

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 (on or about 5/4/2026)

May 4, 2026

President Donald J. Trump
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Re: Continuation of my open-letter series begun February 16, 2026 (“Proof For The Prescribed 'Five Elements Of [Feminist And LGBTQ+] Fascism' In Massachusetts”) — the now-documented Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule, its operational role in the Family Court mail-fraud sequence of February 18, 2026, and its now-manifested reach to the Supreme Court of the United States in *Kifor v. Massachusetts*, No. 25-6878

Dear President Trump,

I write to add the next dated entry to the preserved open-letter series I began on February 16, 2026 (referenced at A in the appendix below). The earlier letter described the structural conduct underlying my then-pending petition for a writ of certiorari in *Imre Kifor v. Massachusetts, et al.*, No. 25-6878. Two events since then have crystallized the documentary record: the Supreme Court's April 27, 2026 dismissal of the petition under Rule 39.8 (B), and a Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (“DTA”) Connect rejection captured in writing on April 29, 2026, that explicitly forbids me, a homeless shelter resident, from using my only deliverable mailing address — the Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter post office box — as my residential address (C-1, C-2, C-3). The April 29, 2026, rejection now anchors, in Massachusetts's own words, the structural constraint that operated unseen on every prior submission, including the address line on the front page of the above dismissed petition. I write this letter as evidence, not as a request for political intervention. Federal courts and federal officers will continue to handle the underlying claims; my purpose here is only to fix the date — May 4, 2026 — on which the rule was placed on the public record of the Supreme Court of the United States in No. 25-6878 (parallel transmittal of even date to the Office of the Clerk; D).

I am, as of the date of this letter, a forcedly indigent pro se litigant residing in a homeless shelter, on the federal Lifeline phone program, and without a valid driver's license. I have no means to mail large paper enclosure packages across the country. The fully elaborated documentary evidence underlying this letter is therefore preserved in two parallel court filings: on the federal record of the U.S. Court of Appeals for

the First Circuit (No. 26-1346, April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit at Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890 and Exhibit 1 thereto at Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890, the latter incorporating the entire April 29, 2026 AGO/DOJ service-letter set), and concurrently on the state-court record of the Massachusetts Appeals Court (No. [REDACTED] April 30, 2026 Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit and accompanying Status Affidavit attaching Exhibits A and B). The per-document file references in this letter (A through F below) are pointers into those filings; this letter itself is what travels by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail to The White House.

I. The factual disclosure, briefly. I reside at the Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter in Waltham, Massachusetts. The shelter occupies 27 Lexington Street, an active City of Waltham fire station; the staff member who handles incoming mail confirmed in person on April 27, 2026, that the fire station neither forwards nor delivers any mail addressed to a “homeless” resident at 27 Lexington Street. Every one of the approximately 50 sheltered men must therefore use the shelter's PO Box (PO Box 541095, Waltham, MA 02453). On April 29, 2026, when I logged in to my federal SNAP account on the Massachusetts DTA Connect portal to update my residential address to that PO Box — the same address now of record across the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit (No. 26-1346, Doc 00118437697, filed April 27, 2026), the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Hon. Angel Kelley, J., No. 1:25-cv-11831-AK, Doc 36, filed April 27, 2026), and the U.S. District Court (MBD) (Hon. Denise J. Casper, Chief J., No. 1:26-mc-91166-DJC, paper packet mailed April 28, 2026 and docketing confirmation received on April 30, 2026) — DTA Connect rejected the update with the verbatim message:

“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.”

A second attempt at 10:34 AM with corrected numerals returned the identical rejection. The rule rejects any “PO Box” string, regardless of numerals, regardless of whether the resident has any other deliverable address. See enclosures C-1 (8:19 AM, with a typo in the PO Box numerals), C-2 (10:34 AM, Safari window snapshot of the rejection), and C-3 (10:34 AM, Safari “Print to PDF” of the same live page on the corrected PO Box 541095).

II. The same rule operating on the February 18, 2026, Family Court mailing chain. I emailed the Middlesex Probate and Family Court at 10:12 AM on February 18, 2026, requesting confirmation that the Court's February 10, 2026 modification judgment in [REDACTED] I had not yet been mailed, expressly citing my close monitoring of mail delivered to my then-only deliverable address at [REDACTED] Newton, MA 02464 (a property whose structure was demolished on February 12, 2025 but whose mailbox the U.S. Postal Service was still serving). See enclosure E-1 with attachments. The Court's 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” (enclosure E-2). The judgment envelope I subsequently received bears a Pitney Bowes meter franking/USPS stamp marked “**18 FEB 2026**” — reproduced as page 1 of enclosure E-3. The metered postage date is the date the envelope physically passed through the mailing machine. The 18 FEB 2026 meter mark, therefore, documentarily impeaches 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 enclosure E-3 contain the actual judgment of [REDACTED], J., that the envelope carried.

III. Operational link. Had I been on the Bristol Lodge PO Box on February 18, 2026, the documentary impeachment in § II 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 depended on my ability to observe, daily and in person, that nothing had arrived at [demolished house mailbox] through that morning. Massachusetts agencies' uniform pressure on indigent pro se litigants to maintain a non-PO-Box residential address — the very rule manifested in writing on April 29, 2026 — therefore, is not procedural neutrality. It is the mechanism that, but for four months of documentary discipline at [de mo] would have ensured the silent expiration of my Mass. R. Dom. Rel. P. 52, 59(e), and 60(b) clocks on the February 10, 2026 judgment, and the loss of all further appellate rights. Mass. R. App. P. 4(a)(2)(B) (effective October 17, 2025, as confirmed by the Family Court) is what now safeguards the timely notices of appeal that issued in this window; without the February 18, 2026, proof, even Rule 4(a)(2)(B) would not have been triggered.

IV. Reach to the Supreme Court of the United States. My petition in No. 25-6878 was filed on October 6, 2025, and docketed February 23, 2026. The first page of that petition bears the address line “ [demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down) Newton, MA 02464” — see enclosure F. 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 Court. I did not, because every then-pending Massachusetts filing was carrying the [demolished house mailbox] address under the same no-PO-Box rule that DTA Connect explicitly manifested on April 29, 2026. Switching to the PO Box on the SCOTUS papers alone would have created a documentable inconsistency that the same Massachusetts respondents could have weaponized to allege misrepresentation of residence. The Court's April 27, 2026, dismissal under Rule 39.8 (enclosure B), therefore, now sits in the federal record bearing an address line that Massachusetts compelled into being. Standing alone, the address line could be read as a litigant's odd self-presentation; in light of the documentary record at enclosures C, E, and F, it is the documentary footprint of the Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule reaching the public record of the Supreme Court of the United States.

V. Why this letter belongs in the open-letter series. The February 16, 2026, letter (enclosure A) described, with citations to Justice Scott L. Kafker's “double-protecting rights” article and to publicly reported instances of organized federally-financed program fraud, the structural conduct that gave rise to my then-pending petition. The May 4, 2026, disclosure now anchors that earlier description in a single piece of documentary evidence whose source is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts itself: DTA Connect's verbatim rejection screen at enclosure C. The same rule that operationally enabled the February 18, 2026, Family Court mailing fraud has now been shown, in writing, to compel an indigent shelter resident either to commit fraud (by reporting a non-PO-Box residential address that he cannot in fact occupy) or to surrender the only mail-monitoring vantage point from which the obstruction can be proved. That is the “five-elements” pattern made concrete: structural pressure on the most marginal litigants — homeless, indigent, pro se — to drop the documentary discipline that protects their access to the federal courts. The two outcomes the rule selects are equivalent to the two outcomes the conduct described in the February 16, 2026, letter selects: silence or self-incrimination.

VI. The fully elaborated evidence is already on the federal record — I have no means to mail paper packages across the country. The complete enclosure set referenced in the appendix below (A through F) is preserved, in its native PDF form, on the public record of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, *Kifor v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al.*, No. 26-1346, as **Exhibit 1 to my April**

30, 2026 Status Affidavit (Status Affidavit at Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890; Exhibit 1 at Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890), which itself incorporates my April 28, 2026 Status Affidavit, Doc 00118438630 / Entry ID 6805376, by reference; and, as Exhibits A and B, on the parallel **April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit accompanying my Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit** that I e-filed the same day in *Kifor v. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts (official capacity), et al.*, Mass. App. Ct. No. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (under advisement before the panel of Massing, Ditkoff, Hand, JJ.). I am, as noted above, forcedly indigent and have no means to mail large paper enclosure packages across the country. This letter therefore travels alone — by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail to The White House, and by electronic mail to the Massachusetts Attorney General (c/o J. David Hampton, AAG; Joseph P. Lucia, AAG; Katherine B. Dirks, Deputy Chief, Government Bureau), the United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts (Leah B. Foley) and the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division addressee, the Department of Revenue / Child Support Enforcement (c/o [REDACTED]; PIN [REDACTED]), counsel of record for [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Esq.), and [REDACTED] (pro se), at the email addresses preserved on the April 29, 2026 service letter referenced at appendix item D. Each of those electronically-served recipients already holds the complete native enclosure set through that April 29, 2026 service email and through my parallel federal e-filings; no paper enclosure copies travel.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your continued attention to this record. I will continue to maintain it as an evidentiary file.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury.

Respectfully,

/s/ Imre Kifor, Pro Se

REFERENCE APPENDIX (no paper enclosures; native PDFs are on the federal-court record)

The fully elaborated documentary evidence cited above is already on the public record of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, in *Kifor v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al.*, No. 26-1346, as the **April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit** (Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890) and **Exhibit 1 thereto** (Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890); and, as **Exhibits A and B to the April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit** (accompanying my respective Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit), on the parallel docket of the Massachusetts Appeals Court in *Kifor v. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts (official capacity), et al.*, Mass. App. Ct. No. [REDACTED]. The per-document file references in this letter map into those filings as follows:

- A. February 16, 2026 open letter to President Donald J. Trump (the prior installment in this open-letter series). Native PDF: `01-To-Pres-Trump.pdf`.
- B. B. SCOTUS Office of the Clerk dismissal email in No. 25-6878 (“The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.”) (April 27, 2026). Native PDF: `26-04-27.pdf`.
- C. April 29, 2026 DTA Connect residential-address rejection screens:
 - C-1. 8:19 AM, first attempt with a typo in the PO Box numerals (Safari “Print to PDF”). Native PDF: `26-04-29.pdf`.
 - C-2. 10:34 AM, Safari window snapshot, with the corrected PO Box 541095. Native PDF: `26-04-29-2.pdf`.
 - C-3. 10:34 AM, Safari “Print to PDF” of the live page, with the corrected PO Box 541095. Native PDF: `26-04-29-3.pdf`.
- D. May 4, 2026 letter of even date to the Office of the Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States (record-supplementation in No. 25-6878); the April 29, 2026 service letter to the Massachusetts Attorney General and the United States Attorney (`To-AGO-DOJ.pdf`) with its six-enclosure attachment set, fifteen PDFs total; the contemporaneous transmittal email for the AGO/DOJ service letter + DOR / CSE auto-reply preserved immediately after the text of the April 29, 2026, service letter in the above mentioned Exhibit 1 and Exhibit B e-filed on April 30, 2026; and the USCA1 No. 26-1346 April 28, 2026 Status Affidavit (`02-Status-Affidavit.pdf`).
- E. February 18, 2026, Family Court mail-fraud documentary sequence:
 - E-1. 10:12 AM email from Petitioner to Middlesex Probate and Family Court (with five attachments: Family Court docket, prior SCOTUS / White House / FBI mailings, Family Court submissions, USPS confirmations, prior motions to alter). Native PDFs: `26-02-18-1.pdf` plus `26-02-18-Exh-01-Family-Court-Docket.pdf` through `26-02-18-Exh-05-Prior-Motions-To-Alter.pdf`.
 - E-2. 12:21 PM email from Middlesex Probate Registry to Petitioner (“All copies were mailed out on 2-13-26”). Native PDF: `26-02-18-2.pdf`.

- E-3. The actually-received envelope (page 1, bearing the "18 FEB 2026" Pitney Bowes meter franking/USPS stamp) and the mailed judgment of [REDACTED], J. (pages 2–3). Native PDF: `26-02-18-3.pdf`.
- F. SCOTUS Office of the Clerk docketing letter and petition cover in No. 25-6878 (February 23, 2026; petition cover bearing the “ [demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down)” address line). Native PDF: `26-02-23.pdf`.