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

Scott S. Harris, Clerk
Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543-0001

> Re: *Imre Kifor v. Massachusetts, et al.*, No. 25-6878 (dismissed under Rule 39.8 on April 27, 2026) — record-supplementation, NOT a re-petition: documentary disclosure of the Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule operating on the address line of the dismissed petition's first page, and on the Petitioner's parallel state-court submissions

Dear Mr. Harris,

I respectfully transmit this letter, with electronically cited references to the accompanying enclosure set, for placement in the public record of the above-referenced cause. I do not seek reconsideration of the Court's April 27, 2026, disposition under Rule 39.8. I understand the disposition is final as to the judgment then before the Court, and I am aware that any future petition arising from a separate lower-court judgment must be filed by paid fee — not in forma pauperis — to avoid the noncriminal-IFP bar contemplated by *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U.S. 1 (1992). The purpose of this letter is solely to put on the record of No. 25-6878 a documentary fact that has now manifested in writing, and that bears on the address line carried on the front page of the dismissed petition.

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 already on the public records of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit (No. 26-1346, as Exhibit 1 to my April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit, Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890) and the Massachusetts Appeals Court (No. [redacted] as Exhibits A and B to the April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit accompanying my Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit). I respectfully ask the Office of the Clerk to treat that record as the operative source set, and to take the per-document file references in this letter as pointers into it.

I. The address-line context. My petition for a writ of certiorari, filed October 6, 2025, and docketed February 23, 2026, as No. 25-6878 (see the Office of the Clerk's docketing letter and the petition cover preserved as enclosure A), bears on its first page the address line " [demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down) Newton, MA 02464." That structure was demolished on February 12, 2025. I have no other Massachusetts street address. I reside in a homeless shelter — Bristol Lodge Men's Shelter at 27 Lexington Street, Waltham, Massachusetts — and the shelter's mail handler confirmed on April 27, 2026, in person, that all approximately 50 sheltered men must use the shelter's U.S. Postal Service post office box (PO Box 541095, Waltham, MA 02453) because 27 Lexington Street is an active City of Waltham fire station that neither forwards nor delivers mail addressed to a "homeless" resident at the street address. The PO Box is therefore the only address at which mail can, in fact, reach me.

II. Why the petition did not show the Bristol Lodge PO Box. Federal law would have permitted me to use the PO Box on the first page of No. 25-6878. Putting it there would have been correct in front of this Court. I did not, because every then-pending Massachusetts filing — at the Probate and Family Court (and /), at the Department of Revenue / Child Support Enforcement (PIN), and at the Department of Transitional Assistance / SNAP — was carrying the [demolished house mailbox] address under a Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule. 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. I was caught between truth in this Court and consistency in the Commonwealth.

III. The no-PO-Box rule, manifested in writing on April 29, 2026. On the morning of April 29, 2026, at 8:19 AM, I logged in to my federal SNAP account on the Massachusetts DTA Connect portal to update my residential address to the Bristol Lodge PO Box now of record across the federal courts (USCA1 No. 26-1346, Doc 00118437697, Date Filed 04/27/2026; D. Mass. No. 1:25-cv-11831-AK, Doc 36; D. Mass. MBD No. 1:26-mc-91166-DJC, paper packet mailed on 04/28/2026 and docketing confirmation received on 4/30/2026). DTA Connect rejected the update with the on-screen 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."

After re-entering the PO Box with corrected numerals, I logged back in at 10:34 AM and submitted the form a second time. The DTA system returned the identical rejection. The rejection screens are preserved as enclosures B-1 (8:19 AM, with a typo in the numerals), B-2 (10:34 AM, Safari window snapshot), and B-3 (10:34 AM, Safari "Print to PDF" of the same live page on the corrected PO Box 541095). The rejection fires on any "PO Box" string regardless of numerals. The PO Box numerals are not the operative variable.

IV. The same rule operating in the Probate and Family Court mailing chain. The no-PO-Box pressure that DTA Connect now manifests in writing also operated on the Probate and Family Court Registry's mailing-of-judgment workflow on February 18, 2026. At 10:12 AM that morning, I emailed the Middlesex Probate and Family Court (with copies to the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office, the opposing counsel and pro se party, and DOR / CSE portal) requesting confirmation that the Court's February 10, 2026 modification judgment in had not yet been mailed, expressly citing my close monitoring of mail delivered to [demolished house mailbox] and attaching USPS Informed Delivery

confirmations and the prior submissions to this Court (preserved as enclosure C-1, with attachments). The 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 C-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 C-3. The metered postage date is the date the envelope physically 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 enclosure C-3 contain the actual judgment of [redacted], J., that the envelope carried.

V. Operational link. Had I been on the Bristol Lodge PO Box on February 18, 2026, the documentary impeachment in § IV 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 meter-vs.-claim contradiction depended on my ability to observe — daily, 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 — manifested in writing at enclosure B and structurally relied upon by the Probate and Family Court Registry's mailing workflow — therefore, is not procedural neutrality. It is the very mechanism that, but for my four-month diligent 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 February 10, 2026 judgment. Mass. R. App. P. 4(a)(2)(B) (effective October 17, 2025, as confirmed by the Family Court), which protects timely notices of appeal that issue while a post-judgment motion is pending, is what now safeguards my appellate rights in this matter; without the February 18, 2026, proof, even Rule 4(a)(2)(B) would not have been triggered.

VI. The address line as a documentary footprint. The address on the front page of No. 25-6878 — "[demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down) Newton, MA 02464" — is the address Massachusetts compelled me to certify across all state-side dockets through October 6, 2025 (the petition's filing date). Standing alone, it could be read as a litigant's odd self-presentation. In light of the documentary record now created by the April 29, 2026 DTA Connect rejection (enclosures B-1, B-2, B-3) and the February 18, 2026 mail-fraud sequence (enclosures C-1, C-2, C-3), it is the documentary footprint of a Massachusetts-administered structural constraint — the no-PO-Box rule — coextensively imposed across DTA, DOR / CSE, and the Probate and Family Court Registry, and now reaching the public record of this Court in the address line of the dismissed petition.

VII. 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 described in the appendix below is preserved, in its native PDF form, 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 **Exhibit 1 to my April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit** (Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890; Exhibit 1 itself at Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890), which itself is fully elaborated through its incorporation, by reference, of my April 28, 2026 Status Affidavit at Doc 00118438630 / Entry ID 6805376. The same record set is concurrently before the Massachusetts Appeals Court as Exhibits A (address-change addendum) and B (forced-fraud addendum) to the April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit accompanying my Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit in *Kifor v. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts (official capacity), et al.*, Mass. App. Ct. No. [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. I therefore ask the Office of the Clerk to treat the federal-court record at USCA1 No. 26-1346 — accessible to the Court through the normal inter-court channels — as the authoritative source for the per-document file references in this letter, and to place this letter, by itself, in the public record of No. 25-6878 as a record-supplementation.

VIII. What I ask the Office of the Clerk. I ask only that the Office of the Clerk receive this letter and place it in the public record of No. 25-6878. I do not seek reconsideration of the Rule 39.8 disposition. I do not seek substantive relief from this Court in this matter. Any future petition I file in this Court will arise from a different lower-court judgment — most likely the eventual disposition of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in *Kifor v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al.*, No. 26-1346 (appellees' brief due May 18, 2026) — and will be presented by paid fee.
TBD (add [redacted] as I am denied to further appeal it in the Mass. SJC)

IX. Service. A copy of this letter is being served the same day, by electronic mail, on the Massachusetts Attorney General (c/o J. David Hampton, AAG; Joseph P. Lucia, AAG; Katherine B. Dirks, Deputy Chief, Government Bureau), on the United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts (Leah B. Foley; DOJ Civil Rights Division addressee), on the Department of Revenue / Child Support Enforcement (c/o [redacted]; PIN [redacted]), on counsel of record for [redacted] ([redacted] Esq., [redacted] LLP), and on [redacted] (pro se), at the email addresses presented on the April 29, 2026, service letter that is itself preserved as part of Exhibit B referenced below. Each electronically-served recipient already holds the complete native enclosure set through the April 29, 2026, service email and through my parallel federal e-filings; this letter therefore travels alone over the wire, and only this letter (with this single-page reference appendix) is mailed by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail to the Office of the Clerk. A parallel transmittal of the same form is being made the same day to the Office of the President of the United States as the next dated entry in my preserved open-letter series begun on February 16, 2026; that transmittal is evidentiary, not a request for political intervention.

Thank you for your attention to this record supplementation.

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 **Status Affidavit (Doc 00118439659 / Entry ID 6805890) and Exhibit 1 thereto (Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890), e-filed April 30, 2026** (with my April 28, 2026 Status Affidavit, Doc 00118438630 / Entry ID 6805376, incorporated by reference). The same materials are concurrently attached, as Exhibits A and B, to the **April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit accompanying my Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit** 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. *Imre Kifor v. Massachusetts*, No. 25-6878 — Office of the Clerk's docketing letter, dated February 23, 2026, and petition cover bearing the " [demolished house mailbox] (mailbox only, house torn down)" address line. Native PDF: `26-02-23.pdf` (preserved as part of Exhibit 1 to my April 30, 2026 USCA1 No. 26-1346 Status Affidavit, and as part of Exhibit B to the April 30, 2026 Mass. App. Ct. No. [redacted] Status Affidavit).

B. April 29, 2026 DTA Connect residential-address rejection screens:
   - B-1. 8:19 AM, first attempt with a typo in the PO Box numerals (Safari "Print to PDF"). Native PDF: `26-04-29.pdf`.
   - B-2. 10:34 AM, Safari window snapshot, with the corrected PO Box 541095. Native PDF: `26-04-29-2.pdf`.
   - B-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`.

   All three preserved as part of Exhibit 1 (USCA1 No. 26-1346) and Exhibit B (Mass. App. Ct. No. [redacted]

C. February 18, 2026, Family Court mail-fraud documentary sequence:
   - C-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`.
   - C-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`.
   - C-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`.

   All preserved as part of Exhibit 1 (USCA1 No. 26-1346) and Exhibit B (Mass. App. Ct. No. [redacted]

D. April 29, 2026 service letter to the Massachusetts Attorney General and the United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts (`To-AGO-DOJ.pdf`) with its six-enclosure attachment set, fifteen PDFs total: the April 28, 2026 USCA1 No. 26-1346 Status Affidavit at `02-Status-Affidavit.pdf`; the DTA Connect rejection screens at `26-04-29.pdf`, `26-04-29-2.pdf`, and `26-04-29-3.pdf`; the SCOTUS docketing letter at `26-02-23.pdf` and the Rule 39.8 dismissal email at `26-04-27.pdf`; the underlying February 18, 2026 sequence at `26-02-18-1.pdf`, `26-02-18-2.pdf`, and `26-02-18-3.pdf`; the five email attachments at `26-02-18-Exh-01-Family-Court-Docket.pdf` through `26-02-18-Exh-05-Prior-Motions-To-Alter.pdf`; and the February 16, 2026 open letter to the President at `01-To-Pres-Trump.pdf`. The full set is preserved as part of Exhibit 1 (USCA1 No. 26-1346) and Exhibit B (Mass. App. Ct. No. [redacted] The contemporaneous transmittal email for the AGO/DOJ service letter + DOR / CSE auto-reply is also preserved immediately after the text of the April 29, 2026, service letter in the two exhibits.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

May 14, 2026

Imre Kifor
PO Box 541095
Waltham, MA 02453

RE: "Record Supplementation"
Kifor v. MA, et al.
No: 25-6878

Dear Mr. Kifor:

The papers received May 14, 2026, are herewith returned in light of the dismissal of the above-entitled petition for a writ of certiorari on April 27, 2026.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By:
Katie Heidrick
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

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

Scott S. Harris, Clerk
Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Re: *Imre Kifor v. Massachusetts, et al.*, No. 25-6878 (dismissed under Rule 39.8 on April 27, 2026) — record-supplementation, NOT a re-petition: documentary disclosure of the Massachusetts no-PO-Box rule operating on the address line of the dismissed petition's first page, and on the Petitioner's parallel state-court submissions

Dear Mr. Harris,

I respectfully transmit this letter, with electronically cited references to the accompanying enclosure set, for placement in the public record of the above-referenced cause. I do not seek reconsideration of the Court's April 27, 2026, disposition under Rule 39.8. I understand the disposition is final as to the judgment then before the Court, and I am aware that any future petition arising from a separate lower-court judgment must be filed by paid fee — not in forma pauperis — to avoid the noncriminal-IFP bar contemplated by *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U.S. 1 (1992). The purpose of this letter is solely to put on the record of No. 25-6878 a documentary fact that has now manifested in writing, and that bears on the address line carried on the front page of the dismissed petition.

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 already on the public records of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit (No. 26-1346, as Exhibit 1 to my April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit, Doc 00118439660 / Entry ID 6805890) and the Massachusetts Appeals Court (No. [redacted], as Exhibits A and B to the April 30, 2026 Status Affidavit accompanying my Motion for Leave to File a Status Affidavit). I respectfully ask the Office of the Clerk to treat that record as the operative source set, and to take the per-document file references in this letter as pointers into it.

RECEIVED
MAY 14 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.