL INFORMATION INSTITUTE – 4th AMENDMENT – AN OVERVIEW http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/fourth_amendment

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-CORRUPTION GAPS FUELED PUBLIC SERVANT MISCONDUCT <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2012/10/22/11589/public-betrayal-bay-state>.....12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

MASSACHUSETTS EARNS A C ON NATIONAL CORRUPTION LIST <http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807>

MASS. EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR LAW REPORT, MARCH, 2006 RE BROOKS AUTOMATION PENALTY FOR FRIVOLOUS LAWSUIT

PUBLIC BETRAYAL IN THE BAY STATE
<http://necir.org/2012/10/23/public-betrayal/>;
<http://www.publicintegrity.org/2012/10/22/11589/public-betrayal-bay-state>

PUBLIC CORRUPTION RISK IN MASSACHUSETTS

<http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807>;
<http://www.publicintegrity.org/2012/10/22/11589/public-betrayal-bay-state>

See also: <http://www.magazinewww.commonwealthmagazine.org/The-Download/178-C-on-integrity-report-nothing-to-write-home-about.aspx>,
<http://www.capecodtimes.com/article/20120401/News/204010343>, <http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Mass-Earns-a-C-on-National-Corruption-Risk-Index-5807>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES AND FACTUAL INFERENCES

Fourth Amendment – Totality of the Circumstances Approach to Probable Cause Based on Informant’s Tips, by Cathy E. Moore: <http://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6395&context=jclc>

WRONGFUL ACT DOCTRINE: AN EXCEPTION TO THE *AMERICAN RULE*, FALL, 2010 LITIGATION QUARTERLY. JUSTIN SEIGWALD) – re ATTORNEY FEES AWARDED UNDER FRIVOLOUS, BAD FAITH SUITS/

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully petitions for a Writ of Certiorari to review a decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court.



OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion of the Single Justice of the MA SJC and the opinion of the full MA SJC Court is reported at SJ-2013-0340 and at SJC-11592 respectively.

The Opinion of the Lawrence MA District Court is found at #1318 RO 0118 in Civil Claims Case Wnek v. Gallagher, which includes a Counterclaim by Defendant Gallagher (Plaintiff in this Petition for Writ of Certiorari)

The Opinion of the Small Claims Newburyport Court Session, Gallagher v. Wnek, is found at #1322SC000306.



JURISDICTION

SJ-2013-0340

12/29/2014 #14 Rescript: (November 28, 2014)
“ORDERED, that the following entry be made in the docket; viz., – Judgment affirmed.”

01/06/2015 #15 JUDGMENT after Rescript from the SJC for the Commonwealth, as on file. (Hines, J.)

SJC-11592

11/28/2014 #12 RESCRIPT (Rescript Opinion): Judgment affirmed. (By the Court)

12/29/2014 RESCRIPT ISSUED to trial court.

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



**CONSTITUTIONAL AND
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
(to the extent that a *pro se* Plaintiff can
assert and describe, i.e., Plaintiff seeks the
Court's indulgence in articulating such)**

Amendment I – Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or *abridging the freedom of speech*, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and *to petition the government for a redress of grievances*.

United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit has held that the Massachusetts anti-SLAPP law, as a mere matter of procedure, does not apply in federal courts – one of the many reasons that MA Courts have been so openly negligent and selective about enforcing their own state laws. See “Stuborn Ltd. Partnership v. Bernstein, 245 F.Supp.2d 312 (D.

Mass. 2003).” *First Amendment Cases and Scholarship*. The Public Participation Project www.anti-slapp.org. Retrieved 2011-06-29. Holding that the Massachusetts anti-SLAPP statute is a “mere matter of procedure” and therefore not applicable in federal court. “A SLAPP in the Face: Why Principles of Federalism Suggest that Federal District Courts Should Stop Turning the Other Cheek”. *From the Selected Works of Lisa Litwiller*. Chapman University School of Law. August 2007. Retrieved 2011-06-29.

Federal Constitution 4th and 14th Amendments *Due Process* in their language of *Totality of the Circumstances* in order to review and to evaluate Massachusetts Court actions in their totality.



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner requests this Honorable Court to exercise its power and discretion under Rule 10 of its rules to grant a Writ of Certiorari to the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court.

The case presents questions about:

1. The (in)ability of the MA SJC to efficaciously and independently superintend its lower courts without undermining, via dangerous precedents, *18 USC par 2261, 2262, 2265* which are collateral to M.G.L. c. 258E Petition for Restraining Order; *Federal Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation (S.L.A.P.P)*; *Fed Const 1st Amend Free Speech*; *Fed*

Const 1st Amend Right to Appeal; and, Fed Const 4th and 14th Amendments Due Process.

2. The feasibility of the Honorable U.S. Supreme Court expanding the *Totality of Circumstances Test* relative to the 4th and 14th Amendments (or otherwise) when State Courts act in such extraordinary mode as to affirm, enable, facilitate, and even promote dangerous precedents which undermine the Federal Statutes, Case Law, and Articles named above.

3. The *dangerous precedent* effect that state courts have on *Federal Statutes Articles, and Case Law* when they accede to the state Attorney General's pleas to grant *non-state* actor defendants *carte blanche sovereign immunity*.

4. The dangerous precedent effect that state courts have on *Federal Statutes Case law, and Articles* when they strain out the gnat while swallowing the camel, i.e., when they accentuate Plaintiff's *procedures* at the expense of the Court's own duties to the *substantive*, ignoring the *totality of the circumstances* that require them (if not proactively, at least conscientiously) to provide a level playing field and to discipline, correct, and model as spelled out in their own *SJC Mission Statement* and as spelled out in both state and federal constitutions.

5. Contradictory message promulgated by the Small Claims Courts, i.e., *Judgment in favor of defendant means that the defendant does not have to pay the plaintiff any part of the claim or costs in this*

claim. This plaintiff does not have any right to appeal from this judgment vs reference to Rule 8 vs IF YOU LOST THE CASE BEFORE THE MAGISTRATE (in caps) . . . You may not appeal from the magistrate's decision against you.

THERE IS NO WAR BETWEEN THE CONSTITUTION AND COMMON SENSE! (MAPP V. OHIO, 367 U.S. 643 (1961).



FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner Robert J. Gallagher (RJG) is a teacher, pastor, and tutor, holding an A.B. In Humanities, Master of Divinity, Master of Education, Master of U.S. History, Doctor of Ministry in Counseling, and J.D. Doctor of Law. He has never been a member of any state or federal bar.

RJG, at age 70, poured his life's savings into the purchase of a \$305,000 condo unit at 528 North End Blvd, Salisbury MA in June, 2011.

Condo purchase was contracted with Respondent Realtor Catherine Wnek (CW) of *Coco, Early, and Associates* of Methuen MA.

Weeks after condo purchase, RJG sought and received an appointment on the Salisbury Board of Health (BOH).

Soon thereafter, RJG (along with other members of the BOH) received complaints from Health Officer

that Realtor CW was in violation of local health codes, i.e., failure to obtain Certificates of Habitability for 12 units at 504 North End Blvd.

Condos at 504 North End Blvd were built by the same builders (CW'S Palmisano Family) as condos at 528 North End Blvd – sister condos, so to speak.

BOH, on which RJG sat, fined CW some \$3,600 for violations noted above.

As RJG learned more of the violations at 504 North End Blvd, he became more attentive to violations at his own condo at 528 North End Blvd, particularly water leakage into the main electric box.

When RJG reported fire hazard from main electric box, and requested records of any repairs (as recommended by Home Inspector Mooney) RJG noted that CW was not only his Realtor but also his Condo Manager – manager of property that CW's own family had built, i.e., CW had been appointed as manager by her own family of builders who themselves had served as trustees immediately after building completion.

RJG reported (to Condo Association) Condo Manager CW's stonewalling re repairs and records of repairs as Conflict of Interest and Ethics Violations.

In June, 2012, CW, in her capacity as Condo Manager, sent memo to all 12 condo units seeking monies to support and endorse new organization SBCFC whose stated goal was to litigate the town for its enforcement of the MA State Sanitary Code. RJG

complained of CW's Conflict of Interest as Builder, Realtor, and Manager to: (1) MA Division of Professional Standards – Licensure, Office of Investigations; (2) MA Ethics Commission; (3) MA Attorney General's Office with copies to Condo Assn.

CW resigned her membership with MA Assn of Realtors, precluding action on that Board's part.

After several months of silence from the State Agencies, RJG sent CW a MA 93A Consumer Protection Demand Letter for Estimated Damages of \$3,434 to remedy Condo Fire Hazards which affected *not only RJG but all adjoining condos*.

On 01/30/2013, days prior to deadline for CW's response to 93A, CW filed a frivolous Restraining Order Petition against RJG in Lawrence District Court in an effort to cool and intimidate RJG from pursuing consumer protection relief via state agencies and state courts, claiming that RJG's Complaints to state agencies and 93A Demand Letter constituted harassment that required a Restraining Order.

CW lied on the RO Petition by checking the box NO when asked if she had had any prior dealings with RJG, in effect denying any adversarial and retaliatory motives.

RJG Counter-Claimed RO Petition as frivolous and retaliatory, a mockery of RO purpose, and – most important of all – a violation of the Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation (S.L.A.P.P.) Statutes, both state *and federal*; RJG also cited CW's falsehood

re no prior business exchanges. RJG argued that courts are inundated and backlogged with countless, valid domestic-abuse cases, only to have licensed realtor CW add to the load with mockery, fabrication, and deception.

Subsequent to her pro se petition for a Restraining Order against RJG, CW retained Mary Mc Cauley-Manzi, Esq., notorious for her bias and brand of ethics when serving on the Bench (see Appendix of appeals of Manzi decisions) refused to correct CW's falsehood but instead pursued the frivolous RO Petition, even admitting to the Court that her own motions to stop RJG from contacting MA Agencies against her client were "giant leaps" in terms of naming such as "harassment".

Recognizing the gravity of a Restraining Order Petition in today's domestic-violence society, RJG Counter-Claimed with both state *and federal* claims, particularly via Strategic Limitation Against Public Participation (S.L.A.P.P.) with pro se standing.

Subsequently, Stephen D'Angelo, Esq. charged RJG \$3,000 to file Motion to Vacate and justified such a fee by labeling it as a "Criminal Defense" Fee though MGL 258E, s3, is a Civil Matter.

Associate Justice D. Baretto denied CW's RO Petition, ruling that CW was "using the Court system for personal gain" and noting that RJG "sent the emails because he believes CW is an unethical realtor . . . and her work as realtor and property manager constitute a conflict."

Justice Baretto added: CW “has failed to demonstrate that (RJG’s) communications, even assuming the claims are without merit, cross the line from speech, which is protected by the *First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution* and art 16 of MA Declaration of Rights, to *unprotected speech*.”.

However, Lawrence District Court did not address the S.L.A.P.P. Counter Suit nor the request for Attorney Fees reimbursement, nor CW’s falsehood on the RO Petition, nor her attorney’s failure to correct the record, nor the fact that both CW and Manzi had pursued a frivolous and expensive case.

When asked to follow through on the counter-claims and request for attorney fees reimbursement, Stephen D’Angelo, Esq. replied that he had not yet received anything from the Court and therefore couldn’t do anything. Days later he emailed: “I got you off on a criminal RO Petition and that’s all I have to do. There’s nothing more that can be done here.” When asked about a Motion for Reconsideration and about his duties to the MA Professional Conduct Codes, he declined to answer.

Subsequent to RO Petition, Condo Association replaced Wnek as Condo Manager, providing RJG with condo records and with the repairs RJG had sought. And so, RJG withdrew that particular 01/07/2013 93A.

MA Attorney General argues disingenuously that RJG had dropped the 01/ 07/2013 93A but conveniently neglects to mention that a *later* 93A was filed for a

related but distinct purpose due to subsequent actions by CW, i.e., RJG sent CW a Consumer Protection 93A Demand Letter re CW's unfair and deceptive practice as licensed realtor and as condo manager, i.e., abusing the Court's Restraining Order Process to delay or stop RJG's Public Participation with state and federal agencies (a S.L.A.P.P. violation) in the matter of condo fire hazards and conflict of interest violations, filing in Newburyport Small Claims Court.

The Newburyport Small Claims Clerk ruled that there was no connection between 93A Consumer Protection and private citizen CW – ignoring the fact that CW was a Licensed Realtor who did business with RJG who again cited CW's violations of both state and federal S.L.A.P.P. Statutes as well as First Amendment Free Speech and Right to Petition state agencies and Consumer Protection Courts.

Attorney General argues that RJG failed to appeal from Newburyport Small Claims Court but documents from that Court are clear: "Judgment in favor of defendant means that the defendant does not have to pay the plaintiff any part of the claim or costs in this claim. This plaintiff does not have any right to appeal from this judgment." Page one of the ruling cites Rule 8 but page 2 goes on to contradict that Rule in all caps: **IF YOU LOST THE CASE BEFORE THE MAGISTRATE . . . You may not appeal from the magistrate's decision against you."**

Attorney General's original brief argues Sovereign Immunity *carte blanche*, in his argument for

dismissal of the case before MA SJC, i.e., Attorney General is representing not only state actors but also *non-state* actors.

Meanwhile, non-state actors do not respond in any way (at least, not openly) to RJG's Complaint because they already have an AG fighting for them. Isn't the AG supposed to treat all of his non-state actors with impartiality and without *ex parte* involvement?

During this entire period, the Salisbury BOH, of which RJG had been a member since 2010 and which had fined CW, continued to pursue enforcement of Certificates of Habitability, not only re CW-Palmisano property but also re motels receiving some \$450 per week in state funds to house the homeless. On March 28, 2014, *Salisbury Town Manager fired the entire five-person BOH for being **too proactive** in its enforcement of the MA Sanitary Code*, replacing the BOH Chair with Chair Charles Takesian, also Chamber of Commerce Chair and Realtor, who has repeatedly and publicly condemned MA Sanitary Health Codes as unconstitutional, i.e., Takesian (known to the Town Manager) is himself in Conflict of Interest.

On April 6, 2013, RJG and another former BOH Member Joanne Housianitis hand-delivered to the MA Attorney General a Complaint re a long and pervasive history of Conflict of Interest within the town, particularly re health sanitary code violations, favoritism, and conflict of interest. To this day, the MA Attorney General's Office has not replied –

though that same office has been quick to represent non-state actors in the matter of *this* case before this Court (SJC 11592 and RELATED CASE SJC 2013-0340).

Massachusetts anti-corruption gaps have, indeed, fueled public servant misconduct – and such gaps (as well as commissions) extend to the state’s highest court, i.e., MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-CORRUPTION GAPS FUELED PUBLIC SERVANT MISCONDUCT. *Deep flaws in MA laws constructed to keep government honest have sustained a recurring parade of criminal and ethical misconduct charges involving public servants in the past five years, a study by the NE Center for Investigative Reporting shows. Massachusetts earned a C grade earlier this year in a national State Integrity scorecard released by the Center for Public Integrity. Among its lowest scores were an F for TRANSPARENCY . . . and public access to info. . . . Judicial Accountability earned a C+ . . . <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2012/10/22/11589/public-betrayal-bay-state>.*



REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

When a State Supreme Court plays politics, obstructs justice, and engages in corruption to the extent that it undermines and endangers precedents re collateral issues of a Federal nature, i.e., frivolous *Restraining Order Petition, 18 USC par 2261, 2262, 2265, Federal Strategic Litigation Against Public*

Participation (S.L.A.P.P), Fed Const 1st Amend Free Speech, Fed Const 1st Amend Right to Appeal, Fed Const 4th and 14th Amendments Due Process, the U.S. Supreme Court is required to act.

When a State Supreme Court rubber stamps State Attorney General's representation of *non-state* actors as deserving of the same *carte blanche sovereign immunity* as *state* actors, it has forfeited its Judicial role to the Executive Branch and needs to be called on it under the U.S. Constitution's Separation of Powers, System of Check and Balances.

When a State Supreme Court judicially oversees a state that has been evaluated as F for *Public Records*, C- for *State Ethics Commission* and C+ for its own *Judicial Accountability*, such Court is no longer able to *function* (let alone *reform*) judicially without some Review by the Honorable U.S. Supreme Court.

When a State Supreme Court belabors the Plaintiff' *Procedure* at the expense of its own *Substance* and to the advantage of its political colleagues in the courts, business, and law offices below, it thereby precludes a level playing field, fails to discipline, correct, and avoid setting dangerous precedents re collateral Federal Articles and Statutes, i.e., It acts erroneously, capriciously, and arbitrarily.



CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to grant his Petition for certiorari.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT J. GALLAGHER, *pro se*
528 North End Blvd. N-1
Salisbury, MA 01952
RevDrBob@aol.com
978-255-4595

ROBERT GALLAGHER vs. FIRST ASSISTANT
CLERK-MAGISTRATE OF THE
NEWBURYPORT DISTRICT COURT & others.¹

470 Mass. 1012

November 28, 2014

Supreme Judicial Court, Superintendence of
inferior courts. Practice, Civil, Attorney's fees,
Small claims procedure. District Court, Small
claims procedure.

Robert Gallagher appeals from a judgment of a single justice of this court dismissing his petition for relief under G. L. c. 211, § 3. In his petition, he sought relief from final judgments entered in two cases in the District Court Department. In one of the cases, after Gallagher prevailed on a complaint brought against him under the harassment prevention statute, G. L. c. 258E, the judge failed to act on his request for attorney's fees. In the other case, judgment was entered against him on a G. L. c. 93A claim that he brought in the small claims session.

As to the former case, Gallagher had, but did not pursue, adequate alternative remedies, both in the trial court and through the ordinary appellate process.²

¹ Justice of the Lawrence District Court, the clerk-magistrate of the Lawrence District Court, Stephen D'Angelo, Mary McCauley-Manzi, and Catherine W. Wnek.

² For example, Gallagher could have moved in the District Court to amend the judgment to include a ruling on his request for attorney's fees, bringing to the judge's attention what might have been an inadvertent failure to rule on the request. He also

(Continued on following page)

“Our general superintendence power under G. L. c. 211, § 3, is extraordinary and to be exercised sparingly, not as a substitute for the normal appellate process or merely to provide an additional layer of appellate review after the normal process has run its course.” *Votta v. Police Dep’t of Billerica*, 444 *Mass. 1001*, 1001 (2005). See *Foley v. Lowell Div. of the Dist. Ct. Dep’t*, 398 *Mass. 800*, 802 (1986), and cases cited (“Where a petitioner can raise his claim in the normal course of trial and appeal, relief will be denied”).

As to the latter case, it is well established that “a plaintiff who chooses to proceed in the small claims session waives the right to appeal from any adverse judgment, and likewise is not entitled to invoke this court’s extraordinary power of general superintendence in lieu of an appeal to compel review of the judgment.” *Zullo v. Culik Law P.C.*, 467 *Mass. 1009*, 1009 (2014), and cases cited. The single justice properly declined to grant extraordinary relief.³

Judgment affirmed.

could have appealed to the Appellate Division from the failure of the judgment to include an award of fees as he has requested. Gallagher asserts that he did not take an appeal in reliance on counsel’s advice. Even if so, this does not entitle him to extraordinary relief. Review was available, even if Gallagher and his counsel failed to pursue it.

³ We need not address the single justice’s further ruling that certain of the respondents are entitled to judicial immunity in this matter.

App. 3

The case was submitted on briefs.

Robert. J. Gallagher, pro se.

Bryan F. Bertram, Assistant Attorney General, for the
Commonwealth.

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
for the Commonwealth
Case Docket

ROBERT GALLAGHER vs. FIRST ASSISTANT
CLERK-MAGISTRATE OF THE NEWBURYPORT
DISTRICT COURT & others
SJC-11592

CASE HEADER

Case Status	Decided, Rescript issued	Status Date	12/29/2014
Nature	Superintendence, c211, s3	Entry Date	12/03/2013
Appellant	Plaintiff	Case Type	Civil
Brief Status	Awaiting blue brief	Brief Due	03/20/2014
Quorum	Spina, Cordy, Botsford, Duffly, Lenk, Hines, JJ.		
Argued Date	11/04/2014	Decision Date	11/28/2014
AC/SJ Number	SJ-2013-0340		
Citation	470 Mass. 1012		
DAR/FAR Number	Lower Ct SJ-2013-Number 0340		

App. 5

Lower Court SJC for Suffolk County Lower Ct Judge Ralph D. Gants, C.J.

Route to SJC Direct Entry: Appeal from Single Justice Order/Judgment

INVOLVED PARTY ATTORNEY APPEARANCE

Robert J. Gallagher
Pro Se Plaintiff/Appellant
Awaiting blue brief

Joseph Kattar *Bryan F. Bertram, A.A.G.*

Respondent/Appellee
Red brief & appendix filed
2 Extensions, 137 Days

James D. Barretto *Bryan F. Bertram, A.A.G.*
Respondent/Appellee

Keith McDonough *Bryan F. Bertram, A.A.G.*
Respondent/Appellee

DOCKET ENTRIES

01/31/2014 #4 ORDER: Robert J. Gallagher appeals from a judgment of a single justice of this court dismissing his petition for relief under G. L. c. 211, § 3. In his petition, Gallagher challenged (1) the denial, by a judge in the Lawrence District Court, of his request for attorneys' fees arising from an action commenced against him pursuant to G. L. c. 258E and (2) an adverse judgment entered on

a claim he commenced in the Newburyport District Court pursuant to G. L. c. 93A. The single justice ruled that Gallagher was not entitled to relief as to these claims because he had (but did not pursue) alternative remedies, namely, an ordinary direct appeal as to the former, and an appeal pursuant to the Uniform Small Claims Rules as the latter. In addition, the single justice ruled that, to the extent that Gallagher sought monetary damages from certain judicial officers arising from the performance of their adjudicative responsibilities, this claim is barred on judicial and sovereign immunity grounds. The case is before us on a memorandum filed pursuant to S.J.C. Rule 2:21, as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001). That rule does not apply in this case, as Gallagher is not seeking relief from any interlocutory ruling of the trial court. Rather, he is challenging final judgments. Moreover, it is clear that, to some extent, the single justice went beyond the availability of adequate alternative remedies and ruled on the merits of Gallagher's request for damages. In these circumstances, we will allow the appeal to proceed in the ordinary course. In doing so, we do not conclude that Gallagher has shown

App. 7

that he lacks an adequate appellate remedy. In his brief, in addition to any argument he makes on the merits, Gallagher shall address that issue, specifically addressing the remedies identified by the single justice. (By the Court).

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUFFOLK, ss. SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
FOR SUFFOLK COUNTY
NO. SJ-2013-0340

ROBERT GALLAGHER

vs.

JOSEPH KATTAR, JR., in his capacity
as First Clerk Magistrate for Newburyport
District Court, and others¹

JUDGMENT

Robert Gallagher seeks various forms of extraordinary relief under G. L. c. 211, § 3, including an order preventing what he characterizes as “reprehensible abuse of the Restraining Order Petition,” multiple damages under G.L. c. 93A, and reimbursement of attorney’s fees he incurred in the amount of \$3,000.

A party seeking review under G. L. c. 211, § 3 “must ‘demonstrate both a substantial claim of violation of [his] substantive rights and error that cannot be remedied under the ordinary review process.’” *Planned Parenthood League of Mass., Inc. v. Operation Rescue*, 406 Mass. 701, 706 (1990), quoting *Dunbrack v. Commonwealth*, 398 Mass. 502, 504

¹ James D. Berretto, in his capacity as Associate Justice of the Brookline District Court; Keith McDonough, in his capacity as Clerk Magistrate for the Lawrence District Court; Stephen D Angelo, Mary McCauley-Manzi, and Catherine Wnek.

(1986). For the reasons ably detailed in the Attorney General's opposition, Gallagher's petition must be dismissed. In short, the allegations against the respondent judicial officers involve conduct that occurred in the performance of their adjudicative responsibilities, and are barred by judicial immunity, as well as sovereign immunity. The claim for attorney's fees must be dismissed because Gallagher did not appeal the judge's denial of his request for attorney's fees in the Lawrence District Court action, and relief under G.L. c. 211, § 3, is not available as an alternative to a timely direct appeal. The claim for damages under G.L. c. 93A also must be dismissed where Gallagher chose to bring this claim in small claims court, and did not appeal the dismissal of his claim, as permitted under Rule 10 of the Trial Court's Uniform Small Claims Rules.

For the above reasons, it is *ORDERED* that judgment enter *DISMISSING* the petition.

/s/ Ralph D. Gants
Ralph D. Gants
Associate Justice

Entered: November 8, 2013

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUFFOLK, ss. SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
FOR SUFFOLK COUNTY
NO. SJ-2013-0340

ROBERT GALLAGHER

vs.

**JOSEPH KATTAR, JR., in his capacity
as First Clerk Magistrate for Newburyport
District Court, and others**

JUDGMENT AFTER RESCRIPT

This matter came before the Court, and in accordance with the Rescript Opinion that was entered in the Full Court in SJC-11592 on November 28, 2014, it is ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the following entry of Judgment be, and the same hereby is, made:

“Judgment affirmed.”

[/s/ gsh]
By the Court, (Hines, J.) [/s/ gsh]
/s/
Maura S. Doyle
Maura S. Doyle, Clerk

ENTERED: January 6, 2015

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Illegible] DISTRICT COURT DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE DIVISION
DOCKET NO. 1318 RC 0118

CATHERINE WNEK)
 Plaintiff)
)
v.)
)
ROBERT GALLAGHER)
 Defendant)

FINDINGS, RULINGS AND ORDER

This order came before me in the Lawrence Division of the District Court Department on March 22, 2013. By agreement of the parties and due to voluminous submissions,¹ the court took the matter under advisement.

At the hearing, the plaintiff testified on her own behalf.

Catherine Wnek lives in Methuon, Massachusetts and is a licensed real estate agent in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. She is also a property manager for a twelve-unit condominium complex in which the defendant resides at 538 North End Blvd., Salisbury, MA.

¹ The Court has reviewed all submissions, pleadings, hearing exhibits and exhibits attached to pleadings.

The plaintiff first met the defendant, Mr. Robert Gallagher, in April 2011. The plaintiff also served as the condominium association manager to help gather documents for his purchase of his condominium in May of 2011.

From May, 2011 to May, 2012 she enjoyed a friendly relationship with the defendant and once visited his home in 2011 to ask the defendant's advice in his capacity as a member of the Salisbury Board of Health.

The defendant also attended the plaintiff's father's funeral in May of 2012 and wrote her a condolence note as well.

At some point, the plaintiff's relationship with the defendant changed markedly for the worse on or about September or October, 2012.

The change in the relationship between the parties seemed to coincide with the plaintiff's joining a Salisbury Beach group of concerned citizens, an association that the plaintiff made public by sending out an email to a number of recipients.

On or about October 20, 2012 the defendant sent the plaintiff an email asking her to assist in resolving some issues as to his building or unit. The defendant sent the email on a Saturday evening, and the plaintiff was not able to respond. Prior to receiving the email, the plaintiff had suggested a meeting with the Board of Trustees of the condominium complex. Later that evening, approximately two hours later, the

defendant sent emails to the Massachusetts Real Estate Commission, Division of Professional Licensure of Real Estate Sales Persons and Brokers, the Greater Boston Association of Realtors, the Massachusetts Association of Realtors and the greater Newburyport Association of Realtors and the Salisbury health inspector alleging generally that the plaintiff was practicing unethically. Approximately a half-hour later, the defendant sent another email of a similar cast to the same entities including Mr. Tim Rooney, a home inspector who had inspected the defendant's condominium in connection with that purchase. At approximately 10:18 p.m. the defendant sent the same or a similar email to the other 11 condominium owners at the defendant's complex. Again, he sent the same or a similar email to the Board of Condominium Owners. The email or emails again alleged generally that the plaintiff had conducted herself in an unethical fashion.²

On October 22, at 12:36 p.m. the defendant sent another email to the condominium association and

² The defendant's complaints regarding the plaintiff seem to focus upon his allegations that the plaintiff's employment and professional roles represent a conflict of interest, that the conduct of the plaintiff raises various ethical issues, and that the plaintiff played a role in certain construction issues (among the, fire hazards, door bell malfunctioning, sounds between the floors of the defendant's condominium; and water seepage in the electric room). This court takes no position on the merits or lack of merits of these claims.

many of the same people or entities, again alleging that she was conducting herself unethically.

On the evening of October 22 over to October 23, the defendant sent additional, similar emails to various individuals including real estate brokers, unit owners and associates.³

[Illegible], has the Board of Licensure investigated the plaintiff for any purpose.

The plaintiff finds the defendant's behavior troublesome and subjectively feels that she cannot go to the property where the defendant lives to perform her job of property manager without feeling intimidated and helpless. She has not communicated directly with the defendant about these communications.

She is asking that the court issue a Harassment Protection Order under G.L. c. 258E to protect her, so she can do her job as property manager and conduct herself professionally and socially.

³ The plaintiff alleges that the defendant has committed many more than three willful and [illegible] acts cognizable under the statute, but at the hearing identified a minimum of three. They are as follows: The 1st is the email(s) to the Massachusetts Real Estate Commission; the 2nd is the defendant's email(s) to the Greater Newburyport Associates of Realtors; the 3rd is the defendant's email(s) to the Massachusetts Association of Realtors.

The plaintiff asks that the defendant be ordered not to harass her, not to come within 25 yards of her and to stay a similar distance from her daughters.⁴

She further asks that the defendant be ordered to convey any of his concerns, which have been the subject of the above-referenced electronic emails, to the Board of Trustees of the Condominium complex and more specifically to the treasurer of the Board, Mr. William Renaud, who is willing to undertake this role and who is familiar with the defendant.

She has filed the instant Petition because she wants him to stop sending emails that involve her.

The plaintiff introduced two exhibits. The second exhibit represents an email exchange between the plaintiff and Mr. Renaud.

After she found herself the subject of the defendant's communications as outlined above, the plaintiff "googled" the defendant and learned that the defendant has a history of sending mass emails to various individuals and officials.⁵ These are summarized in copies of various news articles collectively marked as Exhibit 1.

⁴ There was no evidence relating to alleged harassment by the defendant against the plaintiff's daughters. Accordingly, the Court issues no order regarding the plaintiff's daughters.

⁵ The defendant did not object to the introduction of this hearsay evidence.

In this regard, in 2007, Middlesex Superior Court Judge, Isaac Borenstein, in an unrelated matter, ordered that the defendant no longer email parents and classmates at a charter school in Marlboro.

The defendant has also notified the plaintiff by email that he is filing a 93A action against her for her alleged actions in his building. The plaintiff has not been served with any complaint. The defendant's [sic] announced intention to file a 93A action against her plays no role in the upset she has experienced over the above-referenced conduct of the defendant.

As established by cross-examination, the defendant has not threatened her with force or violence or perpetrated physical harm of any kind whatsoever on her.

There is no evidence that the defendant has ever stalked the plaintiff.

The defendant was called to the stand by plaintiff's counsel.

Although he has a juris Doctor degree, the defendant is not a member of the bar.

He is familiar with the series of emails from October 20 through October 23, and he does not deny sending them and copying them to her.

In general terms, the defendant sent the emails because he believes that she is an unethical realtor, in part, for seeking money from his condominium

association and because, in his view, her work as a realtor and property manager constitute a conflict.

He was also upset that she joined a Salisbury Beach association, which he believes desires to sue the town and the Salisbury Board of Health of which he was a member at the time of these emails.

DISCUSSION

On May 10, 2010, “An Act Relative to Harassment Prevention Orders” (St. 2010, c. 23) became effective. Codified as G.L. c. 258E, the act authorizes the issuance of “harassment prevention orders.” the procedures in chapter 258E for harassment prevention orders are largely parallel to those for abuse prevention orders in G.L. c. 209A, although the two statutes differ in their eligibility provisions and available relief.

“[W]hile a protective order under c. 209A requires a finding of “abuse,” a protective order under c. 258E requires a finding of ‘harassment,’ defined in c. 258E, § 1, as ‘[three] or more acts of willful and malicious conduct aimed at a specific person committed with the intent to cause fear, intimidation, abuse or damage to property and that d(oes [sic] in fact cause fear, intimidation, abuse or damage to property.’” *O’Brien v. Borowski*, 451 Mass. 415 (2012).⁶

⁶ There are other ways to satisfy the statute that are not relevant here.

While I find that the acts committed by the defendant were willful and the plaintiff's subjective distress is real, I am unable to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant's communication, which form the basis of the plaintiff's petition, were malicious, that is characterized by cruelty, hostility or revenge. Nor can I find that the defendant's emails were sent with the intent to cause fear, intimidation, abuse (defined as in G.L. c. 209A) or damage to property.

Finally, the plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that the defendant's communications for purposes of G.L. c. 258E, even assuming that the defendant's claims are without merit cross the line from speech, which is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and art. 16 of the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights to unprotected speech. See *O'Brien, supra* at 422.227. See also generally 94 MBA Law rev. No. 1 2011) Chapter 258E (Harassment Prevention Orders – Balancing the [Illegible] Victims and Defendants).

Accordingly, for the above referenced reasons, the Plaintiff's petition is [illegible]

So ordered.

By the Court

Date: March 25, 2013 /s/ James D. Barretto
James D. Barretto
Associate Justice

JUDGMENT FOR DEFENDANT(S)	DOCKET NUMBER 1322SC000306	Trial Court of Massachusetts District Court Department Small Claims Session
[Illegible] Dr. Robert J. Gallagher v. Catherine Palmisano WNEK et al		
PLAINTIFFS WHO ARE PARTIES TO THIS JUDGMENT Dr. Robert Gallagher	COURT NAME & ADDRESS Newburyport District Court 188 State Street Route 1 Traffic Circle Newburyport, MA 01950	
DEFENDANTS WHO ARE PARTIES TO THIS JUDGMENT Catherine Palmisano WNEK et al	NEXT COURT EVENT (if any)	
(NAME OF ATTORNEY FOR PARTY) TO WHOM THIS COPY OF JUDGMENT IS ISSUED) [illegible] Dr. Robert J. Gallagher [illegible] North End Blvd N-1 Salisbury, MA 01952	FURTHER ORDERS OF THE COURT	

JUDGMENT FOR DEFENDANT(S)

[Illegible] claim, after trial by a magistrate, the Court (A C-M Joseph K Kattar) has entered JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANT(S). This means

that the defendant(s) does not have to pay the plaintiff(s) any part of the claim or costs in this.

The plaintiff(s) does not have any right of appeal from this judgment. Uniform Small Claims Rule 8 provides that for good cause any party may file a motion within one year of judgment, with notice to the other parties, requesting the Court to vacate or [illegible] this judgment.

DATE JUDGMENT ENTERED	CLERK-MAGISTRATE/ASST. CLERK
[Illegible]	X /s/ Kathryn [Illegible]

**INFORMATION ABOUT THIS
SMALL CLAIMS JUDGMENT**

**IF YOU LOST THE CASE
BEFORE THE MAGISTRATE**

If you sued the other party and lost and the magistrate did not award you any money, that decision is final. You have lost your case and the other party does not have to pay you anything. You may not appeal from the magistrate's decision against you.

**PUBLIC BETRAYAL IN THE BAY STATE,
MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-CORRUPTION GAPS
FUELED PUBLIC SERVANT MISCONDUCT**

<http://www.publicintegrity.org/2012/10-22/11589/public-betrayal-bay-state>

Deep flaws in MA laws constructed to keep government honest have sustained a recurring parade of criminal and ethical misconduct charges involving public servants in the past five years, a study by the NE Center for Investigative Reporting shows. Massachusetts earned a C grade earlier this year in a national State Integrity scorecard released by the Center for Public Integrity. *Among its lowest scores were an F for TRANSPARENCY . . . and public access to info. . . . Judicial Accountability earned a C+ . . .*

The anti-corruption weaknesses have been borne out in the litany of public scandals plaguing Massachusetts in recent years. They include federal convictions of two former House Speakers, federal criminal charges lodged against top state Probation officials and the federal bribery sentence imposed on a once-rising female legislator. At least 250 public servants in Massachusetts have been charged with crimes or ethics violations in the past five years, the NECIR analysis found. The charges range from the federal criminal cases to helping to hire friends and relatives to drug offenses. While government officials and watchdog groups say a corrupt public servant is going to find a way to break the law no matter what, wide

cracks in accountability checks in Massachusetts have made it easier for misconduct to occur.

Like the Legislature, the MA judiciary is exempt from public records laws. It's a weakness that took center stage when a massive patronage scandal in the state Probation Department was revealed in 2010. The pay-to-play scheme remained well hidden; then-Probation Commissioner John O'Brien did not have to release recommendations for jobs or candidate's test scores so was allegedly able to hire friends and relatives of favored legislators, who voted on his budget, with impunity. Though the Probation Department falls under the state judicial branch, it provided little to no oversight. Pam Wilmot, executive director of Common Cause Massachusetts, said the lack of an independent overseer left the probation department in "darkness." "It's become one of the biggest areas of patronage dumping." Wilmot said. "It's a major problem." O'Brien has been forced out of office and faces federal corruption charges, as do a number of other probation officials. A federal grand jury is hearing testimony from witnesses, including current lawmakers that could result in further indictments. New rules on hiring were signed into law last year. A new independent court administrator will oversee all hiring. The law creates standard hiring practices and lists minimum qualifications for jobs. The law also puts any recommendations by lawmakers into the public record.

REFORMS NOT BROAD ENOUGH, critics say. The recent scandals led ethics reforms passed in 2009 that

banned all gifts to public officials, increased penalties across the board for bribery and other campaign finance violations and gave the Ethics Commission and Attorney General expanded powers when investigating and prosecuting a violator. But critics said the reforms still lack an important tool used by federal investigators to catch corrupt public servants – power to conduct one-party surveillance or record someone without their knowledge. At least 40 states afford either federal or state Attorneys General that power. “It’s a crucial tool because of the nature of the crimes and how much really hinges on a witness turning state’s evidence,” Wilmot said.

At its core, many political observers in and out of Massachusetts note some of the corruption in Massachusetts stems from the risks associated with the powerful one-party Democratic government that has long held a grip on power in the Bay State, as well as entrenched resistance to change by the political culture. “Whenever there is an advance made in ethics requirements, it’s always done with a gun at the head of the legislature,” Cunningham, the U-Mass Boston professor, said “It’s a sad old story in Massachusetts.”

**MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
M.G.L. c. 211, s 3, SUPERINTENDENCE POWERS:
MISSION STATEMENT**

To promote the rule of law and foster public trust by leading an independent judiciary that assures every person equal access to the fair, timely and impartial

resolution of disputes in courts managed with efficiency and professionalism. The court's modern mission statement derives from the court's historic seal of 1785, which contains a promise made in the Magna Carta. <http://www.mass.gov/courts/court-info/sjc/about/> "WE SELL JUSTICE TO NO ONE; WE DENY JUSTICE TO NO ONE. <http://www.mass.gov/courts/court-info/sjc/about/>

MA SJC SUPERINTENDENCE POWERS

"The supreme judicial court shall have general superintendence of all courts of inferior jurisdiction to *correct and prevent errors and abuses* therein if no other remedy is expressly provided; and it *may issue all writs and processes to such courts and to corporations and individuals which may be necessary to the furtherance of justice and to the regular execution of the laws*. In addition to the foregoing, the justices of the supreme judicial court shall also have general superintendence of the administration of all courts of inferior jurisdiction, including, without limitation, the prompt hearing and disposition of matters pending therein, and the functions set forth in section 3C; and it *may issue such writs, summonses and other processes and such orders, directions and rules as may be necessary or desirable for the furtherance justice, the regular execution of the laws, the improvement of the administration of such courts and the securing of proper and efficient administration*; provided, however, that general superintendence shall not include the authority to supersede any general or special law

unless the supreme judicial court, acting under its original or appellate jurisdiction finds such law to be unconstitutional in any case or controversy. Nothing herein contained shall affect existing law governing the selection of officers of the courts, or limit the existing authority of the officers thereof to appoint administrative personnel.”

MARY MC CAULEY-MANZI, ESQ.
RECORDS ON APPEALS (3 pages)

NEW EXHIBIT 2: HONORABLE MARY
MCCAULEY-MANZI RECORD ON APPEALS

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – App.Ct. Single Justice ES
1995-P-1224 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2010-P-0649 Case status: Blue brief filed IM-
POUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2010-P-0381 Case status: Red & Blue briefs filed
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2009-P-2262 Case status: Stayed till certain date
YEVGENIA N. ANGELO vs. STEPHEN M. ANGELO

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-P-2032 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
KATHLEEN GALLAGHER vs. STEPHEN J. MUR-
PHY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-P-0926 Case status: 17A dismissal sent to trial
court DENISE L. PERRAULT vs. THOMAS S.
PERRAULT, JR.

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-P-0622 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
OLIVIA ON vs. KALL KOSLOVSKI

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-P-0056 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
YASMINA D. ARRIGG vs. PAUL G. ARRIGG

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-P-1895 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
BARRY P. TUCKER vs. CATHERINE S. TUCKER

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-P-1167 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
EDWARD F. FINNEGAN & another vs. STACEY
HUGHES-BIRCH & others

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate A Family
2007-P-0878 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
SARA B. SALAS vs. RAUL E. PORTO

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-P-0480 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
RICHARD G. WILDUNG vs. SUSAN BRACKEN

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-P-0402 Case status: 17A dismissal sent to trial
court EDWARD F. FINNEGAN vs. STACEY
HUGHES-BIRCH & others

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2006-P-1217 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
MATT CRANE vs. JOYCE CRANE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2006-P-1123 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
LAURIE WAKEFIELD vs. JAMES HEGARTY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2006-P-1025 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
MICHAEL R. ISAACSON vs. RANDY W. ISAACSON

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. Essex Probate & Family
2006-P-0950 Case status: 17A dismissal sent to trial
court MALIHE SAATI FROST vs. ROBERT J.
FROST

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2005-P-1708 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
MATT CRANE vs. JOYCE CRANE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2005-P-0750 Case status: Closed: appeal dismissed
ANA M. GLAVIN A/K/A vs. ANUP VIDYARTHY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2005-P-0687 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
KELLY HATFIELD vs. ROBERT W. HATFIELD, JR.

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2005-P-0510 Case status: Closed: appeal dismissed
MARY ROXANN CARTENSEN vs. WILLIAM
BRADFORD CARTENSEN

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2005-P-0338 Case status: 17A dismissal sent to trial
court MARSHALL L. FIELD vs. JOHANNA
O’HEARN & another

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2004-P-1586 Case status: Closed; Rescript issued
DANIEL O. DAY vs. LOUISE HART

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2004-P-1139 Case status: 17A dismissal sent to trial
court JAHAIRA I. MONTANEZ vs. RENE VALENCIA

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2004-P-0899 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
BEVERLY DEAMELIO vs. DOREEN PAVONE &
others

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2004-P-0852 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
GEORGETTE BEJJANI vs. ELIE N. HAJJAR &
another

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2001-P-1821 Case status: Closed: appeal dismissed
GEORGE GRAVEL vs. MARIE ROSE GRAVEL

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2001-P-1171 Case status: Closed; appeal dismissed
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2000-P-0033 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1999-P-0929 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
JANET G.. DANIELS vs. DOUGLAS K. DANIELS

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1999-P-0276 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1998-P-1525 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1998-P-1047 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
PAUL T. ZIPPER, JR. vs. COLLEEN P. O'NEIL

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1995-P-0014 Case status: Closed; Rescript issued
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1994-P-0093 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
JOANN CACCIA vs. RICHARD CACCIA

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
1992-P-0415 Case status: Closed: Rescript issued
IMPOUNDED CASE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2010-J-0253 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
JOANN CAVENEY vs. THOMAS CAVENEY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2010-J-0123 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
JOANN CAVENEY vs. THOMAS CAVENEY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2010-J-0087 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
MASS DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE CSE vs. ROG-
ER MUELLER

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2009-J-0514 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
YEVGENIA N. ANGELO vs. STEPHEN M. ANGELO

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2009-J-0379 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
MARY A. GUILMETTE vs. RICHARD P.
GUILMETTE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-J-0383 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
CATHERINE LOUGHMAN vs. CHRISTIAN
BRIGHT

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-J-0313 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
KATHLEEN GALLAGHER vs. STEPHEN J. MUR-
PHY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-J-0307 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
MICHAEL E. CHENERY vs. PAUL CHENERY

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-J-0222 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
DENISE L. PERRAULT vs. THOMAS S. PERRAULT,
JR.

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2008-J-0155 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
CATHERINE A. BRENNING vs. WOLF
JACHIMOWICZ

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-J-0464 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
SHARI COON-RETELLE vs. ROBERT RETELLE

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-J-0389 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
CATHERINE A. BRENNING vs. WOLF
JACHIMONWICZ

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2007-J-0249 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
BARRY TUCKER vs. CATHERINE TUCKER

Mary McCauley Manzi, J. – Essex Probate & Family
2006-J-0584 Case status: Disposed: Case Closed
KATHLEEN GALLAGHER vs. STEPHEN J. MUR-
PHY

[http://www.ma-appellatecourts.org/search_judge.php?
dlj=Manzi&dlc=&dfy=&dsc=&ddt=&dtp=&sort=&set=
25&get=First+List](http://www.ma-appellatecourts.org/search_judge.php?dlj=Manzi&dlc=&dfy=&dsc=&ddt=&dtp=&sort=&set=25&get=First+List)
