

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse  
1 Courthouse Way, Suite 2500  
Boston, MA 02210  
(617) 748-9057  
[www.ca1.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca1.uscourts.gov)

**DOCKETING STATEMENT INSTRUCTIONS**

1. Counsel for appellant must file a docketing statement for every case appealed or cross appealed to the First Circuit Court of Appeals. The docketing statement must be received by the court of appeals clerk's office within fourteen days after the case is docketed to be deemed timely filed. Copies must be served on all parties to the action below and proof of service must be attached.
2. The attorney filing the notice of appeal is responsible for filing the docketing statement, even if different counsel will handle the appeal. In the case of multiple appellants represented by separate counsel, the parties must confer and decide who will file the docketing statement. Appellants proceeding pro se may file a docketing statement, but are not required to do so.
3. Counsel's failure to file the docketing statement within the time set forth will cause the court to initiate the process for dismissal of the appeal under 1st Cir. R. 3.0.
4. If an opposing party concludes that the docketing statement is in any way inaccurate, incomplete or misleading, that party should file any additions or corrections to the docketing statement within fourteen days of service of the docketing statement, with copies to all other parties.
5. You must attach to the docketing statement:
  - Additional pages containing extended answers to questions on this form.
  - A certificate of service for this docketing statement indicating it has been served on all parties to the action below, if required by Fed. R. App. P. 25(d)(B).

## RELATED CASES

U.S. District Court dockets 1:22-cv-11141-PBS and 1:22-cv-11948-PBS were based on the same facts to be further substantiated in this appeal.

U.S. Court of Appeals, First Circuit (“USCA1”), dockets 23-1008 and 23-1013 were the appeals of the above two U.S. District Court cases.

The above USCA1 appeals referenced the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court (“SJC”), cases SJC-13263, SJC-13310, SJC-13339, SJC-13392, and SJC-13427.

The USCA1 23-1008 appeal also referenced and relied on the U.S. Supreme Court petitions Nos. 22-7115 and 23-5932 (both denied) to appeal the SJC decisions.

U.S. Supreme Court petition No. 23-6398 requests a review of the above USCA1 23-1008 appeal. The relevant question raised by the pending petition is:

Does sovereign immunity apply to an “LGBTQ+” Massachusetts when using federal funds to subsidize the forceful separation and activist-agenda-driven alienation of innocent American children from their loving American parents?

The deadline for responses to the SCOTUS 23-6398 petition is 1/29/2024.

The relevant “Status Affidavit On Continued Systemic Statutory Discriminations And Retaliations” submitted to SCOTUS 23-6398 on 1/26/2024 is attached.

The similarly relevant “Agenda-Driven Statutory Discriminations/Retaliations Are ‘Prisoner-Like’ Segregations” open letter and affidavit mailed to The White House on 1/26/2024 is also attached and incorporated herein.

According to the above two submissions, including the emergency SJ-2023-M014 petition filed with the SJC, the objective of this appeal is to reiterate the question:

Does sovereign immunity apply to an “LGBTQ+” Massachusetts when using federal funds to subsidize the forceful separation and activist-agenda-driven alienation of innocent American children from their loving American parents?

The attached “Complaint For State-Endorsed ‘Prisoner-Like’ Segregations Per 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12134” to U.S. Attorney Levy is a precursor for future defenses.

Imre Kifor

[REDACTED]  
Newton, MA 02464

[ikifor@gmail.com](mailto:ikifor@gmail.com)

I have no phone

I have no valid driver's license

I have to move to a homeless shelter

<https://femfas.net>

January 26, 2024

Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
Supreme Court of the United States  
1 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20543

**SUBMITTED FOR:** Imre Kifor v. Massachusetts. et al., No. 23-6398

Dear Clerk Harris,

Enclosed for filing and docketing on my behalf, please find the following mailed documents:

1. Imre Kifor's Status Affidavit On Continued Systemic Statutory Discriminations And Retaliations (with incorporated addendum),
2. Proof Of Service.

I respectfully note that the deadline set for responses to my above-captioned petition for a writ of certiorari is 1/29/2024.

Respectfully,  
/s/ Imre Kifor, Pro Se

Enclosure

Cc: Katherine B. Dirks, Esq. (Assistant Attorney General), via [katherine.dirks@mass.gov](mailto:katherine.dirks@mass.gov)  
Michael Xavier, Esq. (for [REDACTED]), via [mxavier@princelobel.com](mailto:mxavier@princelobel.com)  
[REDACTED], Pro Se, via [REDACTED]  
Caroline Hendel, Esq. (for Yale School Of Medicine), via [caroline.hendel@yale.edu](mailto:caroline.hendel@yale.edu)  
Allyson R. Cady, Esq. (for LifeStance Health, Inc.), via [ACady@beneschlaw.com](mailto:ACady@beneschlaw.com)  
Wesley S. Chused, Esq. (for The Counseling Center of New England), via [wchused@preti.com](mailto:wchused@preti.com)  
John Puleo, Esq. (for Atrius Health), via [jpuleo@hmdrslaw.com](mailto:jpuleo@hmdrslaw.com)

No. 23-6398

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

IMRE KIFOR,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS et al.,  
*Respondents.*

---

**IMRE KIFOR’S STATUS AFFIDAVIT ON CONTINUED SYSTEMIC  
STATUTORY DISCRIMINATIONS AND RETALIATIONS**

The Petitioner, Imre Kifor (“Father”), respectfully states:

- 1) Father’s above-captioned petition directly referred to the 2/16/2023 Presidential Executive Order. Father also requested a joint review of the specific decisions from the Court of Appeals and the binding Executive Order under Rule 12.4.
- 2) In his petition, Father substantiated the preserved controversy from the lower courts as a “dogmatic interplay” to subvert justice based on merit and replace it with justice based on a more convenient (but also superficial) group identity.
- 3) Specifically, discounting Father’s factual claims of systemic discrimination, the lower courts endorsed the open deception by the State that “[Father’s] Title VII

claim is defective because he is not an employee of any of the Commonwealth Defendants,” despite the established precedent, i.e., “Reasoning that Title VII was intended to prohibit employers ‘from exerting any power [they] may have to foreclose, on invidious grounds, access by any individual to employment opportunities otherwise available to him,’ the court concluded that the statute did not contemplate providing protections only in those situations where there was a direct employment relationship between the plaintiff and defendant, i.e., that of ‘an employee of an employer.’ The court held that, although the defendant was not the plaintiff’s ‘actual [or] potential direct employer,’ the complaint alleged sufficient facts to state a claim against one ‘who control[s] access to ... employment and who den[ies] ... access by reference to invidious criteria.’ *Sibley Memorial Hosp. v. Wilson*, 488 F.2d 1338 (D.C.Cir.1973) at 1342,” Lopez v. Commonwealth, 463 Mass. 696, 703 (Mass. 2012).

- 4) Continuing the same “group identity”-based superficial interpretation of the law, the U.S. District Court dismissed Father’s referenced Civil RICO Class Action Complaint with “Kifor’s complaint fails to state a discrimination claim under Title VII because he is not an employee of the state.” The District Court also noted on 12/21/2023 that “it is ‘crystal clear’ that allowing Kifor to amend the complaint in this action could not cure the pleading deficiencies.” However, based on his extensive 1,319 pages of filed factual evidence, Father was able to assert just a few weeks later to the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court that:

“On 12/18/2023, I submitted my motion for leave and petition to the Supreme Judicial Court. Conclusive proof for the State deploying forced separation and extreme parental alienation of children as sustained statutory (M.G.L. c. 151B) retaliations came only on 1/10/2024 when the Probation Officer confirmed to me upon the Family Court orders that my minor children felt so alienated and so utterly ‘fatherless’ that they wanted to change even their names. These are my ‘State-owned’ children who never had contact with their loving father outside of the agenda-driven and deliberately retaliatory ‘supervised visitations.’ To substantiate my comprehensive M.G.L. c. 151B claims, I would like to extend my petition with the attached Status Affidavit And Memorandum Of Law On Continued Systemic Discriminations And Retaliations.”

- 5) In his filing to the highest state court, Father specifically alleged statutory and systemic “Discrimination Based On National Origin And Sex,” “Retaliation Against A Complaining Father,” “Rule 60 (b)(6) Fraud On The Court,” “Interference With Protected Rights,” “Defamation To Forced Indigency To Jail Sentence,” and also “Aiding And Abetting Employment Discrimination.”
- 6) Father is attaching his open letter/affidavit respectfully mailed to The White House titled “Agenda-Driven Statutory Discriminations/Retaliations Are ‘Prisoner-Like’ Segregations” incorporating by reference the *pro se* text of Father’s already substantiated “Status Affidavit And Memorandum Of Law On

Continued Systemic Discriminations And Retaliations” filed with the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court as SJ-2023-M014 on 1/13/2024.

- 7) To continue his desperate defenses against the now systemic and sustained “conspiracy to silence and enslave,” Father has docketed his appeal of the District Court’s hasty and “prisoner-like” *sua sponte* dismissal of his Civil RICO complaint with the U.S. Court of Appeals, First Circuit, as No. 24-1075.
- 8) Moreover, the also attached “Complaint Against State-Endorsed ‘Prisoner-Like’ Segregations Per 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12134” to U.S. Attorney Levy is a precursor for Father’s defenses against the expected future rights violations.

ADDENDUM TABLE OF CONTENTS


Dear President Biden: Agenda-Driven Statutory Discriminations And Retaliations Are “Prisoner-Like” Segregations . . . . . 5

Dear U.S. Attorney Levy: Complaint Against State-Endorsed “Prisoner-Like” Segregations Per 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12134 . . . . . 55

USCA1-24-1075 Docketing Statement . . . . . 90

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

January 26, 2024

/s/ Imre Kifor  
 Imre Kifor, Pro Se  
  
 Newton, MA 02464  
[ikifor@gmail.com](mailto:ikifor@gmail.com)  
 I have no phone  
 I have no valid driver’s license  
 I have to move to a homeless shelter  
<https://femfas.net>

Imre Kifor

██████████  
Newton, MA 02464

[ikifor@gmail.com](mailto:ikifor@gmail.com)

I have no phone

I have no valid driver's license

I have to move to a homeless shelter

<https://femfas.net>

January 26, 2024

President Joseph Biden  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20500

### **Agenda-Driven Statutory Discriminations And Retaliations Are “Prisoner-Like” Segregations**

Dear President Biden,

In my previous open letter to The White House (and affidavit to the U.S. Supreme Court), I claimed on 1/1/2024 that Marxist equity-based ideas are grossly inadequate for any honest “rule of the law”-based justice, as not even activist feminism can morph a millionaire mother's equity into that of a poor mother.

Most importantly, I meticulously documented in my letter that while “fatherlessness” is meaningless for a now 65-year-old millionaire mother, it is crucially meaningful for my still minor but very dear children as “extreme parental alienation should be considered emotional child abuse and referred criminally.”

Moreover, I reported to the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court on 1/14/2024 that “conclusive proof for the State deploying forced separation and extreme parental alienation of children as sustained statutory (G.L.c. 151B) retaliations came only on 1/10/2024 when the Probation Officer confirmed to me upon the Family Court orders that my minor children felt so alienated and so utterly ‘fatherless’ that they wanted to change even their names. These are my ‘State-owned’ children who never had contact with their loving father outside of the agenda-driven and deliberately retaliatory ‘supervised visitations.’”

Through over 1,400 pages of diligently filed evidence, I have substantiated that agenda-driven statutory (M.G.L.c. 151B) discriminations and retaliations are behind the State's stubborn efforts to conceal and obstruct the existentially destructive effects of just such Marxist “equity-based justice” (see attached).

Due to the fast turn of events, I have now docketed the appeal of my Civil RICO class action complaint with the U.S. Court of Appeals (see attached) with the intent to reiterate the troubling federal question:

**Does sovereign immunity apply to an “LGBTQ+” Massachusetts when using federal funds to subsidize the forceful separation and activist agenda-driven alienation of innocent American children from their loving American parents?**



In my previous open letter, I indicated that my meticulously substantiated complaint in the U.S. District Court was summarily dismissed with 16 direct misrepresentations of my relevant facts. Among other things, I specifically claimed that “as the consequences of the Presidential Executive Order (effectively equivalent to mandating new **‘Jim Crow’-like segregation of Americans** into ‘double protected with equity’ and ‘unprotected with no equity at all’ disjoint camps), the directly implied ‘American Gulag Of Leftovers’ can be categorized only as a base for the new ‘forced deprogramming’ of the masses.”

The *sua sponte* dismissal immediately targeted & banished even the possibility of any existence of such an “American Gulag Of Leftovers.” Moreover, the District Court flatly asserted that “*Kifor cannot fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class that he has identified*” while also acknowledging that I was a forcedly indigent *pro se* individual who had expressly waived his attorney-client privileges to specifically protect his children from the allowed predatory practices of prior million-dollar attorneys.

The **silencing and enslaving intent** behind the dismissal is stated unambiguously: “*Here Kifor has filed several unsuccessful lawsuits with allegations arising out of the same or similar events against identical or substantially similar parties. Nonetheless, the dismissal of his earlier actions has not deterred Kifor from again filing suit. Kifor’s conduct rises above the level of litigiousness and qualifies as vexatious. His repeated filing of lawsuits concerning his family court matters is an abuse of the process.*”

My complaint was dismissed by referring to a “gatekeeper” statute written specifically for “prisoners.” As I have not committed any crimes, have never been convicted, and have never been a prisoner, I immediately objected to the court’s “**prisoner-like**” (but purely group-identity-based) segregation.

The court justified on 1/22/2024 that “*To the extent plaintiff states that the in forma pauperis statute is limited to prisoners, plaintiff misunderstands the scope of cases to which this statute applies due to a clerical error in the statute. Under federal law, a court may authorize the commencement of any suit without prepayment of fees or security therefore, by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such prisoner possesses... The use of the word prisoner in 28 U.S.C. 1915 (a)(1) appears to be a typographical error*” (see attached). Yet, the same statute also duly clarifies that “28 U.S.C. § 1915 (h): As used in this section, the term ‘prisoner’ means any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program.”

Backed by my personal experiences, I reiterated in my petition No. 23-5932 to the U.S. Supreme Court that “In Marxism, ambiguity and inconsistency were unsurprisingly essential: ‘It’s on purpose! The laws are unclear for a reason. Because everybody is a criminal. So anybody can be arrested at any moment ... They’ve always violated something because the laws are badly written, and they seem to be written that way on purpose,’” (see [The Gulag: What We Know Now and Why It Matters](#) at 1:19:11 to 1:21:10). In my “**unprotected with no equity at all**” desperate defense, I will now submit my attached “Complaint Against State-Endorsed ‘Prisoner-Like’ Segregations Per 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12134” to the DOJ.

Respectfully,  
/s/ Imre Kifor<sup>1</sup>, Pro Se

---

<sup>1</sup> Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury as an affidavit in support of my petition for a writ of certiorari, No. 23-6398, to the Supreme Court and my appeal, No. 24-1075, to the Court of Appeals For the First Circuit.

Imre Kifor

[REDACTED]  
Newton, MA 02464

[ikifor@gmail.com](mailto:ikifor@gmail.com)

I have no phone

I have no valid driver's license

I have to move to a homeless shelter

<https://femfas.net>

January 14, 2024

Francis V. Kenneally, Clerk  
Supreme Judicial Court  
John Adams Courthouse  
One Pemberton Sq., Suite 1400  
Boston, MA 02108-1724  
[SJCCommClerk@sjc.state.ma.us](mailto:SJCCommClerk@sjc.state.ma.us)

Maura S. Doyle, Clerk  
SJC for The County of Suffolk  
John Adams Courthouse  
One Pemberton Sq., Suite 1300  
Boston, MA 02108-1707  
[newsjcsinglejusticecase@jud.state.ma.us](mailto:newsjcsinglejusticecase@jud.state.ma.us)

**SUBMITTED FOR:** Kifor v. The Commonwealth of Mass. et al. - SJ-2023-M014

Dear Clerks Kenneally and Doyle,

On 12/18/2023, I submitted my motion for leave and petition to the Supreme Judicial Court. Conclusive proof for the State deploying forced separation and extreme parental alienation of children as sustained statutory (G.L.c. 151B) retaliations came only on 1/10/2024 when the Probation Officer confirmed to me upon the Family Court orders that my minor children felt so alienated and so utterly "fatherless" that they wanted to change even their names. These are my "State-owned" children who never had contact with their loving father outside of the agenda-driven and deliberately retaliatory "supervised visitations."

To substantiate my comprehensive G.L. c. 151B claims, I would like to extend my petition with the attached:

1. Imre Kifor's Status Affidavit And Memorandum Of Law On Continued Systemic Discriminations And Retaliations and exhibits.

Respectfully,  
/s/ Imre Kifor, Pro Se

Enclosure

Cc: Ying Mo, Esq., EEOC Project Coordinator, MCAD, via [EEOCWeight@state.ma.us](mailto:EEOCWeight@state.ma.us)  
Katherine B. Dirks, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, via [katherine.dirks@mass.gov](mailto:katherine.dirks@mass.gov)  
Michael G. Xavier, Esq. (for [REDACTED]) via [mxavier@princelobel.com](mailto:mxavier@princelobel.com)  
[REDACTED], Pro Se, via [REDACTED]

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT  
for Suffolk County  
Case Docket

IMRE KIFOR v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
GOVERNOR MAURA HEALY (OFFICIAL CAPACITY), ATTORNEY  
GENERAL ANDREA CAMPBELL (OFFICIAL CAPACITY),  
COMMISSIONER GEOFFREY SYNDER (OFFICIAL CAPACITY,  
MA DOR CSE), MIDDLESEX PROBATE AND FAMILY COURT,  
[REDACTED] AND [REDACTED]  
THIS CASE CONTAINS IMPOUNDED MATERIAL OR PID  
SJ-2023-M014

CASE HEADER

<b>Case Status</b>	Active: Motion Pending	<b>Status Date</b>	12/18/2023
<b>Nature</b>	Superintendence c 211 s 3	<b>Entry Date</b>	12/18/2023
<b>Sub-Nature</b>	Not Applicable	<b>Single Justice</b>	
<b>TC Ruling</b>		<b>TC Ruling Date</b>	
<b>SJ Ruling</b>		<b>TC Number</b>	
<b>Pet Role Below</b>		<b>Full Ct Number</b>	
<b>Lower Court</b>		<b>Lower Ct Judge</b>	

INVOLVED PARTY

**Imre Kifor**  
Pro Se Petitioner

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
Respondent

**Governor Maura Healy (Official Capacity)**  
Respondent

**Attorney General Andrea Campbell (Official Capacity)**  
Respondent

**Commissioner Geoffrey Syder (Official Capacity, MA DOR CSE)**  
Respondent

**Middlesex Probate and Family Ct.**  
Respondent

[REDACTED]  
Respondent

[REDACTED]  
Pro Se Respondent

ATTORNEY APPEARANCE

[Katherine B. Dirks, Assistant Attorney General](#)

[Katherine B. Dirks, Assistant Attorney General](#)

[Katherine B. Dirks, Assistant Attorney General](#)

[Katherine B. Dirks, Assistant Attorney General](#)

[Katherine B. Dirks, Assistant Attorney General](#)

[Michael Gabriel Xavier, Esquire](#)

DOCKET ENTRIES

Entry Date	Paper	Entry Text
12/18/2023		Case entered.
12/18/2023	#1	(IMPOUNDED) Affidavit of Indigency Request for Waiver, Substitution or State Payment Fees & Costs pursuant to G. L. c. 261, s. 27A-G, filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.
12/18/2023	#2	MOTION to Waive Entry Fee, filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.

12/18/2023	#3	Imre Kifor's MOTION For Leave to File, filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.
12/18/2023	#4	Imre Kifor's Emergency Petition to Correct and Prevent Ongoing Errors Pursuant to G.L.c. 211, sec. 3, filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.
12/18/2023	#5	Imre Kifor's Record Appendices I-V to Petition to Correct and Prevent Ongoing Errors, filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.
12/18/2023	#6	Copy of Letter to EEOC Project Coordinator From Imre Kifor, pro se, filed.
01/01/2024	#7	Letter to Clerks Kenneally and Doyle, dated January 1, 2024 saying "On 12/18/2023, I submitted my motion for leave and petition to the Supreme Judicial Court. In the petition I indicated that I would be filing my third petition for a writ of certioari with the U.S. Supreme Court. Subject to the Supreme Judicial Court's decision on my motion for leave, I therefore respectfully amend my petition with the attached: 1. Imre Kifor's Status Affidavit on Federal Question filed with the U.S. Supreme Court." filed.
01/01/2024	#8	Imre Kifor's Status Affidavit on Federal Question filed with the U.S. Supreme Court with attachment filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.
01/16/2024	#9	Imre Kifor's Status Affidavit and Memorandum of Law on Continued Systemic Discrimination and Retaliations with Certificate of Service and attachments filed by Imre Kifor, pro se.

As of 01/16/2024 10:25am

Imre Kifor

██████████  
Newton, MA 02464

[ikifor@gmail.com](mailto:ikifor@gmail.com)

I have no phone

I have no valid driver's license

I have to move to a homeless shelter

<https://femfas.net>

January 26, 2024

Joshua S. Levy, Acting U.S. Attorney

U.S. Federal Courthouse

1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200

Boston, MA 02210

[USAMA.CivilRights@usdoj.gov](mailto:USAMA.CivilRights@usdoj.gov)

### **Complaint Against State-Endorsed "Prisoner-Like" Segregations Per 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12134**

Dear U.S. Attorney Levy,

Substantiated by my attached "Status Affidavit On Continued Systemic Statutory Discriminations And Retaliations" filed today with the U.S. Supreme Court and "Agenda-Driven Statutory Discriminations And Retaliations Are 'Prisoner-Like' Segregations" open letter/affidavit mailed today to The White House, I continue to claim that I have been a deliberate target of statutory discriminations (based on my national origin and sex) and child-predatory retaliations by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The long-term targeted discrimination and retaliations, coupled with efforts to conceal and deliberately obstruct the unlawful acts, have resulted in my purpose-induced and meticulously documented **forced indigency**. To avoid succumbing to the therefore deliberate conspiracy to outright silence and enslave me, I must make every effort possible to attend and rightfully represent myself in all court hearings.

The ongoing Family Court hearings are being held in Lowell, MA. I currently receive shelter in Newton, MA. Due to my forced indigency, I have no ability to physically transport myself the ~26 miles one way other than to walk. I diligently attempted to do just that for the hearings on 3/23/2023 (see attached).

I am 62 years old. Walking ~32 miles resulted in a paralyzing inflammation in both of my knees, so much so that I could not even stand up. Seeing a doctor was out of the question as I do not have any insurance. My health started to degrade fast without being mobile, presumably also caused by my very restricted and "poor man's" diet of bread, bread, and more bread. In my excruciating pain (driven by my ever-expanding systemic infections, inflammations, and allergies), I still could not request medical help.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts offers no-cost health insurance. Unfortunately, it also comes with the impossible pre-condition that I **deliberately abandon and renounce my dear children**. The Family Court has knowingly refused to accept and consider my complaints for modifications. I have attempted

to modify the orders since 2018, specifically regarding my children's health insurances. Moreover, the Commonwealth receives federal reimbursements related to Child Support Enforcement ("CSE").

Accordingly, as a non-custodial parent, I am entitled by CSE to file complaints for modifications when my circumstances change. Due to the deliberate discrimination and retaliations by the entire state apparatus, my circumstances have changed dramatically. In fact, they have changed so much that even the U.S. District Court has started to hastily **segregate me as a "prisoner"** without clearly being one.

I have alleged factually substantiated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d, *et seq.*) and Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107) violations as the Commonwealth continues to effectively silence me in my desperate efforts to modify the existing orders. These orders are all based on sustained fraud on the court and systemic statutory discriminations and retaliations.

The existing orders have caused not just my forced indigency but also deliberately created a **medical disability** in a manner that unnecessarily segregates me (with an implied and now long-term house arrest), in violation of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12134. The Family Court denying my continued requests for assistance to attend my court hearings is an unnecessary institutionalization (implied house arrest) or segregation and constitutes an injury in fact.

Quoting from the attached "Statement Of Interest Of The United States Of America," the DOJ cites Murphy by Murphy v. Minn. Dep't of Hum. Servs., 260 F. Supp. 3d 1084, 1100 (D. Minn. 2017) ("Through the ADA and the R[e]habilitation A[ct], Congress has elevated the segregation of individuals with disabilities to the status of a legally cognizable injury."); see also Fisher v. Okla. Health Care Auth., 335 F.3d 1175, 1181 (10th Cir. 2003) ("[T]he ADA and its attendant regulations clearly define unnecessary segregation as a form of illegal discrimination against the disabled."); Davis v. Shah, 821 F.3d 231, 263–64 (2d Cir. 2016) (holding that plaintiffs' showing that they were "at a substantial risk of requiring institutionalized care establishe[d] an injury sufficient [for their] integration mandate claim").

I have requested remote (via Zoom) access to the Family Court hearings. On 12/11/2023, the court emailed that "Judge Allen is not sitting today, but I was able to contact her. She said you could log onto Zoom tomorrow and that your motion would probably be allowed, but do not expect that you will be allowed to be on Zoom all the time, especially for a contested matter" (see attached). The DOJ asserted in its above filing that, "a request for such an accommodation is gratuitous when there is an obvious need for an accommodation." That **condition is manifestly satisfied** by the attached 12/12/2023 order.

To this effect, the DOJ cites Haddad v. Arnold, 784 F. Supp. 2d 1284, 1297–98 (M.D. Fla. 2010) (plaintiff was likely to succeed on the merits because Florida had affirmative duty "[t]o avoid the discrimination inherent in the unjustified isolation of disabled persons" by making "reasonable modifications to policies, practices, and procedures for services they elect to provide"); cf. Toledo v. Sanchez, 454 F.3d 24, 32 (1st Cir. 2006) ("Title II imposes an affirmative obligation on public entities to make their programs accessible to qualified individuals with disabilities, except where compliance would result in a fundamental alteration of services or impose an undue burden.")

Respectfully,  
/s/ Imre Kifor, Pro Se