



Imre Kifor &lt;ikifor@gmail.com&gt;

---

**26-1346 Kifor v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al "Status Report"**

---

CA01NoticeDocketActivity@ca1.uscourts.gov &lt;CA01NoticeDocketActivity@ca1.uscourts.gov&gt;

Tue, May 19, 2026 at  
2:27 PM

To: ikifor@gmail.com

\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\* Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

## Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was entered on 05/19/2026 at 2:27:27 PM Eastern Daylight Time and filed on 05/19/2026

Case Name: Kifor v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al

Case Number: 26-1346

Document(s): <https://ecf.ca1.uscourts.gov/docs1/00108448822?uid=ef3f7f05af36a0f8>

## Docket Text:

STATUS report filed by Appellant Imre Kifor. Served on 05/19/2026. [26-1346] (IK)

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Imre Kifor

Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

Andrea J. Campbell  
MA Attorney General's Office  
1 Ashburton Pl  
20th Fl  
Boston, MA 02108-0000

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

666 Document Description: Main Document

Original Filename: 03-Status-Affidavit.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp\_ID=1104935054 [Date=05/19/2026] [FileNumber=6810950-0] [0b1f8fbdaaa4bd5bd7a63a771d832139b8067a2fbc8656fb2bda8582446bd4c74d9c9c3c38dee99d4919786d61fa68a9ba529d3e2932adb1aef7bc635f8a707e]]

666 Document Description:

Original Filename: Exhibit-1.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMP acecfStamp\_ID=1104935054 [Date=05/19/2026] [FileNumber=6810950-1] [262abfa58bd9751d2c2dcf9ce59f7acbd0d3f10f58a52c62aee0262d51f28dd2c8bce5a2360335be6495ee771ae6774d08ae1c465fa0e733ea479ad8845a0403]]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

IMRE KIFOR,

Appellant,

v.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS, et al.,

Appellees.

No. 26-1346

(On Appeal from the U.S. District  
Court for the District of Mass., No.  
1:25-cv-11831-AK, Kelley, J.)

**APPELLANT'S STATUS AFFIDAVIT REPORTING ON (I) THE  
COMMONWEALTH'S NON-RESPONSE TO THE 4/16/2026 BRIEFING  
NOTICE'S 5/18/2026 APPELLEES'-BRIEF DEADLINE, (II) THE 5/19/2026  
MASSACHUSETTS APPEALS COURT RULE 23.0 DECISION IN [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] EXPRESSLY DIRECTING APPELLANT TO THE SUPREME  
COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND (III) APPELLANT'S PLANNED  
SIXTH PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO BE MAILED  
FROM THE BRISTOL LODGE MEN'S SHELTER PO BOX IN  
APPROXIMATELY ONE WEEK**

I, Imre Kifor, the pro se Appellant in the above-captioned matter, declare and state on personal knowledge under 28 U.S.C. § 1746 as follows:

## I. PURPOSE

1. This Status Affidavit reports three developments material to this Court's record that post-date Appellant's 4/30/2026 Status Affidavit (Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890) and 5/12/2026 Emergency Motion for Injunction Pending Appeal (Doc 00118445745 / Entry ID 6809309). It is preservational. It does not seek substantive relief, does not move to expand the briefed record, and does not delay any briefing schedule.
2. The three developments are:
  - (a) As of 11:59 PM EDT on 5/18/2026 — the deadline this Court's 4/16/2026 Briefing Notice set for the appellees' brief — the Commonwealth had filed nothing in this Court. As of the moment of this filing, the docket likewise reflects no appellees' brief, no motion for extension, and no other appearance by the Commonwealth (¶¶ 3–5).
  - (b) On 5/19/2026 at 10:00 AM EDT, the Massachusetts Appeals Court issued a Rule 23.0 Memorandum and Order in *Kifor v. Commonwealth & others*, No. [REDACTED] (lower-court No. 2481CV00983), affirming the Middlesex Superior Court's dismissal of Appellant's certiorari complaint and the order denying Appellant's motion to alter or amend the judgment. The panel — Massing, Ditkoff, Hand, JJ. — expressly directed Appellant to seek review by the Supreme Court of the United States as he has done

in the past, citing *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, 144 S. Ct. 591 (2024), and *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, 143 S. Ct. 2504 (2023) (¶¶ 6–10).

- (c) Appellant intends, on or about 5/26/2026 — i.e., approximately one week from the date of this filing — to mail to the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States Appellant's now sixth pro se petition for a writ of certiorari, *in forma pauperis*, seeking review of the 5/19/2026 Mass. App. Ct. judgment in No. [REDACTED] together with the underlying Superior Court judgment in No. 2481CV00983. The sixth petition will, for the first time across Appellant's six petitions, bear Appellant's Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter PO Box address of record (PO Box 541095, Waltham, MA 02453), now of record across this Court, the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, and (since today) the AGO, DOR/CSE, opposing counsel, Probation, and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Massachusetts (¶¶ 11–15).

**II. THE COMMONWEALTH'S NON-RESPONSE TO THE 5/18/2026 APPELLEES' BRIEF DEADLINE**

3. By the 4/16/2026 Briefing Notice, this Court set the appellees' brief in No. 26-1346 to be filed on or before 5/18/2026. Appellant's principal brief (Doc 00118432189) and the bound 11-volume Record Appendix were timely filed and served on that schedule.

4. As of 11:59 PM EDT on 5/18/2026, no appellees' brief had been filed by any of the named Appellees — the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the Massachusetts Probate and Family Court, Middlesex Division; the Massachusetts Department of Revenue, Child Support Enforcement Division; Governor Maura T. Healey (in her official capacity); Attorney General Andrea Joy Campbell (in her official capacity); Commissioner of Revenue Geoffrey E. Snyder (in his official capacity); Yale University (Pediatric Gender Program / Yale School of Medicine); The Counseling Center of New England (now Lifestance Health, Inc.); Atrius Health; [REDACTED]; or [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Appellant's PACER account reflects no filing by any Appellee, no motion for extension of time, and no notice of appearance by counsel for the state defendants beyond the standard "Notice will not be electronically mailed to: Andrea J. Campbell/MA Attorney General's Office/1 Ashburton Pl/20th Fl/ Boston, MA 02108..." line carried on every Notice of Docket Activity to date.
5. Appellant reports the non-response neither as a request for default nor as an invitation for this Court to act on it. He reports it because his now sixth SCOTUS petition (¶¶ 11–15) will, by definition, be filed against the same Commonwealth on the same factual record. The absence of any appellees' filing in this Court — coupled with the Mass. App. Ct.'s same-week directive to

Appellant to seek review by the Supreme Court of the United States — is itself the material context for the public record this Court is creating.

**III. THE 5/19/2026 MASSACHUSETTS APPEALS COURT RULE 23.0**

**DECISION IN** [REDACTED]

6. At 10:00:36 AM EDT on 5/19/2026, the Massachusetts Appeals Court Clerk's Office ([AppealsCtClerk@appct.state.ma.us](mailto:AppealsCtClerk@appct.state.ma.us)) emailed to [ikifor@gmail.com](mailto:ikifor@gmail.com) the Notice of Decision in *Kifor v. Commonwealth & others*, No. [REDACTED] (lower-court No. 2481CV00983), reciting: "Decision: Rule 23.0 Judgment affirmed. Order denying motion to alter or amend judgment affirmed. (Massing, Ditkoff, Hand, JJ.). *Notice.*" That Notice expressly stated that the clerk's office will *not* mail a paper copy of the decision to Appellant (only incarcerated self-represented litigants receive a paper copy by mail), and pointed Appellant to <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/new-opinions> for the decision text.
7. Both the four-page Rule 23.0 Memorandum and Order ([REDACTED]SD.pdf) and the one-page Rescript Conclusion ([REDACTED]RC.pdf, signed by Clerk Paul Little, dated May 19, 2026) are attached to this Affidavit as Exhibit 1, Enclosures A and B. Both are the same Rule 23.0 disposition issued by the same panel on the same date.

8. The panel framed Appellant's case as follows: "The plaintiff, Imre Kifor, appeals from a judgment of the Superior Court dismissing his complaint for relief in the nature of certiorari on the grounds that the defendants are entitled to absolute immunity, the action is barred by claim preclusion, the complaint fails to comply with Mass. R. Civ. P. 8, ..., and the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The plaintiff also appeals from an order denying his motion to alter or amend the judgment. The gist of the plaintiff's complaint is that various rulings of the Probate and Family Court and the Supreme Judicial Court discriminate against him, constitute retaliation for protected complaints, interfere with his rights, and aid in employment discrimination against him."
9. The panel rested its affirmance on Mass. R. A. P. 16 (a) (9) (A) waiver and on the holding that "absolute immunity neither applies selectively against straight white males nor bars the plaintiff from raising claims of discrimination in the course of judicial proceedings." Citing *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 227-228 (1988), the panel held that absolute immunity applies in federal court as well as state court — a holding directly bearing on the federal civil-rights merits in No. 26-1346.
10. **The panel then expressly directed Appellant to the Supreme Court of the United States:** "If dissatisfied with the rulings of the Massachusetts courts, the

plaintiff can seek review by the United States Supreme Court, as he has done in the past. See *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, 144 S. Ct. 591 (2024); *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, 143 S. Ct. 2504 (2023)." That instruction is the operative authority that frames Appellant's planned sixth SCOTUS petition (¶¶ 11–15). It also forecloses any subsequent argument by the Commonwealth that Appellant's recourse to the Supreme Court is improper, premature, vexatious, or otherwise not what Massachusetts itself has told him to do.

#### **IV. APPELLANT'S PLANNED SIXTH PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

11. The 5/19/2026 Mass. App. Ct. judgment in No. [REDACTED] affirming the Middlesex Superior Court's dismissal in lower-court No. 2481CV00983, is the new lower-court judgment from which Appellant now intends to seek review in the Supreme Court of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257 and Sup. Ct. R. 10, 13.1, and 14. The petition is timely on its face under Sup. Ct. R. 13.1 (90 days from entry of judgment on 5/19/2026), and the underlying matter is wholly distinct from the SJC matters that were the subject of Appellant's now-dismissed fifth petition, *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, No. 25-6878.
12. Appellant intends to mail the sixth petition on or about 5/26/2026, after he receives and verifies (a) the two outstanding certified audio recordings he has formally requested from the Massachusetts Office of the Supervisor of Court

Transcripts (Dawn V. Portillo) and the certified transcriber (Susan M. Lobie, CET), and (b) the corresponding already-kindly-corrected transcripts of the parallel Family Court hearings whose docket entries are the documentary backbone of both this appeal and the sixth petition. The corrected transcripts will be appended to the sixth petition's appendix.

13. For the first time across Appellant's six petitions, Appellant will file from his federally-IFP-adjudicated address of record — **Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter, PO Box 541095, Waltham, MA 02453** — already established on this Court's record at Doc 00118437697 / Entry ID 6804893, Doc 00118438630 / Entry ID 6805376, Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890, and Doc 00118445745 / Entry ID 6809309 (the 5/12/2026 Emergency Motion), and on the U.S. District Court's record at 1:25-cv-11831-AK, Dkt. 36 (Filed 04/27/26 by IFP-adjudicated Order of 3/25/2026, Hon. Angel Kelley, D.J.). The address line on the front page of the now-dismissed *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, No. 25-6878 (filed 2/16/2026) — " [demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down)" — is, by Massachusetts state-administered no-PO-Box pressure (this Court's 4/30/2026 Status Affidavit, Doc 00118439659, ¶¶ 3–10), no longer the address at which Appellant can in fact receive mail; the sixth petition will accordingly carry the Bristol Lodge address.

14. Should the single justice of the Massachusetts Appeals Court rule, in the coming days, in either or both of Appellant's pending companion petitions challenging the Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule (2026-J-0464 / 2026-J-0465, see this Court's 4/30/2026 Status Affidavit and 5/12/2026 Emergency Motion), Appellant will include those dispositions in the appendix to the sixth petition as further evidence of the Commonwealth's structural foreclosure of Appellant's address-of-record.
15. Earlier today, at 11:05 AM EDT, Appellant emailed all known counsel and agencies of record — namely, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Massachusetts, Civil Rights ([USAMA.CivilRights@usdoj.gov](mailto:USAMA.CivilRights@usdoj.gov)); Middlesex Probate ([middlesexprobate@jud.state.ma.us](mailto:middlesexprobate@jud.state.ma.us)); the Massachusetts DOR Child Support Enforcement [REDACTED]; Register of Probate [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; J. David Hampton, Esq. (AAG); Katherine B. Dirks, Esq. (Deputy Chief, Government Bureau, AGO); Joseph P. Lucia, Esq. (AAG and the only attorney of record for the Commonwealth in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOR/CSE); [REDACTED] Esq. (counsel for [REDACTED]); [REDACTED] (pro se, [REDACTED]); [REDACTED] (Transcription Supervisor); and [REDACTED] (certified transcriber) — formally notifying them of the planned sixth petition, of the Bristol Lodge PO Box mailing address, of the operative excerpt from the Mass. App. Ct.'s 5/19/2026 decision ("If dissatisfied

with the rulings of the Massachusetts courts, the plaintiff can seek review by the United States Supreme Court, as he has done in the past"), and of the one-week window (i.e., before next Tuesday, 5/26/2026) within which any addressee may, if it so chooses, communicate feedback to Appellant before the petition is mailed. A true and correct copy of that 11:05 AM email — together with the forwarded 10:00 AM Mass. App. Ct. Notice of Decision — is attached to this Affidavit as Exhibit 1, Enclosure C.

#### **V. CONCLUSION**

16. Appellant respectfully requests that this Court take note of the foregoing for purposes of this Court's record only. No relief is sought herein. The 5/18/2026 appellees'-brief deadline is past with no filing; the Massachusetts Appeals Court has, by Rule 23.0 decision issued today, explicitly directed Appellant to the Supreme Court of the United States on the same factual record now before this Court; and Appellant's sixth *pro se in forma pauperis* petition for a writ of certiorari, addressed for the first time from the Bristol Lodge PO Box, will be mailed to Washington, D.C. on or about 5/26/2026.

#### **VI. SERVICE**

17. Appellant is this day serving copies of this Status Affidavit (with Exhibit 1) by electronic mail on counsel of record for the appellees and on opposing parties: Andrea Joy Campbell, Attorney General of Massachusetts, c/o Katherine B.



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

(857) 340-8699

(by the federal Lifeline program)

I have no valid driver's license

<https://quantapix.com> and <https://femfas.net>

<https://github.com/quantapix>

## EXHIBIT 1 — ENCLOSURES

- **Enclosure A:** [REDACTED]RC.pdf — Rescript Conclusion of the Massachusetts Appeals Court in No. [REDACTED] signed by Clerk Paul Little, dated May 19, 2026 (1 page).
- **Enclosure B:** [REDACTED]SD.pdf — Memorandum and Order Pursuant to Rule 23.0 in No. [REDACTED] by the Court (Massing, Ditkoff, Hand, JJ.), entered May 19, 2026 (4 pages).
- **Enclosure C:** A true and correct copy of Appellant's 5/19/2026 11:05 AM EDT email to counsel and agencies of record (subject: "Notice of new, now sixth, SCOTUS petition to be mailed in a week (was Fwd: [REDACTED] - E-notice of opinion)"), together with the forwarded 5/19/2026 10:00 AM EDT Mass. App. Ct. Clerk's Office Notice of Decision in No. [REDACTED] (3 pages, Gmail print-to-PDF).

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Appeals Court for the Commonwealth

At Boston

In the case no. [REDACTED]

IMRE KIFOR

---

vs.

COMMONWEALTH & others.

---

Pending in the Superior

---

Court for the County of Middlesex

---

Ordered, that the following entry be made on the docket:

Judgment affirmed.

Order denying motion to alter  
or amend judgment affirmed.

By the Court,

 , Clerk

Date May 19, 2026.

---

NOTICE: Summary decisions issued by the Appeals Court pursuant to M.A.C. Rule 23.0, as appearing in 97 Mass. App. Ct. 1017 (2020) (formerly known as rule 1:28, as amended by 73 Mass. App. Ct. 1001 [2009]), are primarily directed to the parties and, therefore, may not fully address the facts of the case or the panel's decisional rationale. Moreover, such decisions are not circulated to the entire court and, therefore, represent only the views of the panel that decided the case. A summary decision pursuant to rule 23.0 or rule 1:28 issued after February 25, 2008, may be cited for its persuasive value but, because of the limitations noted above, not as binding precedent. See Chace v. Curran, 71 Mass. App. Ct. 258, 260 n.4 (2008).

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

APPEALS COURT

██████████

IMRE KIFOR

vs.

COMMONWEALTH & others.<sup>1</sup>

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER PURSUANT TO RULE 23.0

The plaintiff, Imre Kifor, appeals from a judgment of the Superior Court dismissing his complaint for relief in the nature of certiorari on the grounds that the defendants are entitled to absolute immunity, the action is barred by claim preclusion, the complaint fails to comply with Mass. R. Civ. P. 8, 365 Mass. 749 (1974), and the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The plaintiff also appeals from an order

---

<sup>1</sup> Governor, Attorney General, Commissioner of Revenue, Middlesex Division of the Probate and Family Court Department, and ██████████. The plaintiff never made proper service of ██████████. Although the plaintiff was entitled to file an amended complaint as of right, Mass. R. Civ. P. 15 (a), 365 Mass. 761 (1974), he instead moved for leave to file an amended complaint, which would have added ██████████ as a defendant. No action was taken on that motion.

denying his motion to alter or amend the judgment. The gist of the plaintiff's complaint is that various rulings of the Probate and Family Court and the Supreme Judicial Court discriminate against him, constitute retaliation for protected complaints, interfere with his rights, and aid in employment discrimination against him.

The argument section of the plaintiff's brief is four pages long, and it is devoid of any explanation why the Superior Court judge was wrong that the complaint is barred by immunity and claim preclusion, fails to comply with Mass. R. Civ. P. 8, and fails to state a claim. Arguments not raised in the appellant's brief are waived. See Mass. R. A. P. 16 (a) (9) (A), as appearing in 481 Mass. 1628 (2019). Accord Tody's Serv., Inc. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 496 Mass. 197, 199 n.3 (2025).

Arguments raised for the first time in a reply brief are also waived. See, e.g., Springfield Water & Sewer Comm'n v. Department of Env'tl. Protection, 105 Mass. App. Ct. 721, 730 n.9 (2025); Commonwealth v. Lugo, 104 Mass. App. Ct. 309, 316 n.6 (2024). In any event, even in the reply brief, the plaintiff fails to explain why the Superior Court judge erroneously concluded that the plaintiff's claims were barred by absolute immunity or failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted. Instead, the plaintiff states that absolute immunity

"confirms that no such protection [against discrimination] applies to straight white males & legal immigrants" and that its existence "also confirms that Father's only option for 'adequate remedy' is in federal court." Putting aside the fact that absolute immunity applies in Federal court as well, see Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 227-228 (1988), absolute immunity neither applies selectively against straight white males nor bars the plaintiff from raising claims of discrimination in the course of judicial proceedings. The plaintiff can raise such arguments in those judicial proceedings and seek appellate review if dissatisfied with the resolution of such complaints, rather than suing the courts and related entities. See, e.g., Commonwealth v. Washington W., 457 Mass. 140, 142 (2010), S.C., 462 Mass. 204 (2012). If dissatisfied with the rulings of the Massachusetts courts, the plaintiff can seek review by the United States Supreme Court, as he has done

in the past. See Kifor v. Massachusetts, 144 S. Ct. 591 (2024);  
Kifor v. Massachusetts, 143 S. Ct. 2504 (2023).

Judgment affirmed.

Order denying motion to alter  
or amend judgment affirmed.

By the Court (Massing,  
Ditkoff & Hand, JJ.<sup>2</sup>),

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Paul Little".

Clerk

Entered: May 19, 2026.

---

<sup>2</sup> The panelists are listed in order of seniority.