

FORMAL DEMAND FOR LEGISLATIVE INTERVENTION

Systemic Court Failure, Court-Enabled Perjury, and Breakdown of Due Process in Maine

To: Members of the [Maine Legislature](#)

Cc: Government Oversight Committee; OPEGA; Legislative Leadership

From: Anthony Michael Rinaldi

Re: Immediate Legislative Action Required — Court-Enabled Perjury and Due-Process Failure

THIS IS NOT A REQUEST. IT IS A NOTICE.

I am writing because every non-judicial safeguard has failed

For more than four years, I have presented Maine courts with documentary proof of sworn falsehoods—not opinion disputes, not “credibility issues,” but objective perjury by a licensed court insider. Those falsehoods were credited, relied upon, and operationalized to impose coercive outcomes, while motions, evidence, and corrective requests were ignored or dismissed without explanation.

At this point, the issue is no longer one case. It is whether Maine’s civil justice system tolerates perjury when it serves the “right” party.

That question now belongs to you.

THE CORE FACTS (UNDISPUTED AND DOCUMENTED)

- A licensed Maine real-estate broker submitted multiple sworn affidavits and trial testimony containing demonstrably false statements.
- An indexed analysis identifies 181 discrete false statements under oath, many contradicted by documents the witness himself drafted.
- The false statements concerned material facts: contract scope, alleged breach, escrow obligations, extensions, delay attribution, and right to close.

- The court was placed on notice—repeatedly—through filings, transcripts, and exhibits.
- No meaningful correction occurred. The false evidence remained operative.
- Coercive judicial outcomes followed.

This is not a close call. It is a systemic failure of adjudication.

WHY THIS IS A LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM

Courts are not self-policing when:

- perjury is tolerated rather than sanctioned,
- professional insiders are shielded, and
- corrective mechanisms fail in sequence.

When that happens, legislative oversight is not optional. It is the only remaining constitutional backstop.

If the Legislature does nothing after being placed on notice of court-enabled perjury, then the Legislature becomes part of the failure.

THIS IS NOT ABOUT “JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE”

Judicial independence does not include:

- the right to rely on known false evidence,
- the right to ignore documentary contradictions,
- or the right to insulate perjury from consequence.

Oversight of process integrity is not interference. It is governance.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS REQUIRED (NOT SUGGESTED)

I am demanding that the Maine Legislature immediately:

1. Open a Government Oversight Committee inquiry into court-enabled perjury and due-process failures in *Pierce v. Rinaldi*.
2. Direct OPEGA to conduct a formal investigation into:

- how sworn false evidence was credited,
 - how corrective filings were handled,
 - and whether this reflects a broader systemic pattern.
3. Refer documented perjury to appropriate authorities and require written explanations for any refusal to prosecute.
 4. Hold public hearings on the adequacy of safeguards against perjury in Maine civil courts.
 5. Preserve records and communications related to the handling of this matter.

These are basic oversight functions. Failure to perform them signals institutional abdication.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION

If the Legislature declines to act after receiving this notice, I will reasonably conclude—and publicly state—that:

- Maine tolerates sworn falsehoods in civil courts;
- professional insiders receive de facto immunity; and
- legislative oversight exists in name only.

That conclusion will not remain private.

CLOSING

This letter is sent so that no legislator can later claim ignorance.

You now have:

- documented evidence,
- a defined oversight path,
- and a clear choice.

Act—or accept responsibility for what follows.
