

**Anthony Rinaldi**  
P.O. Box 1222  
Westbrook, ME 04092  
SouthernMaineConstruction@gmail.com  
207-347-1692

**Subject: Urgent Request for Oversight in *Drew Pierce v. Anthony Rinaldi* – Systemic Bias Toward Pro Se Litigants & WORST ABUSE OF LEGAL SYSTEM IN MAINE HISTORY**

**Dear Government Oversight Committee Members,**

I am writing to formally request your attention to a grave miscarriage of justice that has persisted for four years in the case of *Drew Pierce v. Anthony Rinaldi*. As a *pro se* defendant, I have been forced to navigate an unfair legal system that consistently favors represented parties, even when overwhelming evidence contradicts their claims. What should have been a straightforward resolution has instead turned into one of the worst abuses of the legal system in Maine's history.

**The Plaintiffs' Ever-Changing Story**

Since the inception of this case, the plaintiffs have altered their narrative at least five times, each version contradicting prior statements. Rather than presenting a consistent and credible claim, they have continuously shifted their allegations to fit their needs, disregarding truth and fairness. The fact that the court has allowed such blatant manipulation to continue unchecked raises serious concerns about the integrity of our judicial system. A legal case should be based on facts, not on a revolving series of falsehoods designed to prolong litigation and financially and emotionally exhaust a defendant.

**Clear and Undeniable Evidence Exposes Perjury**

This case is not one of conflicting evidence or interpretation. I possess a vast amount of text messages, emails, and recorded conversations that tell a crystal-clear story—one that directly contradicts the plaintiffs' claims. These communications provide undeniable proof of the facts, yet they have been ignored in favor of baseless testimony from the plaintiffs.

Most alarmingly, it has been **proven that the plaintiff, Drew Pierce, committed perjury at trial** when he falsely testified that he had never purchased a home. In reality, he had bought a similar property, a fact that was easily verifiable and ultimately confirmed. The fact that a plaintiff can lie under oath, be caught, and yet still have the case proceed is a shocking failure of our legal system.

Furthermore, the plaintiffs' only remaining evidence consists of **the perjurious testimony of Drew Pierce and his realtor, Andy Lord**. Adding to the misconduct, the plaintiffs stated in open court **2.5 years ago** that Andy Lord was no longer involved in the case, which appeared to be an attempt to distance themselves from his two perjurious affidavits. Yet, despite this admission, his false testimony continues to be used against me. How can a person be "removed"

from a case but still serve as a key witness when their testimony benefits the plaintiffs? This is a blatant and unacceptable manipulation of due process.

## **Blatant Abuse of the Legal System and Attorney Misconduct**

The conduct of the plaintiffs and their attorney, **Mr. Monteleone**, has been so egregious that it has become a stain on Maine's judicial system. Rather than seeking justice, they have exploited legal loopholes, prolonged litigation unnecessarily, and engaged in outright deception without facing any consequences. The fact that an attorney can knowingly facilitate perjury and manipulate the courts in this way without repercussions undermines the very foundation of our legal system. Attorneys are officers of the court and should be held to the highest ethical standards. Allowing this type of behavior to continue unchecked only encourages further misconduct and erodes public trust in the judiciary.

## **The Systemic Unfair Treatment of Pro Se Litigants**

While my personal experience has been grueling, this case is not just about me. It highlights the larger, systemic issue of how *pro se* litigants are treated in Maine's courts. Individuals who cannot afford legal representation—or who choose to represent themselves—are often met with bias, procedural hurdles, and blatant disregard for their rights. The judicial system, which is supposed to be neutral, instead tilts the scales in favor of represented parties, even when their claims are demonstrably false.

The fact that I have been deprived of such **basic civil rights**, while my opponents have been allowed to manipulate the system freely, is fundamentally wrong. Every citizen, regardless of whether they have an attorney, deserves a fair trial based on facts and evidence. If a case with **clear perjury, shifting narratives, and overwhelming evidence in favor of the defendant** can still persist for four years, what does that say about the fairness of our courts?

## **Call for Investigation and Reform**

This case is not an isolated incident—it is a symptom of deeper systemic problems that must be addressed. I urge you to investigate not only this specific case but also the broader issue of how *pro se* litigants are treated in Maine. Steps must be taken to ensure that:

1. **Perjury is taken seriously** – Litigants who knowingly provide false testimony should face meaningful consequences.
2. **Attorneys are held accountable** – Lawyers should not be allowed to manipulate the system, coach clients into changing their stories, or rely on false evidence without facing disciplinary action.
3. **Pro se litigants receive fair treatment** – The judicial system should not inherently favor represented parties at the expense of those who cannot afford legal counsel. Courts should be required to consider all admissible evidence, not just the testimony of those who can afford attorneys.

4. **There is oversight of cases with clear abuses** – When cases persist despite overwhelming evidence in favor of one party, judicial oversight committees should intervene to prevent undue harm.

## How My Case Falls Within the GOC's Mission

The Government Oversight Committee (GOC) and the Office of Program Evaluation and Government Accountability (OPEGA) are tasked with identifying systemic issues within state agencies and programs. While review requests based on individual complaints are generally not considered, my case meets the GOC's criteria for further investigation for the following reasons:

1. **Evidence of a Systemic Issue** – The treatment I have received as a *pro se* litigant is not an isolated incident. There is a clear pattern of bias within Maine's judicial system that disadvantages those who represent themselves, depriving them of due process and fair consideration of evidence. My case is a prime example of how the system enables legally represented parties to manipulate court proceedings unchecked.
2. **Potential Violation of the Law** – The plaintiffs' case against me is built entirely on perjured testimony. It has been **proven** that Drew Pierce lied under oath, falsely testifying that he never purchased a home, when in fact he did. The plaintiffs also stated in open court **2.5 years ago** that their realtor, Andy Lord, was no longer involved in the case, after questions arose regarding his two perjurious affidavits. Yet, despite this admission, his testimony continues to be used against me. The fact that perjury and fraudulent testimony have been allowed to shape legal outcomes is a serious violation of legal and ethical standards.
3. **Economic Waste and Inefficiency** – This case has dragged on for four years, consuming judicial resources that could be allocated to legitimate cases. The plaintiffs have changed their story at least five times, forcing the court to repeatedly consider baseless claims that should have been dismissed outright. Allowing a case with clear perjury and overwhelming counter-evidence to persist represents a **wasteful and inefficient use of state judicial resources**.
4. **Gross Misconduct and Legal System Exploitation** – The conduct of the plaintiffs and their attorney, **Mr. Monteleone**, has been so egregious that it has become a stain on Maine's judicial system. They have exploited procedural loopholes, fabricated false claims, and manipulated court proceedings in a manner that directly undermines the principles of justice. If attorneys are permitted to knowingly submit perjured testimony and shift their clients' narrative at will, **without consequence**, it suggests a **system-wide failure** that requires immediate review.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further and provide documentation that supports these claims. It is imperative that action is taken to restore fairness and integrity to Maine's judicial system. No individual should have to endure years of legal harassment simply because the system allows bad actors to exploit it unchecked.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response and to seeing meaningful action taken to address these serious concerns.

Sincerely,

**Anthony Rinaldi**



**Southern Maine Construction**

**Design • Build • Remodel**

Anthony Rinaldi  
Westbrook  
LD 260

My name is Anthony Rinaldi, and I have been treated like a second-class citizen. I strongly support any measure that promotes equal rights.

For the past four years, I have been shouting from the rooftops that I am the victim of the worst abuse of the legal system in Maine's history, yet my pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Case CV-2021-138 is an egregious and blatant fraud on the court, involving eight justices and a complete breakdown of the rule of law. I have filed over 60 properly submitted motions, all of which were denied without explanation—effectively stripping me of my right to pre-trial motions.

In response, I began protesting at Deering Oaks with prior approval from the Portland Police Department. Despite this, my banner was stolen by Portland PD, and my First Amendment rights were violated on a massive scale.

Additionally, Maine has historically gone above and beyond in protecting the right to a jury trial. So how is it that, despite requesting one on time, I was denied? Instead, I was forced into a bench trial. At the time, I was not overly concerned, believing that at the very least, the judge would be required to follow the law and issue findings of fact and conclusions of law. But that never happened. The judge's ruling simply stated that I breached—without explanation. His order was completely void of findings or legal conclusions, which is outrageous, especially considering I had already been deprived of my right to a jury trial.

I look forward to testifying via Zoom so the committee can fully understand just how critical this bill is.