

Imre Kifor
Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter
PO Box 541095
Waltham, MA 02453
(forcedly indigent — only deliverable mailing address available)
ikifor@gmail.com
(857) 340-8699
(by the federal Lifeline program)
I have no valid driver's license
<https://femfas.net> & quantapix.com (from 5/3/2026)

April 29, 2026

Andrea Joy Campbell
Attorney General of Massachusetts
c/o J. David Hampton, AAG
Joseph P. Lucia, AAG
Katherine B. Dirks, Deputy Chief, Government Bureau
One Ashburton Place, 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
david.hampton@mass.gov
joseph.lucia@mass.gov
katherine.dirks@mass.gov

Leah B. Foley
United States Attorney
District of Massachusetts
DOJ Civil Rights Division
John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse
1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
Boston, MA 02210
USAMA.CivilRights@usdoj.gov

[REDACTED], Esq.
[REDACTED] LLP
(counsel for [REDACTED])

[REDACTED]
Pro Se
(defendant in [REDACTED])

SUBMITTED FOR:

- Re: U.S. Court of Appeals, First Circuit — Kifor v. Commonwealth et al., No. 26-1346 (appellees' brief due 5/18/2026)
- Re: U.S. District Court, D. Mass. — Kifor v. Commonwealth et al., No. 1:25-cv-11831-AK (Hon. Kelley, J.; CM/ECF Filed 04/27/26 at Doc 36)
- Re: U.S. District Court, D. Mass. (MBD) — In re Petition for Leave to File of Imre Kifor, No. 1:26-mc-91166-DJC (Hon. Casper, Chief J.; paper packet mailed 4/27/2026; CM/ECF stamp pending)
- Re: Kifor v. [REDACTED] — [REDACTED] (Family Court paper bundle hand-delivered 4/28/2026; e-filed 4/27/2026 via Tyler Envelope 4871572)
- Re: Kifor v. [REDACTED] — [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] (Family Court paper bundle hand delivered 4/28/2026; e-filed 4/27/2026)
- Re: Continued requests for DOR CSE reviews (PIN: [REDACTED])
- Re: Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule (DTA / SNAP, DOR / CSE, Probate and Family Court Registry) — its operational role in obstructing the federal record, and its now-manifested reach to the Supreme Court of the United States in No. 25-6878

Dear Counsel and Parties,

Service herewith is the **Appellant's Status Affidavit** that I e-filed on April 28, 2026, with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in No. 26-1346, together with its five exhibits. This Status Affidavit reports the parallel state-court hand-delivery of the same content already on the federal record at Doc 00118437697 (Affidavit), 00118437698 (Exhibit A), and 00118437699 (Exhibit B) under Entry ID 6804893, Date Filed 04/27/2026.

I am serving the **complete e-filed Status Affidavit and exhibits** in lieu of stand-alone copies of the stamped Hand-Delivery Certificate, so that each recipient sees the chain of custody in a single self-contained record:

- **Exhibit 1** is the Amended Hand-Delivery Certificate executed by the Middlesex Probate and Family Court Registry on April 28, 2026. The clerk who attended the counter declined to give her name or to sign anything but agreed to (i) handwrite the parallel docket numbers ([REDACTED] on the DV1 certificate; [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] on the WD certificate) and (ii) apply the Registry's office stamp to each parallel certificate. The two stamped pages are reproduced as photographs on pp 13–14 of Exhibit 1.
- **Exhibit 2** is the cover letter that accompanied the April 27, 2026, Tyler e-filing on the parallel Family Court dockets, with the Tyler envelope confirmation (Envelope Number 4871572 for the DV1 docket; Envelope Numbers 4871591 and 4871597 for the paired WD dockets) and with per-docket Tyler stamps appearing on the filings themselves on the pages of Exhibits 3-1 and 2.
- **Exhibits 3-1 and 3-2** are the parallel Motions for Permission to File (DV1 and WD captions, respectively).
- **Exhibit 4** is the Status Affidavit on the Federal Record Through 4/24/2026 and on the Updating of Father's Mailing Address of Record. Its content tracks the federal-court record now reflected at Doc 00118437697 in the Court of Appeals.
- **Exhibit 5** is the Motion to Compel Decision on the three pending substantive motions, pursuant to Probate and Family Court Standing Order 2-99(c), anchored to the Court of Appeals' 5/18/2026 appellees-brief deadline.

The Family Court Registry's office stamp on Exhibit 1, taken with the federal PACER / CM/ECF stamps recited in Exhibit 1's Section III and visible on the underlying exhibits, collectively confirm that the same content was placed in the federal court records on April 27, 2026, and accepted by the Family Court Registry on April 28, 2026. My mailing address of record across all dockets is **Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter, PO Box 541095, Waltham, MA 02453**.

Please update your service rosters to reflect the Bristol Lodge address. The [demolished house mailbox] Newton, MA 02464, address is undeliverable (the structure was demolished on 2/12/2025) and was the address listed on Mr. Hampton's 4/21/2026 certificate of service preserved at USCA1 Document 00118437159 (Date Filed 4/24/2026), which is the source of the misroute documented in Exhibit 4.

Service is by electronic mail (and, where indicated above for the Attorney General, by U.S. mail via the Bristol Lodge address) due to forced indigency, which the U.S. District Court (Hon. Angel Kelley, J.) adjudicated on March 25, 2026, by allowing my motion to proceed in forma pauperis in No. 1:25-cv-11831-AK.

Supplemental disclosure since the 4/28/2026 hand-delivery: the Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule, the manifestly forced fraud at SCOTUS, and the Family Court mail-fraud proof of 2/18/2026.

I write to disclose a finding that crystallized this morning, April 29, 2026, when I logged in to my federal SNAP account at the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (“DTA”) to update my residential address of record to match the address now on file with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Kelley, J., and Casper, Chief J.), and the Middlesex Probate and Family Court Registry. The DTA Connect system rejected the update with the following on-screen message, captured at 26-04-29.pdf:

“Your residential address is where you live and cannot be a PO Box. To update your mailing address, click 'Go Back' to edit your mailing address.”

After re-entering the PO Box with the correct numerals (541095, not the 541005 typed in the first attempt), I logged back in and submitted the form a second time. The DTA system returned the identical rejection screen at 10:34 AM the same morning, captured (i) as a Safari window snapshot at 26-04-29-2.pdf and (ii) as a Safari “Print to PDF” of the live page at 26-04-29-3.pdf. The PO Box number is therefore not the operative variable: the rule rejects any “PO Box” string in the residential-address field.

I reside in a homeless shelter — Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter — that accepts mail only through a U.S. Postal Service post office box: PO Box 541095, Waltham, MA 02453. The shelter has no street-deliverable mailroom for residents. On April 27, 2026, two days before the DTA rejection captured at 26-04-29.pdf, I specifically inquired with the Bristol Lodge staff member who handles incoming mail. He explicitly emphasized that, although the building is physically located at 27 Lexington Street in Waltham — which is one of the City of Waltham's active fire stations — every one of the approximately 50 homeless men sheltered there must use the PO Box for all incoming mail, because the fire station will neither forward nor deliver any mail addressed to a “homeless” resident at 27 Lexington Street. The shelter, therefore, has no usable street-address option to offer the DTA, the DOR / CSE, the Family Court Registry, or any other Massachusetts agency that purports to forbid PO Boxes; the PO Box is the only address at which mail can, in fact, reach a Bristol Lodge resident. The Postal Service permits PO Boxes as the address of record for federal benefits, federal courts, and federal correspondence; the Mail Recovery and Forwarding rules treat the PO Box as the legal address of the named addressee.

Massachusetts, by contrast, has built a layered no-PO-Box rule across the agencies that touch indigent litigants — DTA / SNAP residential intake (manifested at 26-04-29.pdf), the Department of Revenue / Child Support Enforcement notice file (PIN [REDACTED]), and the Probate and Family Court Registry's mailing-of-judgment chain. The rule appears administrative; in the record I am preserving across the federal courts, it is operational. It forces an indigent pro se litigant either (a) to commit fraud by reporting a Massachusetts non-PO-Box residential address that he cannot in fact occupy, or (b) to lose the only mail-monitoring vantage point from which the obstruction of the state record can be proved.

I. The forced choice between truth at SCOTUS and consistency in Massachusetts. My petition for a writ of certiorari in *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, No. 25-6878 (filed October 6, 2025; docketed February 23, 2026) bears on its first page the address line “ [demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down) Newton, MA 02464” — see SCOTUS docketing letter at 26-02-23.pdf. Federal law would have permitted me to use the Bristol Lodge PO Box on that petition; doing so would have been correct in front of the Supreme Court of the United States. I did not, because every then-pending Massachusetts filing — at the Probate and Family Court ([redacted] and [redacted] / [redacted]), at DOR / CSE, and at DTA / SNAP — was carrying the [demolished house mailbox] address under the same no-PO-Box pressure that the DTA system explicitly manifested this morning. Switching to the PO Box on the SCOTUS papers alone would have created a documentable inconsistency that the very same Commonwealth respondents could have weaponized to allege misrepresentation. The petition was dismissed under Supreme Court Rule 39.8 on April 27, 2026 (26-04-27.pdf), an adverse substantive determination that now sits in the federal record bearing the address that Massachusetts forced me to keep — even though the federal forum would have allowed the truthful one.

II. The Family Court mail-fraud proof of 2/18/2026 — why the [demolished house mailbox] monitoring window mattered. On 2/18/2026 at 10:12 AM I emailed the Middlesex Probate and Family Court (with copies to AAG Dirks, AAG Lucia, opposing counsel, DOR/CSE) requesting confirmation that the 2/10/2026 modification judgment in [redacted] had not yet been mailed, expressly citing my close monitoring of mail delivered to [demolished house mailbox] and attaching USPS confirmations, the docket sheet, and proof of my prior SCOTUS / White House / FBI submissions. See 26-02-18-1.pdf and the five attachments preserved as 26-02-18-Exh-01-xxx.pdf to 26-02-18-Exh-05-xxx.pdf files. The Middlesex Probate Registry replied at 12:21 PM the same day, stating: “All copies were mailed out on 2-13-26. You should be getting the copies in the mail within the next few days” — see 26-02-18-2.pdf. The judgment envelope I subsequently received bears a Pitney Bowes meter franking marked “18 FEB 2026,” reproduced as page 1 of 26-02-18-3.pdf. The metered postage date is the date the envelope passed through the mailing machine. The 18 FEB 2026 meter mark is therefore documentary impeachment of the Registry's “2-13-26” representation: the judgment was mailed only after — and in immediate response to — my 10:12 AM email proving it had not been mailed. Pages 2–3 of 26-02-18-3.pdf contain the actual judgment of [redacted], J., that the envelope carried.

III. Operational role of the no-PO-Box rule. Had I been on the Bristol Lodge PO Box on 2/18/2026, the 2/13–2/18 mail-monitoring proof in §§ I–II above would have been impossible to make. PO Box delivery batches mail at the post office, not at a continuously-observed street mailbox; the chain-of-custody window that produced the 18 FEB 2026 meter-vs.-claim contradiction depended on the fact that I could observe — daily, in person — that nothing had arrived at [demolished house mailbox] through 2/18/2026 morning. Massachusetts agencies' uniform pressure on indigent pro se litigants to maintain a non-PO-Box residential address — manifested on the SNAP page captured at 26-04-29.pdf, mirrored in DOR/CSE notice handling, and structurally relied upon by the Probate and Family Court Registry's mailing-of-judgment workflow — therefore, is not procedural neutrality. It is the very mechanism that, but for my 4-month documentary discipline at [demolished house mailbox] would have ensured the silent expiration of my Mass. R. Dom. Rel. P. 52, 59(e), and 60(b) clocks on the 2/10/2026 modification judgment. Mass. R. App. P. 4(a)(2)(B) (effective 10/1/2025) is what now protects the timely notices of appeal that were issued in this window; without the 2/18/2026 proof, even Rule 4(a)(2)(B) would not have been triggered.

IV. How the obstruction reaches SCOTUS. The same no-PO-Box pressure that operated on the 2/18/2026 Family Court mailing operated on every prior Massachusetts filing whose address line my SCOTUS petition had to mirror in October 2025. The address on the front page of No. 25-6878 — “[de mo use] (mailbox only, house torn down) Newton, MA 02464” — is the address Massachusetts compelled me to certify across all state-side dockets. The Supreme Court's Rule 39.8 disposition therefore now sits in the federal record carrying an address line that Massachusetts forced into being and that, on its face, looks like a litigant's misrepresentation of his residence. It is not. It is the documentary footprint of a state-administered structural constraint — the no-PO-Box rule — coextensively imposed by DTA, DOR, and the Family Court Registry, and now manifested verbatim in 26-04-29.pdf. The conspiracy to obstruct justice and to conceal the underlying SNAP and DOR/CSE fraud — meticulously substantiated to the U.S. Supreme Court, the White House, and the local FBI Special Agent in my open letter of February 16, 2026 (preserved at 01-To-Pres-Trump.pdf with the parallel 2/18/2026 USPS proof attached) — has now reached the Supreme Court of the United States itself, in the form of the address line on the dismissed petition.

V. Use of this letter at SCOTUS and as a continuation of the 2/16/2026 open letter to President Donald J. Trump. I intend to (a) transmit a copy of this letter, with the entire AGO-DOJ enclosure set, to the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by a request that the address-line record in No. 25-6878 be supplemented with this Massachusetts no-PO-Box disclosure; and (b) transmit a parallel copy to The White House as the sixth installment in my preserved open-letter series begun on February 16, 2026. The transmittal under (b) is not a request for political intervention. It is the next dated entry in the same evidentiary record begun in 01-To-Pres-Trump.pdf, which already documents the prior installments and the Massachusetts conduct giving rise to them. The Supreme Court transmittal under (a) is not a re-petition of No. 25-6878; per *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U.S. 1 (1992), and Rule 39.8 itself, that judgment is closed. It is a record-supplementation directed solely at the address line, the conduct that produced it, and the future federal docket — most likely the eventual U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit disposition in No. 26-1346 — from which any next petition would issue.

I am not asking the Office of the Attorney General or the Office of the United States Attorney to do anything in connection with this disclosure other than to receive it and preserve it alongside the Status Affidavit. The address-update affidavit itself, e-filed on 4/27 and 4/28/2026 in the four federal dockets and hand-delivered to the Family Court Registry on 4/28/2026, already does the docket-specific work. The function of this supplemental disclosure is to fix the date — April 29, 2026 — on which the Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule became, in its own DTA-Connect words, the operative piece of documentary evidence linking the obstruction at the trial-court mailing chain to the address line on the front page of a now-dismissed Supreme Court petition.

Thank you. Respectfully,

/s/ Imre Kifor, Pro Se

Enclosures:

1. Appellant's Status Affidavit Reporting the Parallel Family Court Bundle E-Filed April 27, 2026, and Hand-Delivered April 28, 2026, Attesting to the Chain of Custody of Appellant's April 27, 2026 Address-Update Affidavit (Doc 00118437697), with Exhibits 1 through 5 as 02-Status-Affidavit.pdf.
2. 26-04-29.pdf, 26-04-29-2.pdf, 26-04-29-3.pdf — DTA Connect residential-address rejection screens captured at 8:19 AM (first attempt, with a typo in the PO Box numerals) and at 10:34 AM (Safari window snapshot and Safari “Print to PDF” of the same rejection on the corrected PO Box 541095). The no-PO-Box rule rejects any “PO Box” string regardless of the numerals.
3. 26-02-23.pdf and 26-04-27.pdf — SCOTUS Office of the Clerk docketing letter for No. 25-6878 (showing the Massachusetts-forced address line on the petition's first page) and emailed notice.
4. 26-02-18-1.pdf, 26-02-18-2.pdf, 26-02-18-3.pdf — the 10:12 AM proof email, the 12:21 PM Registry reply, and the actually-mailed envelope bearing the 18 FEB 2026 Pitney Bowes meter franking.
5. 26-02-18-Exh-01-xxx.pdf to 26-02-18-Exh-05-xxx.pdf email-attachments/ — the five exhibits transmitted with the 10:12 AM email (Family Court docket, SCOTUS / White House / FBI mailings, Family Court submissions, USPS confirmations, prior motions to alter).
6. 01-To-Pres-Trump.pdf — the 2/16/2026 open letter (record substrate for the planned § V(b) continuation).

Cc:

Massachusetts Department of Revenue, Child Support Enforcement (PIN [REDACTED]),
via [REDACTED], c/o [REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on April 29, 2026, true copies of the above-referenced Appellant's Status Affidavit (with Exhibits 1 through 5) and of this Cover Letter (with the supplemental disclosure at §§ I–V and Enclosures 2 through 6) were served upon Andrea Joy Campbell (c/o Hampton, Lucia, Dirks), Leah B. Foley (DOJ Civil Rights), DOR/CSE ([REDACTED] [REDACTED], Esq. (for [REDACTED] [REDACTED]), and [REDACTED], by electronic mail at the addresses listed above (and, for the Attorney General, also by U.S. mail).

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury.

Dated: April 29, 2026

/s/ Imre Kifor, Pro Se