

230 Prospect Street
Framingham, MA 01701
March 15, 2023
April 11, 2023

Rodney S. Dowell, Chief Counsel
Massachusetts Office Board of Counsel
99 High Street, 2nd Floor
Boston, MA 02110

SENT: VIA CERTIFIED US POSTAL MAIL
Re: Complaint against Attorney Robert N. Meltzer

Mr. Dowell:

April 11, 2023 - please note the updated complaint against Attorney Robert N. Meltzer - evidence is clear and convincing to support disbarment. This matter continues to be a safety concern for my child and I. It is not safe for us to be continually harassed by neighbors which are represented by Attorney Meltzer, neighbors who have pornographic images of my child, cameras mounted on the exterior of their house pointed at my child's bedroom, conspiring with other attorneys and judges as well as local, state and federal officials. This matter is now in Federal Court and there remains a valid concern about the conspiracy to obstruct justice which involves Rep. Katherine Clark and Sens. Warren and Markey will continue.

Confidentiality - I am aware of the information on your website "Filing a Complaint Against an Attorney," under "Confidentiality" it states "Under Supreme Judicial Court rules, the Board and Bar Counsel must treat complaints as confidential matters. Until the attorney has been served with a petition for discipline instituting formal charges or has agreed to be formally disciplined, the Board and Bar Counsel may not publicly disclose that the complaint has been filed.

Certain narrow exceptions to this prohibition exist. My child and I are in fear of our safety because of this ongoing conspiracy which involves the Board and Bar Counsel as well as numerous other local, state and federal officials. It is not my intent to disparage or defame any of the co-conspirators but to ensure our safety through this process. We are demanding an expedited hearing as Attorney Meltzer continues to present a threat to our safety and wellbeing. I am also sending Attorney Meltzer a copy of this complaint for accuracy and accountability. I am also sharing this with Mr. Howard Neff, the Executive Director of the Commission on Judicial Conduct as the conspiracies involve numerous Judges.

As you know from prior correspondence, I am an accidental whistleblower who has exposed ongoing fraud of federal, state, and private funds by Massachusetts School Committees, Police Departments, and the Dept of Ed. My family continues to be retaliated against; civil rights violated, obstruction of justice. This is a very unsafe situation; my child and I are both under the care of a physician for stress-related illness. My child is suffering.

Please let me know if you need me to provide the court transcripts - beginning at entry 12; I copied the transcripts verbatim for accuracy.

History:

1. 2008 - I came home to find my abutters Karen and Paul Vaz had installed a shed which was encroaching on my property. I asked Karen Vaz if they had obtained a permit and she said no. I explained that I owned the fence and 1-2 feet on her side to allow us to maintain the fence. The Vazs became hostile and harassing and remain so to date.

2. 2008 - November: I prevailed in a Zoning Board of Appeal with the Vazs being given a special permit to move the shed onto their property as they lacked the land to comply with the bylaws. The shed was moved in March, 2009 and the roof caved in; it was left this way until July, 2014.
3. 2010 - I reported fraud by the Framingham TownWide and Barbieri Elementary Parent Teacher Organizations "PTOs"; I was a board officer with a legal duty to report. We were not registered to fundraise, our attorney, Mike Barry was conspiring with fellow board officers and the Framingham School Committee. The Framingham School Committee had an \$8 million dollar budget deficit and were misappropriating the tax exempt donations. This became front page news and I complained that my family was being retaliated against because of my whistleblower actions.
4. 2010/11 - Due to safety concerns involving the Vazs' kids, I removed the fence to install trees. In the interim of the trees being delivered, the Vazs installed a fence in the same post holes as my fence.
5. 2010/11 - Framingham Officials conspired with my neighbors Karen and Paul Vaz, Suzanne and Avi Finder, Betty DaSilva, and others unknown to force my family out of Framingham to chill my whistleblower actions. The Vazs were given fraudulent permits for new additions, shed, etc. but I was told by the Framingham Building Dept. Inspector James Paolini that the Vazs had submitted all necessary documents including land surveyor reports - we now know this is false.
6. June, 2014 - I had inadvertently learned that similar fraud was occurring in the Natick School Committee; it was later confirmed that there was embezzlement by a former employee in the millions. My child was excluded from attending Natick Schools and I was forced to file a complaint with the Dept. of Ed. This matter ended up in Superior Court through 2015.
7. August, 2015 - Avi Finder committed perjury when he applied for a restraining order against me, and conspired with Judge Doug Stoddart to commit conspiracy to obstruct justice. Per Mr. Finder's own court testimony stated he felt threatened when I went on his street because I don't live on his street. Karen Vaz and Betty DaSilva were co-conspirators.
8. September 6, 2015 per email, I became aware that Mr. Finder has a camera mounted on the exterior of his house which was pointed at my daughter's bedroom window. My attorney, Mark McMahon, contacted Mr. Finder who was now represented by Attorney Robert Meltzer. Mr. Meltzer violated the Rules of Professional Conduct - See BBO Complaint filed on October 8, 2015.
9. The harassment continued by the Vazs anytime I was near the fence - it was very unsafe. I was forced to file in Framingham District Court.
10. October, 2017 - Karen Vaz falsely claimed to Judge Jennifer Stark that she had had her land surveyed and her fence was on her own property; she falsely claimed that she had prevailed in the ZBA hearing. Karen Vaz had countered my RO with one of her own, falsely claiming that I had filed false reports with the police against her. FOIA results confirmed I never reported her to the police. Ms. Vaz confirmed she was harassing us

because she didn't like the disabled and told all the neighbors that I was defrauding the government, my child and I were not really disabled.

11. November, 2017 - I filed for Preliminary Injunctions against both neighbors identified as providing evidence for the residency investigation by the Natick School Committee: The Vazs and the Finders. In my complaint against Ms. Karen Vaz, I requested the court to compel her to provide any and all land surveyor reports. The Court stated because Framingham Attorneys had already filed in Housing Court, I would have to have the Housing Court compel Framingham to provide the land surveyor reports.
12. November, 2017 - Natick School Committee and their attorneys, allowed their then Superintendent Peter Sanchioni to give a sworn affidavit to Attorney Robert N. Meltzer in which Dr. Sanchioni now claims that the Natick School Committees do not rely on neighbors directly contradicting his December, 2014 sworn affidavit to the court in which he claimed the Natick Police interviewed neighbors. *The Natick School Committee does not deny or dispute my claims that they retained Attorney Robert N. Meltzer to represent neighbors involved in the conspiracy. In a Public Records Request, the Natick School Committee refused to provide the documentation based on attorney-client privilege. Attorney Meltzer continues to lack candor in his statements to the tribunal as of March 16, 2023 before Framingham District Judge Galvin.

Per Court Transcripts verbatim:

13. November, 2017 before Judge Jeffrey Karp - Attorney Meltzer stated to the Tribunal that he has a long relationship with Judge Stoddart and referencing the Restraining Order "he doesn't give these things out casually, particularly for two years." Attorney **Meltzer lied to the Tribunal when he stated** "Judge Stoddart..he heard all of these same allegations that you're hearing today, everything from 2015. He also - was somewhat shocked at the hearing by the fixation Ms. Spaulding has with my client. As we pointed out in our opposition, she's already filed six lawsuits against the Natick School Department over these issues. My client has nothing to do with this. In fact, there is no surveillance of her property. There is no trespass. That's all res judicata, and Judge Stoddart, I think was fairly clear on that." "So here we are, this apparent attempt to drag in issues from 2015. I have an affidavit from the superintendent. I think it's important because the superintendent has never acknowledged or admitted or stated that Mr. deny my child and I our civil rights. They have come near me, the Finders did hire Bill Mrazik to trespass and do damage to my home, he also tried to break into my house. They got the restraining order so they could continue to video record my child - there is involvement. Attorney Meltzer did not get another restraining order against me. There is harm, pornographic images of my child, denial of FAPE (Please note that the Natick Police confirmed that my child was seen in Natick 50% of the time but disregarded that evidence and falsely claimed that the Natick Police interviewed neighbors who provided evidence that resulted in Natick School Committee excluding my child. His client was not getting dragged into anything, he is a co-conspirator.
14. I brought up the sworn affidavit of Dec. 17, 2014 in which Natick Superintendent confirmed that the Natick Police had intervieweFinder was, in fact, ever talking to them. **Attorney Meltzer lied to the Tribunal when he falsely claimed that Judge Stoddart heard all of these same allegations. There is no evidence from the Court**

Documents that Judge Stoddart was somewhat shocked at the hearing by the fixation Ms. Spaulding, me, has with my client, Avi Finder. Atty. Meltzer goes on to say that I already filed six lawsuits against the Natick School Department..My client has nothing to do with this. The Natick School Committee confirmed they retained Atty. Meltzer because of the involvement of Avi and Suzanne Finder and the Vazs. There is surveillance of my property (see BBO Complaint Oct. 8, 2015) There is trespass and it was not adjudicated by his friend Judge Stoddart. Attorney Meltzer has a sworn affidavit from the superintendent because both Attorney Meltzer and the Finders are co-conspirators. Again, the Natick School Committee does not deny they conspired with the Finders and the Vazs and Framingham Officials.

15. "By the way, your Honor, Mr. Finder has a right to talk to whoever he wants. In this case he hasn't, but there's certainly nothing actionable as to Ms. Spaulding." Your Honor, this is absolutely frivolous. My clients have no interest in being near Ms. Spaulding." They haven't gone near her. They got the order to keep her away from them and now the order has lapsed, here we are again on another frivolous case, this fixation where They got the order to keep her away from them. And now that the order has lapsed, here we are again on another frivolous case, this fixation where Mr. Finder is getting injected into her dispute with the Town of Natick. There's just no involvement. This is absolutely inappropriate. I will be back getting that order renewed next week. But, in the meantime, there are no facts before you that would support an injunction. There's certainly no harm. And, in fact, I asked your Honor, as well, in our papers - - this is so frivolous and so devoid of any evidence that I would ask that this Court award attorney's fees and costs on this, as has happened to her in prior cases in Middlesex Superior Court. This was served on my client on Friday, which was a holiday. My client took time off during the weekend with his family. I took time off to prepare for this. I had to change a deposition that was scheduled months in advance to be here. My client is (Page 18) being dragged into something that he has no role in and wants nothing to do with. So I'd ask Your Honor to not only deny that motion, but to award the fees and costs of a very frivolous motion. And, in fact, Your Honor, I'd invite you, since the only basis of this complaint is injunctive relief, and if that's denied, in fact, the case should equally be denied and dismissed." **The complaint that I filed was to require neighbors to act in good faith, and not to conspire with the School Committees, who were acting in bad faith, to d** neighbors and this was the factual evidence used by the School Committee to exclude my daughter. I also provided emails from the Superintendent in which he doesn't deny the identity of the neighbors.
16. Page 18 Attorney Meltzer continues to lie to the Tribunal "I've never seen that. There is no documentation of that, your Honor." Page 19 Meltzer "your Honor this is absurd" **Judge Karp found me credible as I was reading right from the documents.**
17. Judge Karp denied Attorney Meltzer's request for a dismissal and legal fees. He reminded Attorney Meltzer of Rule 65 "that Ms. Spaulding would have the right to a trial on the merits of the request for a permanent injunction."
18. **Per Court Transcripts from January 31, 2018 before Judge Bruce Henry:** Judge Henry allowed Attorney Meltzer to file for a motion of Anti-SLAAP. Duly noted, I have a complaint being filed before the Commission on Judicial Conduct as Judge Henry does

not deny being a bad actor and in possession of the pornographic images of my child. "Your Honor, first if I could answer a couple of the questions you've put to Ms. Spaulding." "There is zero evidence that Mr. Finder has had any involvement or any participation in her ongoing dispute with the Natick School Department or the Framingham School Department. This is simply a figment of her imagination. Part of the reason why Judge Stoddart in 2015 entered a two-year stay away order is all of these issues were fully adjudicated in a hearing in the Framingham District Court, as soon as that two years lapsed, we're back here now with the same allegations." "There was an affidavit from the Natick Superintendent when we did the preliminary injunction. They have not relied on any communications. There are no pictures." "There is no evidence of anything. But leaving that aside, your Honor, we brought this motion particularly – it's a special motion under Chapter 231-59H, the anti-SLAPP, because fundamentally, entirely, exclusively this is a claim that Mr. Finder –not truly is involved in cooperating with public authorities in their lawful discretionary responsibility of determining residency of children for their school.

Page 13 - Meltzer: That is a classic example under 231-59H of a case that cannot be brought. This case would specifically not just chill the ability of the Town of Natick and the City of Framingham to engage in their responsibilities, it's actually prior restraint on free speech. 59H exists for the purpose of protecting the public process. **There is evidence that Mr. Finder had involvement in the ongoing residency investigation. It is not a figment of my imagination - Atty. Meltzer is retained by Natick School Committee. Judge Stoddart gave Mr. Finder a restraining order based solely on Mr. Finder's lies to Judge Stoddart - stating it was because I went onto his street and I don't have a right to do that. These matters were not fully adjudicated in 2015; Judge Stoddart gave Mr. Finder a 2 year restraining order to defame my credibility as a whistleblower and allow the Finders to continue to harass us. To date, the Natick School Committee has not provided us with a complete school file, no evidence regarding the residency investigation. The police provided us with evidence (only after court action) which confirmed my child fulfilled the 50% residency policy. The Natick and Framingham School Committees were not public authorities in their lawful discretionary responsibility of determining residency of children for their schools; they were illegally excluding her from attending, denying her civil rights. Freedom of Speech does not afford you the right to commit a crime, deny civil rights.**

19. When you look at the complaint, –and it's very hard to figure out what, in fact, she is alleging - her allegations are that Mr. Finder is somehow or other cooperating with the City of Framingham and the Town of Natick in their investigation of residency.
20. Based upon the fact that she admits that, that's just primarily petitioning activity, the entire claim is based on the exclusivity. I stated that I did not want the neighbors to conspire with the School Committees in bad faith - not to provide evidence that cannot be challenged through due process.
21. Your HOnor, I'd like to touch on one other issue on this.
22. I think it is very straightforward.
23. There really is not a lot of complication as to what the claim is.
24. There's a lot of erroneous items in that complaint. Atty. Meltzer did not identify one erroneous item.

25. Ordinarily, because this is a fact-based and law-based motion, I wouldn't be touching on this but the reality is that all of these issues about the cameras in 2015, that's all res judicata from the trial that was heard by Judge Doug Stoddart. The BBO and Attorney Meltzer are fully aware that the camera is not res judicata as it was not discovered until September and the hearing before Judge Stoddart was in August.

26. She was represented by counsel. There was a trial.

27. And, in fact, Judge Stoddart found there was no evidence, no credibility on any of these things that had taken place in 2015.

28. She continues to raise them even though they've been

29. Page 14 - Meltzer: adjudicated and tried in the Framingham District Court. Judge Stoddart did not hear anything about the trespassing, cameras. I was represented by counsel and Mr. Finder was pro se. Per the Court Transcripts Judge Stoddart violated numerous canons, his oath - he conspired with Atty. Meltzer, Natick and Framingham Officials. Judge Stoddart removed all contents of the court record except for Avi Finder's sworn affidavit to prevent us from filing an appeal.

30. So what we're left with is allegations allegedly that Mr. Finder is telling the Town of Natick what he observes.

31. That's protected speech. That's petitioning activity, even though, your Honor, it didn't happen.

32. Your HOnor, I find myself at somewhat of a disadvantage on this.

33. As you may have noticed from the papers, the idea that my client is somehow or other involved in a Machiavellian Conspiracy, her words, that somehow or other the City of Framingham is going to trade land or a fence in exchange for information about who's living in a house." Evidence supports that Mr. Finder had his land surveyed by GLM Engineering which was fraudulent and Mr. Finder was allowed to fence in a paper street. Town/City officials told me the land was no longer a paper street but privately owned.

34. "We point out, your Honor, that we deal with a plausibility factor in the standard 12(b)(6) capacity. There's nothing plausible about what is in front of the Court.

35. And its very frustrating because there is nothing to tangibly grab onto.

36. And it is also damaging and harming my client.

37. He's in the financial services industry.

38. He's been accused of conspiracy and fraud without any basis whatsoever.

39. When she talks about malice and fraud and these terrible things he is doing, she's in a different standard of proof.

40. We're into the idea of under Rule 9 of specificity. When did it happen? Who was there?

41. All of those things. It's not the same standard.
42. So she comes and says well, we have evidence of this. There is no evidence.
43. All she is saying is he is talking to town officials, which he's not, but taking what she says is true**Attorney Meltzer was retained by Natick School Committee, he also has a relationship with Framingham School Committee and town officials per his own admittance in court documents (he was very involved in Framingham becoming a city). I was denied discovery but the fact that Atty. Meltzer had to lie to the tribunal so many times, it supports my claims of a Machiavellian Conspiracy.**
44. Page 15 - Meltzer: , its based on petitioning activity and therefore, the special motion should be allowed.
45. Your Honor, I would also point out he's been going through this for years with Ms. Spaulding for years. I lived in Framingham since 1998, the Finders moved in 2007 and I had only 2 encounters with Mr. Finder (one was in Boston), it was only after his rotted tree fell onto my house in 2015 that there was contention. I did not violate the two year restraining order and only filed in Nov. 2017 to allow my child the right to return to public school without another residency investigation.
46. The two-year interlude of the stay-away order, as soon as it is over, he's back to spending money he needs for his family to defend something he has no participation in. 59H specifically provides for attorney's fees and costs for this kind of case.
47. This is the kind of lawsuit where this is imperative.
48. This should not have been brought in the first place.
49. I shouldn't be here having to argue that you shouldn't be talking to town officials.
50. So we're asking the Court to throw this out and to grant the fees and costs. Attorney Meltzer is fully aware that Mr. Finder has pornographic images of my child and as an attorney, he was assisting Mr. Finder in a crime including fraud.
51. Would you like me to address, your Honor, the motion to amend or do you want to wait on that one?
52. Your Honor, the...first of all, just so you're aware, that motion to amend is not on the docket. I'm aware you had it, but when I called up yesterday it's actually not on the list for being heard today, but I'd rather get this over with in one shot.
53. She wants to amend the complaint to add two particular items.
54. The first one is invasion of privacy.
55. As we address in our brief - and I won't go into this in great detail- the
56. Page 16 - Meltzer: invasion of privacy, according to her, is that my client, again, which is not happening, is giving information on residency of her daughter.

57. That's not the kind of private information that is invoked by invasion of privacy.
58. Invasion of privacy relates to private known facts that you don't want disseminated and informed.
59. Where somebody lives for the purposes of public school education is not the kind of thing that's considered an invasion of privacy. Mr. Finder has a camera mounted on the exterior of his house pointed into my child's bedroom and committed perjury, and conspired with Judge Stoddart to continue to record my child.
60. The second element she wants to add is under the criminal statute for civil rights violations.
61. It simply does not apply in a civil context, in a civil case.
62. And there's no evidence that, in fact, she—that Mr. Finder is denying her of any civil rights whatsoever.
63. The two counts simply don't exist in the civil world for this kind of thing.
64. And, in fact, your Honor, we'd be back here, if this were allowed on motion to amend, on another motion to dismiss because, again, it's simply futile.
65. It simply should not be allowed. This needs to go away. My client needs to be left alone.
66. And, in fact, your Honor, one of the things I have also suggested to the Court, considering the fact she's brought six cases now in the Superior Court, on this issue of her disputes with the towns. I would actually also like to have an order that before she brings another case against Mr. Finder that it receives preclearance with the Court.
67. This is becoming harassment
68. Page 17 - Meltzer: by litigation.
69. My client should not be involved in this.
70. It's becoming distressing to his family and disruptive to his business. Again, the Natick School Committee retained Atty. Meltzer to protect Mr. Finder from liability because he was involved in the conspiracy to deny civil rights, he also conspired with Judge Stoddart to obtain a fraudulent RO which did not meet the standard of law and sole purpose was to discredit me as a whistleblower.
71. This needs to stop.
72. He's just not involved in her fight with the Towns. Thank you.
73. Page 21 - Ms. Spaulding (me) begins responding to the court about filing a lawsuit for Mr. Finder having hired Bill Mrazik and the camera -
74. Page 21 - Meltzer: "Your Honor, may I respond to that for a moment, please, if I may?"

75. There is no camera pointed at her house.
76. This was adjudicated two years ago.
77. There is a camera on the house that points at the swing set so that the parents can observe their children on their property.
78. This was gone through ad nauseam once before.
79. There is no surveillance of her
80. Page 22 - Meltzer: property, no cameras, nothing pointed at her house.
81. And certainly, Mr. Finder did not have a conversation with Ms. Spaulding where he admitted he is retaliating against her, as she told you a few moments ago.
82. **This stuff just doesn't have any factual basis, your Honor, at all." What plausible reason is there for Atty. Meltzer harassed my Attorney in September/October which led to the filing of a complaint against Atty. Meltzer - why all the lies, it was not adjudicated.**
83. February 2, 2018 Judge Henry's decision "This matter is the latest in a series of lawsuits brought by the plaintiff with respect to a dispute she has with the Town of Natick and the City of Framingham regarding her daughter's education. In the original complaint in this matter, Ms. Spaulding seeks to prevent the defendant, a neighbor, from reporting, maliciously in her view, where the plaintiff's daughter is residing. The defendant brings this motion pursuant to G.L. c 231, 59H seeking dismissal of the plaintiff's complaint. While the complaint is not a model of clarity, the gist of the plaintiff's complaint is that she wishes to stop the defendant from participating in what she describes as a "Machiavellian Conspiracy" to prevent her daughter from attending school in Natick. While the defendant denies the allegations against him, he argues that the acts alleged amount to petitioning activity on his part and the plaintiff's attempt to squelch these activities must be dismissed. (Civil rights violations) (violations of privacy) Judge Henry does not deny or dispute having pornographic images of my child.
84. February 23, 2018 - My motion of opposition to the legal fees based on Again, Plaintiff has no issues with Mr. Finder or anyone giving a factual statement of their knowledge and belief but it should have been subjected to dispute. Mr. Finder is a proven Poor reporter. The evidence supports Mr. Finder is a poor reporter, the police report, the reward by the Town/City of Framingham in which he was gifted town property and allowed to trespass onto Defendants property to install a fence. This was not a retaliatory claim, Plaintiff did not know Mr. Finder prior to his rotted tree falling on her home in August 2015 and requesting his home insurance information.
85. March 12, 2018 email to Attorney Meltzer - "*Mr. Meltzer: Last week the storm took down some very large tree limbs and they landed on my home/side of house where bedrooms are located. This is the same property which your client, Avi Finder, was allowed to install a fence and to trespass onto my property - it had been town/city property from 1998 when I moved in until October 2015 when Town Manager Robert Halpin confirmed it was now private property. My city councilman Giombetti also stated last week that it*

was private property - Mr. Finder has been allowed to keep the fence enclosing the land so I am assuming he is the owner - or knows who is. Please advise if your client owns the paper road that abuts 230 Prospect Street and his property at Lilian Road - Time is of the essence as we are very concerned for our safety with the predicted storm tomorrow. BestC"

86. March 30 - email to Attorney Meltzer "payment"
87. April, 2018 - Per emails, the Vazs had again violated the law and removed my surveyor stakes, refused to remove their fence. Per the Framingham Police Karen Vaz stated "she took her fence down and I put mine up." Again, Ms. Vaz was fully aware from the ZBA hearing that my fence was not on the property line to allow us to maintain the fence on the abutters' side. (The fence was installed prior to the Vazs' moving in; former occupant was an employee of Mr. John Spaulding's).
88. April 23, 2018 - email to Attorney Meltzer "court orders"
89. April 27, 2018 - email "Avi Finder Payment #2"
90. May 30, 2018 - email Payment
91. June, 2018 - I am notified by the ACLU attorneys that an attorney from Framingham contacted them about money owed to a neighbor and may be at our ACLU court hearing. Attorney is identified as Attorney Robert Meltzer.
92. July 5, 2018 - email "Payment" first time Attorney Meltzer responds I need you to increase the payments to \$250 per month. Payment over ten years is not going to work. If you can't do that, I'll ask the court for a court date to review your finances. The judge will tell you that these payments have to be your priority over everything. This payment is statutory and mandatory. Rob
93. September, 2018 - My child was prescribed a service dog which we were picking up in November, 2018 and I needed the Vazs to move their fence off my property so that I could install a proper fence to protect the service dog.
94. September 18, 2018 - email "Avi and Suzanne Finder" Hello Attorney Meltzer: I have been working with DA assistant Miller in trying to better protect my child and I civil rights - we are both disabled and are concerned with discrimination by both the courts, police and city/town officials. We continue to be denied our civil rights in Framingham to be reasonably safe in our home and enjoy our community. She advised me to fill out No Trespass Orders - Please provide me with names of Avi and Suzanne Finder's children - I am in the process of having No Trespass Orders filed against them and served by the police. As you are aware, Mr. Finder and Karen VAz were both identified by Natick School Committee as providing factual evidence that Sarah Catherine was not a resident - and Natick School Committee excluded her based on pictures of Sarah Catherine

taken by Avi Finder (and Karen Vaz) in her bedroom. He has a camera mounted on the exterior of his house - pointed at her bedroom and after his rotted tree fell onto my house and I became aware, I hung up a window covering - he then obtained a restraining order from Judge Doug Stoddart so he could trespass onto my property and continue to conspire with Natick School Committee. Suzanne Finder has trespassed onto my property as well - I also witnessed one of his daughter's climbing a tree to view Sarah Catherine's bedroom. I seek to protect my disabled child's privacy....Attorney Meltzer's response:Ms. Spaulding I require that you immediately cease and desist any further harassment of the Finder family. I'm not sure why you don't understand this, but you have lost all of your prior lawsuits against the Finder family, which bars you from any further claims against the Finder family as a matter of law. After your last loss, in which your claim was deemed utterly frivolous, the court awarded legal fees to the Finders. Judge Henry, based in large part on the history of your eight frivolous lawsuits against various parties, left open the possibility of more drastic sanctions if you continue your pattern of harassment. Thus far, you have been fortunate that the only sanctions imposed against you by the court have been legal fees. If you file further actions against any members of the Finder family, I will file the appropriate counterclaim and I will seek all measures of sanctions and damages permitted by law arising out of your conduct, which has now become nothing less than stalking. It is evident that the Court is prepared to protect the Finder family from you if it appears necessary, as your latest email suggests. At this juncture, your obligation is to pay the outstanding damages already assessed against you and to desist from further inappropriate behavior.

Robert N. Meltzer
Wheelhouse at the Bradford Mill
33 Bradford Street
Concord, MA 01742
978 254 6289

95. September 21, 2018 - email No Trespass Orders None of this is the concern of my clients. The court found your claims unfounded and dismissed them and you are forever barred from raising this issue again. The only outstanding issue is your failure to pay the sanctions ordered by the court. The court issued an arrest warrant based on your failure to appear in court this morning. You are also facing an imminent lawsuit for fraud, defamation and malicious prosecution. This is the last time I am going to warn you to cease and desist from your specious attacks.
96. September 25, 2018 - email - \$4428.50
97. October 3, 2018 - email from Attorney Meltzer's office manager Please send a reply directly to Attorney Robert Meltzer at robmeltzer@aol.com.
98. October 6, 2018 - email -funds
99. October, 2018 - Again, I was forced to bring Karen Vaz to Framingham District Court as she continued to harass me anytime I was trying to tend to my yard. Ms. Vaz told Judge McGrath that she was now represented by Attorney Meltzer. Judge McGrath put Ms. Vaz on notice that one more act of harassment would result in a restraining order against her. I was able to clean up my yard (I was in contempt of a court order from Housing Court Judge Diana Horan) and Framingham Officials withdrew their complaint.

100. October 24, 2018 - Attorney Meltzer filed for a motion to transfer the matter to Superior Court to revive the November, 2017 filing in which I was requesting the Superior Court compel Karen Vaz to produce the land surveyor reports which she claimed to have done. Per court documents, Attorney Meltzer states "in order to understand this case, the Clerk Magistrate needs to understand and comprehend that the Plaintiff Corey Spaulding suffers from paranoid delusions, and that she populates her persecution fantasies with her neighbors on Lilian Road in Framingham filing serial lawsuits which are routinely dismissed." "Ms. Spaulding has been stalking not only the Vaz Family at 3 Lilian Road but also the Finder family at 7 Lilian Road." "Several documents should make the point. First, Ms. Spaulding brought claims similar to this against the Finder Family in 2015. Exhibit A consists of several pages of transcripts before Judge Stoddard (sic) in this Court (Framingham District) of an evidentiary hearing, following which Judge Stoddard (sic) issued an unusual two- year stay away order against Ms. Spaulding. Exhibit A shows an exasperated Judge Stoddard, (sic) having heard Ms. Spaulding, state to Ms. Spaulding "I find you incredible, I don't believe a word you say."(page 19) and on Page 20, Judge Stoddard (sic) said to Ms. Spaulding's lawyer (Mark McMahon) "...no offense to you counsel, but you have a difficult client." "I don't believe a word she is saying." Attorney Meltzer goes on in the same vein of discrediting and defaming my reputation by invoking Judge Wall again as well as Judge Bruce Henry, now claiming Judge Henry did not believe me either. Again, in November, 2017 Judge Karp did find me credible and that I was due a hearing on the merits of the case against Mr. Finder.

101. During this time, SS was now enrolled in a private online school as her private brick and mortar school had shuttered. Framingham refused to enroll her citing the Dept. of Ed had allowed Natick to be the Local Educational Authority despite knowledge that hospital and psychiatrists warned against her returning to Natick Schools for "fear of re-hospitalization and further emotional decompensation." **Natick filed another 51a of neglect and threatened to file for care and protection if we didn't disenroll her from her virtual school and enroll her in a Massachusetts virtual school TECCA.**

102. I was forced to retain Sped attorney Peter Hahn for the DCF matter - Attorney Hahn stated he felt that this was clear retaliation by both Framingham and Natick School Committees. Evidence supports that because of the involvement of the BBO (Connie Vecchione, Rodney Dowell and his wife, Representative Katherine Clark do not deny being complicit with the conspiracies to commit fraud, deny civil rights, obstruct justice) Attorney Scott Semple and Peter Hahn were also not good actors concerned with retaliation by the BBO, Court Administrators.

103. I filed in Framingham District Court to be made whole and the hearing was to be on Dec. 5, 2018.

104. November 3, 2018 I again notified the Vazs they needed to move their fence to allow me to install a proper fence for the service dog; I received no response but Attorney Meltzer sent me a certified letter that GLM would be conducting a land survey.

105. Once the No Trespass Orders were served I was able to address the overgrown vegetation and on November 5, 2018 Framingham Attorneys voluntarily dismissed the hearing for contempt of court scheduled for November 6, 2018.

106. November 6, 2018 I received an email from the Framingham Attorney Benjamin falsely claiming that the School Committee does not have legal authority to decide residency/enrollment; they needed to know how many nights SS slept in Framingham this is in violation of case law Ames v. Wayland decided in August, 2014.

107. November 6, 2018 Gov. Baker's constituent services respond to John Spaulding but is not willing to accommodate our disabilities and communicate via email.

108. November 8, 2018 email "Certified Letter?" - *"Mr. Meltzer: I am aware that you are now representing both abutters - Karen Vaz and Avi Finder. As you know, I was forced to file a restraining order against Ms. Vaz and the Court put her on notice to stop harassing me and allow me to maintain my yard. I am in the process of having the fence that is on my property removed and installing a fence of my own. My disabled child needs a service dog and this is quite an investment. We need to insure the fence is secure and will not be tampered with by your clients. My new fence will be installed after our court date to ensure no further harassment by Ms. Vaz - I will require a detail from the Framingham Police. As you are aware Karen Vaz has been very antagonistic towards my child and I since I first asked her to move her shed from encroaching on my property per the set back laws in 2009. Ms. Vaz has eluded to harming my cats and now one is missing - we simply cannot take this risk with another animal. I have not been able to pick up the certified letter at the PO - as you know, I am disabled and email is the preferred method of communication. Best C"*

109. November 9, 2018 - Public Records Request. I notified the Vazs that SS had been prescribed a service dog and they needed to move their fence off my property to allow me to install a proper fence to protect the service dog. I did not receive a response until Attorney Meltzer notified me that GLM Engineering was now going to conduct a survey.

110. I was forced to retain Sped attorney Peter Hahn for the DCF matter - Attorney Hahn stated he felt that this was clear retaliation by both Framingham and Natick School Committees.

111. November 13, 2018 Email to Attorney Metlzer - "Representation" Mr. Meltzer: "Please be aware that I have retained legal representation as of today - please instruct your clients to cease trespassing on my property -Thank you." I just spoke with attorney who informed me that I am to put you on notice that you have no right to trespass onto my property even an inch to remove the fence - I have a fence company already hired to install an appropriate fence for the service dog on the property line. Please choose to work collaboratively and cooperatively with me to resolve this conflict so that my child's service dog is secure in our yard. Best C

112. November 19, 2018 - Fence Company coming today - Mr. Meltzer: "First, please inform your client that I am greatly appreciative that they have been abiding by the Judge's warning that the harassment against us cease at once. We have been able to go in our front yard without the continued harassment. Second, I am withdrawing the complaint from District Court based on your last email and kinship with certain judges (Doug Stoddart) - I am retaining an attorney to move this matter into Land Court where we hope for a more fair hearing. Third, I have a fence company coming today - and a surveyor coming this week to record the fence and shed in a legal report for the Court. I have copied Chief Trask and Mayor Spicer on this matter as I have continued concerns about criminal harassment based on disability by your clients as well as a conspiracy to

deny us our civil rights. Natick continues to state that they relied on information from both your clients Avi Finder and Karen Vaz (families) to exclude my disabled child from attending their schools. I am aware of your relationship with both Framingham and Natick School Committees and your testimony to Superior Court Judge Bruce Henry regarding enrollment. Again, please cease and desist any activity regarding the fence/shed until we can better understand the dispute between our surveyors. Please acknowledge receipt of this email and note that it will be sent certified and US Postal mail to ensure you have received it Best Corey”

113. November 19, 2018 - My fence company came and gave me an estimate - in the interim, the Vazs installed a fence just 1 -2" from the original fence post holes. **The Vazs lacked the property to obtain legal permits and could not move the fence off my property. I was denied the right to install a proper fence for the service dog. My Land Surveyor disputed the findings and said via email he would testify in court it was at least 1 foot off.**

114. December 5, 2018 - Paul Vaz was outside my home (I have No Trespass Orders against the Vazs) apparently videorecording - I called the police and Officer Sanchez responded. He was hostile and refused to ask Mr. Vaz why he was trespassing and video recording into my house. I could not go to court that day, Attorney Meltzer revived the November, 2017 Superior Court matter.

115. December 10, 2018 - Attorney Meltzer told my attorney Scott Semple that he would dismiss it without prejudice under terms that I never file another lawsuit against the Vazs without legal counsel. Attorney Meltzer was fully aware that the BBO was complicit with the fraud, embezzlement, conspiracy to deny civil rights, obstruct justice, child pornography, and I would be unable to retain counsel that was not tainted or acting in bad faith. Attorney Meltzer was covering up for the fraudulent permits and bogus land surveyor report and co-conspirators including Gov. Baker - I was advised by my attorney not to sign the terms and I did not.

116. March 20, 2019 - Superior Court before Judge Barry-Smith:

117. Page 5: Meltzer: “Your Honor, we are objecting to the dismissal of the case at this point. I can give you a little bit of background on this so you’re aware of what’s going on. Ms. Spaulding is a serial litigator against her neighbor. I’ve represented not only Ms. Vaz, but also another neighbor, Avi Finder. Over the course of the last several years, she has filed somewhere between 16 - “Page 6 “to 18 lawsuits, all of them frivolous against her neighbors. She has referred to this as a quote “Machiavellian Conspiracy” of public corruption and cover-up.” I’ve had several of these cases and already they’ve been dismissed by the very courts. Judge Stoddart found in a hearing against her that she was, in fact, a serial fabricator. There’s certainly a bunch of testimony that the Judge actually felt that she was completely untruthful.” We were here in front of Judge Henry for another case involving Mr. Finder. We had a case dismissed back in 2018. We had requested, at that time, that Judge Henry issue an order that precluded her from filing any further lawsuits against her neighbors.” “Judge Henry actually denied doing that, saying however, that even though he denied my request to impose a restriction, such a restriction is a possibility if the filings become abusive or harassing. These filings are

harassing." "At this juncture what I need is I need a dismissal judgment on the merits because at that point, I will be seeking a permanent injunction against filing of any further lawsuits. One of her habits, one of her patterns, she comes in, files frivolous lawsuits, it costs her neighbors money, the cases get dismissed and then along comes another one shortly thereafter. I need Page 7: to end this. At this point, she has on numerous occasions, made incredibly defamatory comments about my current client and her neighbor and the city, as well. At this point, I'd ask her to produce documents that are supporting her cases. I have never made any defamatory comments about any clients or the city as well. Again, the intent of Attorney Meltzer is to continue to cover up the ongoing conspiracy to commit fraud involving the permits the Vazs were given, the fraudulent bogus land surveyor report that GLM Engineering Joyce Hastings provided. Again, he references Judge Doug Stoddart to discredit and defame me (conspiracy to obstruct justice) as well as Judge Bruce Henry. Again, I asked Judge Henry (and prior Judge Karp) to not allow neighbors to give false evidence to deny a child her right to an education - to not allow neighbors to conspire to deny a federal civil right. Again, the Natick School Committee's only factual evidence from the residency investigation (Natick police) confirmed that my child was seen in Natick 50% of the time fulfilling Natick School Committees policy for residency; they had no reason to exclude her.

118. I would like those documents. I would like an opportunity to bring a summary judgment. Most of her claims are collaterally estopped, once I have that, I will, in fact, be filing suit for damages. Your Honor, if I may, she was ordered by the City of Framingham to clean up a severely decrepit front yard, overgrowth vegetation. The vegetation and growth she's had is subject to the City of Framingham order has caused substantial damage to my client's property. My claims are not collaterally estopped because Attorney Meltzer conspired with Judge Henry. Attorney Meltzer is not showing candor to the tribunal when he fails to mention that I had a severely decrepit front yard because Karen Vaz would harass me every time I was trying to clean up the yard, once Judge McGrath put her on notice that one more incident of harassment would result in a restraining order against her - Karen Vaz is the person who filed the complaint with Framingham's Building Commissioner Michael Tusino who is the one responsible for giving the Vazs' the fraudulent permits. If it was damaging the Vazs' fence, why didn't they just move their fence off my property, why not stop harassing me and falsely claiming they own the land?

119. All this talk about survey, there is no encroachment on the property, never has been. But, in fact, my client's have been harmed. Again, Attorney Meltzer lied to the Tribunal as there was encroachment and I prevailed in the ZBA. If his client had been harmed, why didn't he/they file against me? Why did they wait until November 2018 to have the first land survey done, why did they repeatedly pull up the stakes/pins and why did they move the fence?

120. So at this juncture, what I am asking for..for the motion to be allowed to compel the documents. Because I don't think those documents exist. They don't exist. Page 8: Meltzer -Your Honor, the problem we're having is, if you dismiss this without prejudice, I'm going to be back here, my client's paying me, the next time she decides she is having a problem with her neighbors. What I am going to suggest that the Court do, is to

grant my motion to compel production of documents because I know there are no documents. I would then ask the Court to schedule a further status conference on this. At this point, the biggest issue in my situation, I've got to get this harassment to stop. The report of what happened in the Framingham Court like every other thing Page 9 - Meltzer she tells these Courts, is simply not true. Again, Attorney Meltzer references his friend and co-conspirator Judge Stoddart and falsely claims I am not being truthful.

121. This has to stop. And the Court has made it very clear, Judge Henry made it very clear that he is prepared to address the idea of permanent injunction on further filings. Judge Henry does not deny being a co-conspirator and being in possession of child pornography.

122. I can't have another case dismissed without prejudice. I'm just going to be here again." I've never seen a document production from her." Page 10: Meltzer: Your HOnor, at the suggestion of one of the attorneys, I believe the Judge in Framingham, we've actually been blocking her emails since last November. They're harassing emails to my office and I simply don't accept them. Again, Attorney Meltzer is influencing the Court by falsely claiming Judge Stoddart suggested he block my emails. There are no harassing emails.

123. I will check with my office when I get back there but I have not seen documents. Page 11 - Meltzer: They're past. They are I believe in the area of – I believe there's 10 cases Page 12 - Meltzer: that have been dismissed in Middlesex County Superior Court. I just don't remember the exact number. Attorney Meltzer is retained by the Natick School Committee and is referencing those lawsuits, all of which evidence supports that Natick counsel also violated Rules of Professional Conduct.

124. I had one of her prior cases against Ms. Vaz was dismissed by Framingham District Court in November. No, he had the case in Framingham transferred to the Superior Court merged into this lawsuit.

125. I hop back and forth from these Courts on these motions to dismiss for both of these clients. No, Attorney Meltzer was in Superior Court in Nov. 2017, Jan. 2018 for Avi Finder and Superior Court for Karen Vaz in March, 2019. There would have been no lawsuits had they not been involved in fraud and conspiracy to deny civil rights.

126. The people of her names on the docket, you'll see a substantial number of cases, they've all been dismissed on motions for dismissal. Page 14 - Meltzer: If I may, your HOnor, part of my frustration is that affidavit that she's mentioning is something that nobody has ever seen, including the one who supposedly signed it. Again, not because they lacked merit but because the attorneys were involved in fraud, Judge Wall does not deny being a co-conspirator and violating canons.

127. One of the document requests is to produce that affidavit because everybody wants to see it." I provided the sworn affidavit of Dec. 2014 which is filed with the court and Attorney Meltzer is retained by the Natick School Committee.

128. Page 15 - Meltzer: All I care about at this point, your Honor, it's in the Finder case when, in fact, Judge Henry dismissed the last case under the anti-SLAAP statute.

129. Ms. Spaulding paid the Finders \$4,600. At this point, Karen Vaz has paid me almost \$7,000 to defend a series of absolutely frivolous lawsuits. I want the opportunity for recouping that money. And I want this to stop because my clients cannot afford to be perpetually and perennially dragged into her dispute with the towns and city. **Attorney Meltzer is involved in the fraud and is conspiring with both Framingham and Natick to protect the neighbors from liability.**

130. So that's why I said, at this point, I need a finding for Ms. Vaz in her favor. And I think once I get those documents, I think at that point, a summary judgment will get me what I need to protect my clients. By the way, I'll also at this point, to get an order to have my legal fees covered by her. Because it's exactly the same cause of actions now barred by collateral estoppel. **Attorney Meltzer is trying to protect his clients whom he knows are involved in fraud. Attorney Meltzer conspired with Judge Henry.**

131. Page 18 - Attorney Meltzer was requiring I provide documentation that I am in fact disabled. Court "do you really want that letter?" Meltzer "No, but you know what I do want, Your Honor, is that there is a very carefully worded document request and I'm assuming that if she actually had an attorney on the other side, we would have an actual response saying: no, if there were no documents responsive. **Attorney Meltzer continues to harass based on disability, trying to imply that I am defrauding the government. Attorney Meltzer is implying that I cannot obtain legal counsel because my claims are frivolous, factually, I cannot obtain legal counsel because of those involved in the Machiavellian Conspiracy - including the BBO, Rep. Katherine Clark, Senators Warren and Markey, State elected senators, representatives. Court documents confirm that both Judge Stoddart and Atty. Meltzer were interfering with my right to counsel.**

132. So I would like to have a formal response, even if it's handwritten, no documents. So that I know Page 19 - Metlzer: what those requests actually correspond to, what documents have been produced in response to that. I believe in my request, I probably asked for that. So I knew what she was claiming related to what particular issue.

133. May 1, 2019 before Judge Valerie Yarashus Middlesex Superior Court: Page 2 - Meltzer: "Your Honor, before we begin today here, I need to raise an issue with the Court if I may." This case is a dispute between Ms. Spaulding and her neighbor, Karen Vaz. In the last group of hearings, papers that have been filed with this Court beginning about a month ago, Ms. Spaulding has begun to raise issues of my religious practices and affiliations in her filings with the Court, and in fact on the 26th of March 2019, she filed a document with the Court that I don't really understand why it was filed with the Court but it contains some documentation that Ms. Spaulding is cyber stalking three synagogues in the Framingham, Page 3: Sudbury and Natick area, and in fact, two of those synagogues are clients of mine, they're Chabad centers from the same organization where the shooting took place last Saturday. I had conducted an internet search of Rob Meltzer, Avi Finder and Adam Blumer to find out what the personal connection was, why Attorney Meltzer was so involved in discrediting my reputation, defaming my character at every opportunity. I was forced to take the State Police to Superior Court to confirm Attorney Meltzer was lying.

134. My clients, members of our community, state police, the local police, homeland security are aware of the fact that Ms. Spaulding seems to be now making an issue of

the religious community of Framingham, Natick being out to get her and my affiliation with them being relevant to this lawsuit. It is absolutely inappropriate, it's inexcusable and it's putting people at severe, personal real risk of harm. Attorney Meltzer again made false statements to the Tribunal, FOIA requests confirm that no clients, no members of our community, state police, local police, homeland security are aware of the fact that I am now making an issue of the religious community of Framingham, Natick being out to get me and his affiliation with them being relevant to this lawsuit. I do believe that Attorney Meltzer is personally involved and this is why he is repeatedly lying to the Courts. I also did a search of the YMCA to see if the co-conspirators were affiliated through that organization. Attorney Meltzer was trying to infer that I am anti-semetic; a tactic the Natick School Committee also tried to do.

135. What I'm going to suggest to the Court, Your Honor, is that as I raised in one of the initial papers, any reference to my religious practices or my synagogue should be stricken from any of the papers that are filed in this document that was dated March 26th 2019 where she's cyber stalking my clients, my synagogues. This document does not need to be filed with the Court. This document should be returned to Ms. Spaulding and removed from the record completely. This was on March 26th, 2019, not actually a pleading, but at the very end of this makes a reference to the fact that I have involvement with the Metro Jewish Community. In fact, they're clients of Page 4 - mine and she attached records from the Temple Israel of Natick, the Chabad Center of Sudbury, and the Chabad Center of Natick. Three synagogues in our community. This - I think, your Honor, my two points on this. One, it should be taken out of the record because it's not appropriate. It is appropriate because it shows Attorney Meltzer is part of a conspiracy and acting in bad faith.

136. I think also Ms. Spaulding needs to understand if she has a dispute with Ms. Vaz, she needs to deal with that through the appropriate measures of Superior Court and the law that applies. Attorney Meltzer again is trying to distant his personal involvement.

137. At this point, she's getting herself pretty darn close to being arrested because this is being viewed as threatening by a number of people. Per FOIA and State Police testimony, no one was viewing this as threatening. Attorney Meltzer was again using threats to intimidate me.

138. I haven't made an issue of it. I'm bringing it up with the Court, but I spoke to the police about this the other day. They told me to raise it as a civil matter first and see if the court can deal with this because it's within your jurisdiction, but frankly, regardless of what her dispute may be with her neighbors, this is so far beyond the pale of acceptable behavior. No per FOIA no police officer told him to raise it as a civil matter first and see if the court can deal with this -again, Attorney Meltzer is lying to the tribunal.

139. Court Judge Yarashus "All right, and do you have a motion filed on that I can rule on?" What I did, your Honor, as part of our opposition, this is before I saw what she filed with the Court, I did ask the Court to strike these papers. Court "OK" This one came in after, but Page 5 - there's references in the actual pleadings to the same effect. So, what I did, Your Honor, because we've, I'm not really certain what she's been filing with the Court. So, I filed two oppositions because there were two motions filed. At the end of one of those shorter motions, I did ask the Court to strike all those inappropriate references

from the record. Court "Okay" "All right, and I have that." "it looks as, I'm sorry docket entry seven and docket entry eight..." If I may, your Honor, when I got that pleading, I did file that opposition with that comment. I must tell you this seems an awful lot more serious this week than it did last week which is why I'm bringing it up first. Again, Attorney Meltzer knows I am not a threat, and he brought this up for the sole purpose of trying to win a case by implying that I am anti-semitic.

140. Page 10 - Meltzer: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, our objection to this, I'm always happy to have a case against my client's dismissed but not in an instance where it is without prejudice. In this instance, the case is totally frivolous. In fact, Judge Henry has already entered a judgment in the companion case dismissing all the potential civil rights cases alnd public dissipation cases under the anti-SLAAP statute. Again, Judge Henry does not deny being a co conspirator to obstruction of justice, civil rights.

141. Number two, there's no evidence that there's ever been any encroachment or infringement. Yes, Ms. Vaz had to move her 2008 shed off my property, and her fence was also on my property by 1-2 feet; she moved it in Nov. 2018 but only a couple of inches. Again, Attorney Meltzer lied to the Tribunal.

142. We've now received the documents that we requested and were the issue of the last hearing. At this point, your Honor, this is a plaintiff who has filed more Page 11 - Meltzer: than 18 lawsuits. She is a perpetual and consistent litigant. My objective for my client at this point is to follow up on Judge Henry's suggestion of seeking a malicious prosecution claim which requires that in fact a case be terminated in my client's favor. There were not 18 lawsuits filed, I am not a perpetual and consistent litigant. But for the neighbors being involved in fraud, there would not be any lawsuits. Judge Henry did not suggest seeking a malicious prosecution claim which requires that in fact a case be terminated in his client's favor. Again, Attorney Meltzer is trying to influence the Court and is lying.

143. The case is ripe for summary judgment. Judge Yarashus is fully aware I have not received discovery and there are facts that are being disputed. I wish to bring an argument on collateral estoppel on the issues of any of these bizarre civil rights claims which she describes as a Machiavellian conspiracy of or something involving corruption which my clients are supposedly parties to and apparently, I am too. These issues are not bizarre civil rights claims and they are best described as a Machiavellian Conspiracy and yes, your clients and you are involved in the corruption per the facts.

144. I want to file summary judgment and I just want a schedule date that I can do that so this Court can actually look at this from a legal and factual record in making adjudication. Attorney Meltzer was rushing the summary judgment so that I could not receive a fair hearing; Attorney Meltzer lied so many times that the facts were not accurate.

145. This is costing my clients a fortune to defend something that is absolutely taking place within the client's, Ms. Spaulding's imagination. I've given you as part of the record that at least on once occasion, Judge Stoddard noted on the record that he does not believe a word that Ms. Spaulding had said in the Framingham Court record. She tells you things. She makes statements about what judges did, what people did. None of it is at all verifiable by any kind of factual record. So, at this point, your Honor, what my

clients need is they need a chance to have a summary judgment. Have the case decided on its merits under the law. Again, Attorney Meltzer influences the Court by falsely claiming Judge Stoddart noted on the record that he does not believe a word that Ms. Spaulding had said in the Framingham Court record. Judge Stoddart violated canons, was trying to protect his wife, a US ASssociate Attorney who is responsible for prosecuting money laundering. Judge Stoddart removed all court documents after we stated we would be appealing the decision. I don't lie and it is verifiable of factual record.

146. So Page 12 - Meltzer: My clients need to be done with Ms. Spaulding. This has been a nightmare where she is literally populating her paranoid fantasies with the people she sees over her back fence, and I think, your Honor, I'm getting a very good sense that in fact what my clients must be experiencing when my name starts getting dragged into the conspiracy, as is for that matter Judge Stoddard is part of the conspiracy as well. Attorney Meltzer is fully aware of the fraud and conspiracy his clients are involved with and continues to portray me as mentally unstable with psychosis in an attempt to discredit my whistleblower claims.

147. This has been a nightmare where she is literally populating her paranoid fantasies with the people she sees over her back fence, and I think, your Honor, I'm getting a very good sense that in fact what my clients must be experiencing when my name starts getting dragged into the conspiracy, as is for that matter Judge Stoddard is part of the conspiracy as well. Attorney Meltzer is fully aware of the fraud and conspiracy his clients are involved with and continues to portray me as mentally unstable with psychosis in an attempt to discredit my whistleblower claims.

148. Your Honor, I'd simply ask the Court at this point to deny the motion to dismiss, deny the motion to amend, issue an order of some form that allows us to get to the summary judgment process. I understand that pro se litigants have a terrible time with Rule 9A and Rule 9C and Chapter, and Rule 56. Clearly we need a way to get a summary judgment record together and before this Court as a next logical step in this two-year old case. So, I would ask the Court deny that any effort to dismiss this case without prejudice and to come up with an order that takes care of the pro se needs on a summary judgment motion so, we can finally get this case disposed of as it should be. Attorney Meltzer wants summary judgment quickly before I have a chance to get discovery.

149. By the way, your Honor, I also want to note because of Scott Semple, the lawyer who was approached, as far as I know, was never actually retained Page 13 - Meltzer: by Ms. Spaulding. Attorney Meltzer is aware that I was not willing to sign the agreement he proposed which would not allow me to sue the Vazs unless I had counsel. Attorney Meltzer is aware I had retained Attorney Semple as he was dealing with him from Nov - January via emails. Attorney Meltzer is fully aware the permits the Vazs have are fraudulent as is the November, 2018 land surveyor report by GLM Engineering.

150. I believe the reason that he didn't make an appearance on this, and at this point, Ms. Spaulding has attached here e-mail correspondence with Mr. Semple, he was provided a copy of the survey, there are no encroachments by my clients on the property. This entire lawsuit is totally frivolous. I've known Scott Semple for years. He's well respected in this court. If there were encroachment, I have no doubt he'd be standing here on the

other side of me today. Again, Attorney Meltzer is trying to imply that my lawsuit is frivolous and no lawyer will represent me.

151. There is nothing that would require this Court to go forward you know any further on the facts. If a motion to amend is allowed, I'm still going to be back here on a motion to dismiss under 12(b) (6). This case has to end. Thanks, your Honor, if I may. I Page 14 - Meltzer: just, you know I want to be made clear on this. These are clients of mine. Three weeks ago, I was actually at a wedding in New York with the Rabbi from California who was shot. He's a friend of mine. Your Honor, what I'm asking this Court to do is strike the March 26th , 2019 document in its entirety as it's not in any way a pleading that should be with the court and any references to me or my religious practices or affiliations in any of the pleadings that have been filed in this case to equally be stricken from the record. And, your Honor, if I may –Right, your HOnor, and I believe at this point since the police department seems to believe it's under your jurisdiction, I think at this point an order from this Court to Ms. Spaulding is fully within the Court's jurisdiction, that she stay away from the synagogues and their webpages. Again, Attorney Meltzer is lying to the Tribunal and falsely claiming that the police (influencing the court) are saying the Court has the jurisdiction to order me to stay away from synagogues. Another attempt to defame my character and harass me.
152. Page 15 - Meltzer: -- I will do that your HOnor. Your HOnor, by the way those e-mails of webpages are being tracked for security reasons.“She's going to get herself into trouble on this.” Again, Attorney Meltzer is threatening me to intentionally inflict emotional distress, fully aware that I have autoimmune disease.
153. June 29, 2019 - Superior Court Judge Maureen Hogan Spaulding v. Mass State Police: Per Court Transcripts no one filed a complaint against me as of May 1, 2019 but on May 7, 2019 (the date I did FOIA requests) someone filed a complaint with the Town of Concord Police. Town of Concord Officials and their attorney do not deny the person who filed the bogus report was Attorney Robert N. Meltzer.
154. September 22, 2020 - Judge Camille Sarrouf -Page 3 - Meltzer: Good Morning Your Honor, this is Rob Meltzer representing Karen Vaz. Page 7 - Meltzer: Right. Thank you, Your Honor. Again, this is Rob Meltzer for Karen Vaz. Your Honor, just so you know, I'm getting an echo when – when everybody is speaking there. So if I could, could simply, if I could request, Your Honor, that between when people are speaking if we could have a little bit of a pause till the echo catches up. I believe its easier for me.” I just have a lot of echo I think from the courtroom. But, Your Honor, this is a very straightforward motion and I don't really intend to belabor a lot of the points that are made in the — in the motion. But by way of background on this, this arises from a case that Ms. Spaulding brought against Karen Vaz, her neighbor, back she filed the case on November 28th, 2017. This is case 3473. About three weeks before Ms. Vaz was sued in this case, Ms. Spaulding had sued Karen Vaz's next door neighbor, Ari Cinder (sic) “Avi Finder' in a case that was 1781CV3198. What these two cases have in common as their common thread is that Ms. Spaulding has alleged that the that both Mr. Finder and Ms. Vaz as her neighbors, were involved in some kind of residency investigation that was being done by the Town of Natick or Framingham. I haven't really been able to understand what that residency investigation is, it's really not my issue. Attorney Meltzer is retained by the Natick School Committee and is fully aware of the residency investigation; again, he lies to the Tribunal.

155. But that was the, one of the gravamen of both cases against both of her neighbors; that they had participated in some kind of residency investigation. The other element of the Vaz case is that there's an allegation of trespass through a fence from Ms. Vaz's fence onto Ms. Spaulding's property. On February 8th, 2018, the Middlesex Superior Court dismissed the Finder case under the anti-SLAAP statute, G.L. 231, 59H with a holding that – that said that even if the facts were true of the participation within the - within the residency investigation, it would still protect the individual - activity under the Blanchard standard as the case was brought primarily to inhibit public participation.

Again, I was requesting for an Injunction to require neighbors to act in good faith and provide factual evidence in a residency investigation. Instead, per Natick Police Chief, the police evidence confirmed my child fulfilled the residency policy she was seen in Natick 50% of the time with her dad. In a sworn affidavit by the then Natick Superintendent, he claimed that the Natick Police interviewed neighbors and this evidence resulted in my child being excluded from Natick Schools. The Chief of Police now denies any Natick Officer ever interviewed the neighbors. The Natick School Committee does not deny that the Vazs and Finders were co-conspirators in the residency investigation and exclusion of my child.

156. These two cases, Your Honor, should have been consolidated early on. For very complicated reasons they weren't even though they arose out of essentially the same allegation of public participation. But in that case, in the Page 9 - Meltzer: Finder case. Ms. Spaulding was assessed a — attorney – (Court and Meltzer speaking at once). "Yes" "sure" Page 10 Meltzer "yes" Yeah. Your Honor, if I may, it's very difficult. She's a pro se party. It's very difficult to figure out from the complaint in my mind what the allegations even are. And - and so that's partially why they were not consolidated when I said it was complicated Attorney Meltzer did not ask for clarification, aware I am fully disabled why not accommodate my disability and request clarification.

157. But, yeah, the two issues she continues to assert the participation of Ms. Vaz and there is the fence issue, and that there was also a case filed in Framingham District Court. And so because there were really three cases, that was the procedural problem with consolidation. But the, clearly the - our point here today is that Ms. Vaz and Mr. Finder stand in exactly the same position pursuant to the anti-SLAAP statute; that the allegation is that both Mr. Finder and Ms. Vaz were participating in the residency investigation. So our position simply on that element is that, number one, it's already been adjudicated on the same set of facts from the same plaintiff; that, in fact, it's public Page 11 Meltzer: participation under G.L. 231, 59H under the new Blanchard standard. Consequently, the – any allegations arising out of that residency investigation should be subject to summary judgment under two grounds: First is the anti-SLAAP because if it's applicable to Mr. Finder, it's not appealed, then the same logic applies to Ms. Vaz. Attorney Meltzer is fully aware that I could not file in appellate court because of the factual misrepresentation and I was denied discovery.

158. Equally, we've brought up in our summary judgment that there's an issue of collateral estoppel here. The issue has already been adjudicated. The issue of whether the neighbor's participation in the residency investigation as to Ms. Spaulding's child has already been deemed to be public participation, not appealed. So we are requesting that any of the allegations regarding the residency issue that it's subject to summary judgment. Again, Attorney Meltzer is aware that I was not challenging the right of a neighbor to participate, I was challenging the intent - Both Natick and Framingham School Committees illegally excluded my child to chill my whistleblower actions. Karen Vaz admits she discriminates based on disability and has told neighbors

not to speak to me, that my child and I are not really disabled and we are defrauding the government. The evidence the neighbors gave to the School Committee contradicted Natick's own police officers' evidence. Judge Henry does not deny being a bad actor and being in possession of child pornography.

159. The issue of the fence is what I also simply don't understand on this, Your Honor. The allegation in the complaint is that Ms. Vaz's stockade wooden fence is on Ms. Spaulding's property. There's actually never been any evidence at all whatsoever that the stockade fence was on Ms. Spaulding's property. As we've attached to our summary judgment motion, there's a survey from Mr. Fence Company (GLM Engineering) That's the - my client's surveyor. **Attorney Meltzer is fully aware that there were no land surveyor reports prior to November, 2017 when I filed in Superior Court.** Attorney Meltzer is fully aware that the permits the Vazs were given by the Framingham Building Commissioner and ZBA were fraudulent, no land surveyor report was ever submitted. Attorney Meltzer is fully aware that the survey done by GLM Engineering was fraudulent as well. Gov. Baker appointed GLM Owner Joyce Hastings to the Board of Professional Licensing of Land Surveyors in Nov. 2017 - which we now know was because I had my land surveyed in Nov. 2017 and it confirmed the fence was on my property. The Vazs removed the surveyor stakes again. Attorney Meltzer lied to the Tribunal again (lack candor) when he falsely claimed there was no evidence Ms. Vazs fence was on my property. Again, the **GLM Survey was not done until Nov. 2018.**

160. The fence – traditional to what used to be done when the fence was built, the fence was on the property line. It was not over the property line. Page 12 - Meltzer: it was on the property line. But it's all immaterial what the original fence was because that fence no longer exists. That fence was removed and a new white vinyl fence was put in. Again, **Attorney Meltzer is lying to the Tribunal, the Vazs installed the stockade fence in 2010/11 and installed it in the same fence post holes that my fence was in.** And I have a 1-2 foot clearance on the other side (Vazs') to allow for maintenance.

161. Just by way of background on that, your Honor, Ms. Spaulding was subject to an order from the Town of Framingham to clean up debris on her yard, and we provided pictures of what that looked like. Ms. Spaulding's debris actually destroyed the wood stockade fence. **Attorney Meltzer again omits the truth (lacks candor) to the Tribunal when he intentionally does not tell the Court that everytime I went near the fence to maintain the yard, the Vazs would harass me which led to me filing for a restraining order in October, 2017 - at which time Ms. Vaz countered and Judge Jennifer Stark dismissed both matters.** Within 2 hours of court, Ms. Vaz filed a bogus report with the Framingham Building Commissioner Michael Tusino for overgrown vegetation. Mr. Tusino was the Building Commissioner who gave **Ms.Vaz the fraudulent permits.** Attorney Sinrich just talked to Ms. Spaulding. "I called your surveyor who confirmed that the neighbor's fence is not on your yard, and that the matter is resolved as far as he was concerned." So, Your Honor, where we are at this point is we have a survey from the original fence showing it wasn't on the property. The fence has now been moved and nobody denies that. You have Ms. Spaulding in the Response 16 saying that the issue is now moot. And **October 2018 I was forced to file another complaint for a RO and Judge McGrath put Karen Vaz on notice to allow me to maintain my yard in peace, one more incident of harassing me and he would give me the restraining order.** This allowed me to maintain my yard and **Framingham Attorneys withdrew their contempt of court order.** Attorney Scott

Sinrich does not deny or dispute he was a bad actor, a co-conspirator. Ever since August, 2015 with statements by Judge Doug Stoddart “you have a very difficult client here.” Along with the involvement of the BBO in October, 2015 and the meeting with Rep. Katherine Clark’s aid, Jay Higgins in November, 2019 (fully aware of the fraud/abuse) and the MA Supreme Court appointing Rep. Clark’s husband, Rodney Dowell as the Chief Counsel of the BBO in November, 2019.

162. When the new fence was put in, it's now a foot further into the property so Ms. Vaz can actually get behind the fence and still be on her property to actually maintain that. Again, Attorney Meltzer is lying to the tribunal; the new fence was put in just a couple of inches from the post holes. To date, the Vazs have never even attempted to maintain the yard on my side (I have No Trespass Orders against them) and have never filed another complaint with the City although the land is overgrown. And, Your HOnor, if we put it to the paperwork on this, we had sent a document request with information pertaining to the allegation or surveys that would show that, in fact, there was a trespass on the fence. It was Request Number 16 in our document request in the joint - in the appendix document. The Request Number 16 says, “provide any and all surveys for your property from 2015 through the present which shows that the Vaz fence or shed is on your property.” In an order to do so by the Court, also within the documents in Response 16, this is from Ms. Spaulding, this is exactly what she said in response to the Request 16. I am unaware of any order to do so by the Court.

163. “The matter is now moot as Defendant Karen Vaz moved fence after Page 13 - Meltzer: court action.” So by her own admission, even though we deny the fence was ever on the property, she’s now acknowledged that the fence has been moved and so by her own language, that’s her word, that’s moot. “Your Honor, I want to make one other point on this fence issue. I’m a little uncomfortable about the motion that was filed a couple of days ago, the motion for leave of court to seek competent counsel and continuance of summary judgment. I’m uncomfortable because Ms. Spaulding appended a series of letters from her attorney, Scott Sinrich, the actual (indiscernible). But for whatever it’s worth, they’re actually in the court file. And I just want to quote, if I may, from an August 25th 2020 letter that Mr. Sinrich wrote to Ms. Spaulding. He acknowledges that she’s recognized that the “matter is now moot.” He then also says, I then you have a curious letter to Ms. Spaulding quoting her own expert Page 14 - Meltzer: saying, it’s not there. There is no fence on the property. So where we are at this point is even if the original complaint had some merit, which we deny, there’s nothing in this record that a well pled motion for summary judgment that would countervail our argument that, in fact, there is no fence trespassing on the property and there is no basis for this case to continue. I had retained an attorney Scot Sinrich who was a bad actor (again, Rep. Katherine Clark, Senators Warren and Markey, Maura Healey, Gov. Baker, FBI and DOJ are all co-conspirators) and claimed he spoke to my land surveyor who confirmed if the fence is now moved, it is no longer on my property. My land surveyor, Terry Ryan, was concerned with retaliation by the Licensing Board. So yes, I didn’t realize that my own land surveyor and my attorney were co-conspirators until I spoke with another attorney. I became concerned when Attorney Sinrich stated that he called my land surveyor because I had requested everything be done via email because of court involvement everything needed to be accurate.

164. Incidentally, your Honor, one of the things that has not been addressed yet is that the fence was moved because the earlier fence was destroyed. If any party has been harmed here, it’s the damage to my client’s stockade fence. Again, Attorney Meltzer is

fully aware that he is being untruthful to the Court - her fence was on my property and Ms. Vaz continued to harass me every time I attempted to maintain my yard.

165. Regardless, we're only looking for summary judgment on those three grounds: Number one, public participation is -is protected under 231, 59H anti-SLAAP statute, for which, by the way, Ms. Spaulding did pay approximately \$5,000 in legal fees to Mr. Finder; Number Two: it's collaterally estopped. It's been adjudicated on these exact same facts without appeal; and Spaulding's surveyor, all acknowledging there is no trespassing by the fence. Again, Attorney Meltzer is aware that Judge Henry was a bad actor, a co-conspirator to obstruct justice and deny civil rights. Again, my attorney and land surveyor were bad actors; emails support this.

166. It is time for this three-year-old case to be dismissed on summary judgment. There is nothing, absolutely nothing that Ms. Vaz has ever done to be involved in this case from day one. There was a dispute of facts on the land surveyor report and summary judgment should not have been allowed. Ms. Vaz installed her stockade fence on my property, never had her land surveyed prior to Nov. 2018 and conspired with Framingham Building Commissioner Michael Tusino to obtain fraudulent permits because she lacked the land to comply with the bylaws.

167. Her legal fees to deal with this - this file is Page 15 - Meltzer: now over 18 inches thick. How thick would the file be if Karen Vaz had simply had her land surveyed and didn't install a fence on my property. If Attorney Meltzer had not lied to the Court and represented a client he knows is involved in fraud. The legal fees are approaching \$30,000 on a case that was frivolous when filed. This is not a frivolous case and I now have to have this heard in Federal Court to be made whole.

168. So we're asking the Court then for summary judgment on this case on the grounds it's already been adjudicated by Judge Henry, also on collateral estoppel, also on grounds that even the plaintiff and her surveyor acknowledge there is no cause of action. Thank you, Your Honor. I was defrauded out of my property by a conspiracy to deny civil rights, obstruct justice, harm my child, etc.

169. April, 2022 - I receive notification from the Framingham District Court that Attorney Meltzer has filed for payment of legal fees from December, 2020 - no explanation as to why he waited so long. During Court, Attorney Meltzer continued to conspire with Judge David Cunis. Attorney Meltzer continues to lie to the tribunal, lacks candor - and repeatedly attacks my credibility.

170. June, 2022 - Attorney Meltzer conspired with Judges Cunis, McGrath and Framingham District Court Personnel to obstruct justice, when they held a hearing which I could not attend because I had been exposed to Covid and due to disability, do not fare well in a Zoom hearing, especially with Attorney Meltzer who has a well established pattern/history of lying to the tribunal.

171. July, 2022 - to date - Attorney Meltzer continues to conspire with Judge David Cunis, McGrath, and Framingham District Court lying to the tribunal (denying he was retained by the Natick School Committee), making disparaging remarks about me to Clerk Justin Wing at hearing in March, 2023. Attorney Meltzer continues to seek payment for legal costs with full knowledge the judgment was based on a conspiracy involving Gov. Baker who appointed Supreme Justices, who, in turn, appointed Rodney S. Dowell, Gov. Baker also appointed GLM Engineering owner Joyce Hastings to prevent us from an impartial land surveyor report.

172. March, 2023 - I received a certified letter from Attorney Meltzer informing me that he is now retained by another neighbor, Betty DaSilva, who is a co-conspirator along with her grandson. Ms. DaSilva has a No Trespass Order against her after she repeatedly harassed us by having her snow plow driver dump all her snow in my front yard. More concerning is my child reported Ms. DaSilva approached her when she was in our front yard and began a conversation. My child reported Ms. DaSilva had not approached her in the past 10 years prior to this incident. My child also reported to the forensic psychologist, Dr. Daignault, that she has had nightmares about these neighbors. Attorney Meltzer is not going to stop this continued conspiracy against my family.

Attorney Metlzer has violated the Rules of Professional Conduct numerous times since October, 2015 -

1. Rule 1.2: Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer: (a) A lawyer shall seek the lawful objectives of his or her client through reasonably available means permitted bylaw and these Rules. A lawyer does not violate this Rule, however, by acceding to reasonable requests of opposing counsel which do not prejudice the rights of his or her client, by being punctual in fulfilling all professional commitments, by avoiding offensive tactics, or by treating with courtesy and consideration all persons involved in the legal process. (d) A lawyer shall not counsel a client to engage, or assist a client, in conduct that the lawyer knows is criminal or fraudulent, but a lawyer may discuss the legal consequences of any proposed course of conduct with a client and may counsel or assist a client to make a good faith effort to determine the validity, scope, meaning, or application of the law. Attorney Meltzer did not seek the lawful objectives of his clients The Finders or The Vazs (and now Betty DaSilva) but sought to conspire with Framingham, Natick and State Officials, Federal DOJ, Judge Doug Stoddart, Judge David Cunis, Judge Matthew McGrath, Maura Healey and Gov. Charlie Baker, Rep. Jack Lewis, US Rep. Katherine Clark and all other co conspirators to obstruct justice, deny our civil rights, inflict intentional emotional distress, harm a child, harassment of the disabled, etc. Attorney Meltzer was fully aware that Avi Finder had committed perjury, has pornographic images of my child, aware the Vazs were given fraudulent permits, did not submit land surveyor reports which he lied to the tribunal during summary judgment, lied to the tribunal about the property line, was fully aware the Vazs had removed my surveyor stakes, conspired with my land surveyor and Attorney Scott Sinrich to defraud me and my child of our property, conspired with GLM Engineering and Gov. Baker in 2017 when he appointed GLM Engineering Owner Joyce Hastings to the Board of Professional Licensing which, we now know, prevented me from obtaining an impartial expert witness. Per Court transcripts, Ms. Vaz claimed before Judge Jennifer Stark that her counsel told her not to respond to my letters requesting the land surveyor reports prior to my filing in court. Attorney Meltzer was fully aware the Finders were gifted town/city property as a reward for their involvement in the conspiracies as well as Mr. William Mrazik.
2. Rule 3.1 Meritorious Claims and Contentions and ABA ethics opinion 92-366 Withdrawal when a Lawyer's services will otherwise be used to perpetrate a fraud - Attorney Meltzer was fully aware his clients (The Finders and The Vazs) are involved in fraud - the Vazs obtained fraudulent permits from the Framingham Building Dept. as rewards for harassing us. The Vazs and Finders were given

town/city property (allowed to fence in a paper street) as rewards for their involvement in a conspiracy to deny civil rights, obstruct justice, child pornography, harassment, etc. He is retained by the Natick School Committee and is aware of the embezzlement, fraud by the Natick Officials including the police.

3. Rule 3.2 Expediting litigation - Attorney Meltzer continued to lie to the tribunal and require me to file FOIA against the State Police, had to bring them into court, etc. Attorney Metlzer could have addressed the November, 2017 Vaz matter in 2017, combining it with the Finder litigation.
4. Rule 3.3 Candor towards the Tribunal - There are numerous incidents where Attorney Meltzer made false statements or facts to the Tribunal. Falsely claiming the trespass and camera (pornographic images of child) had been adjudicated by Judge Stoddart - they were not and the BBO is aware of this from the October 8, 2015 complaint. The Natick School Committee confirmed they retained him but he failed to tell the Tribunal or me that he was retained by Natick. Attorney Meltzer represents clients in an adjudicative proceeding and who knows that a person intends to engage, is engaging or has engaged in criminal or fraudulent conduct related to the proceedings shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal.
5. Rule 3.4 Fairness to Opposing Party and/or counsel - Attorney Meltzer unlawfully obstructed my right to evidence. He also conspired with Natick Superintendent to falsify evidence by submitting the second sworn affidavit which he knew was false. Attorney Meltzer alluded to matters that he knew would not be supported by admissible evidence, he asserted personal statements to the justness of a cause, the credibility of a witness. Duly noted, I am a disabled pro se litigant and he was repeatedly and knowingly making false statements to the Tribunal.
6. Rule 3.5 Attorney Meltzer repeatedly used his relationship/conspiracy with Judge Stoddart to influence other judges (Judge Karp, Judge Henry) and admitted to ex parte communication with Judge Stoddart.
7. Rule 4.1 Truthfulness in Statements to Others - again, numerous examples from 2015 of Attorney Meltzer making false statements to my attorneys, the BBO, Tribunal, etc. He failed to disclose to a third person (my counsel and me) that he was, in fact, retained by the Natick School Committee. This disclosure was necessary as the Natick School Committee is involved in fraud.
8. Rule 4.4 Respect for the Rights of Third Persons - Attorney Meltzer has repeatedly defamed my reputation, intentionally inflicted emotional distress - violating "in representing a client, a lawyer shall not use means that have no substantial purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person.
9. Rule 8.3: Reporting Professional Misconduct- (a)A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects, shall inform the Bar Counsel's office of the Board of Bar Overseers.(b)A lawyer who knows that a judge has committed a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct that raises a substantial question as to the judge's fitness for office shall inform the Commission on Judicial Conduct. *Attorney Meltzer was fully aware and complicit in a conspiracy to obstruct justice and did not report other lawyers he was fully aware were violating the Rules of Professional Conduct: Natick's Attorneys (MHTL), Rep. Katherine Clark (attorney), Wade Blackman, Framingham's Attorneys Chris Petrini, Chris*

Brown, Kathryn Fallon, Brian Simoneau, and John/Jane Doe. Attorney Meltzer was fully aware and complicit with Judges Doug Stoddart, David Cunis, Matthew McGrath, Bruce Henry, Josh Wall, Camille Sarrouf, Jr., Valerie Yarashus, Diana Horan, John/Jane Doe.

10. Rule 8.4 Misconduct. It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

- (a) violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another;
- (b) commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects;
- (c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;
- (d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;
- (e) state or imply an ability (1) to influence improperly a government agency or official or (2) to achieve results by means that violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law;
- (f) knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law;
- (g) fail without good cause to cooperate with the Bar Counsel or the Board of Bar Overseers as provided in S.J.C. Rule 4:01, § 3 ; or
- (h) engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on his or her fitness to practice law.

Again, Attorney Rob Metlzer willingly violated the Rules of Professional Conduct and knowingly and with malice, assisted/induced others to do so, and did commit a criminal act which reflects adversely on Attorney Meltzer and other lawyers' honesty, trustworthiness, and fitness of a lawyer, willingly engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation and willingly engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, influenced improperly (conspired with) a government agency or professional (FBI, DOJ, State Police, Concord Police, etc. Attorney Meltzer conspired with BBO Chief Counsel Connie Vecchione (and others) in October, 2015 in regards to the complaint filed by my Attorney Mark McMahon. Evidence gained in the past week, confirms that my Attorney McMahon was also a co-conspirator to the obstruction of justice.

Respectfully submitted,

Corey Spaulding, April 11, 2023

Please note that Chief Justice Jeffrey Locke will have all the documents filed with his office to ensure transparency, accountability with the Court System. This is necessary because the ongoing conspiracy to obstruct justice and deny civil rights appears to involve the Commission on Judicial Conduct and the Office of the Bar Counsel.

CC: Attorney Robert N. Meltzer via email - David.Cunis@jud.state.ma.us

Jeffrey Locke, Chief Justice Trial Court via email.