PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY — Justice May Be Blind; She Need Not Be an Idiot

1 message

Justin Tahai <justintahai@gmail.com> Sat, Nov 14, 2026 at 11:09 AM

To: governor@maine.gov, info@hannahforgovernor.com, Maine Judicial Branch: Clerk of the SJC <lawcourt-clerk@courts.maine.gov>

Cc: Office of the Maine Attorney General <attorney.general@maine.gov>, Maine Judicial Branch / Chief Justice Valerie Stanfill - Courtesy Notice <info@courts.maine.gov>, Maine Judicial Branch Legal Affairs/Public Relations <barbara.cardone@courts.maine.gov>, Patrick S. Bedard <psbedlaw@bedardbobrow.com>, Amanda Ramirez <aramirezesq@gmail.com>, Glenn Anderson <ganderson@myottmail.com>, mattie.daughtry@legislature.maine.gov, Fecteau, Ryan <ryan.fecteau@legislature.maine.gov>, teresa.pierce@legislature.maine.gov, matt.moonen@legislature.maine.gov, trey.stewart@legislature.maine.gov, kenneth.fredette@legislature.maine.gov, roger.albert@legislature.maine.gov, susan.bernard@legislature.maine.gov, timothy.guerrette@legislature.maine.gov, donald.ardell@legislature.maine.gov, tracy.quint@legislature.maine.gov, arthur.mingo@legislature.maine.gov, william.tuell@legislature.maine.gov, tiffany.strout@legislature.maine.gov, russell.white@legislature.maine.gov, gary.friedmann@legislature.maine.gov, holly.eaton@legislature.maine.gov, nina.milliken@legislature.maine.gov, steven.bishop@legislature.maine.gov, mathew.mcintyre@legislature.maine.gov, richard.campbell@legislature.maine.gov, dani.ohalloran@legislature.maine.gov, ambureen.rana@legislature.maine.gov, laura.supica@legislature.maine.gov, sean.faircloth@legislature.maine.gov, laurie.osher@legislature.maine.gov, james.dill@legislature.maine.gov, irene.gifford@legislature.maine.gov, nancy.theriault@legislature.maine.gov, james.white@legislature.maine.gov, stacey.guerin@legislature.maine.gov, jim.thorne@legislature.maine.gov, kimberly.haggan@legislature.maine.gov, reagan.paul@legislature.maine.gov, benjamin.hymes@legislature.maine.gov, michael.ray@legislature.maine.gov, valli.geiger@legislature.maine.gov, wayne.farrin@legislature.maine.gov, david.sinclair@legislature.maine.gov, rafael.macias@legislature.maine.gov, sally.cluchey@legislature.maine.gov, michael.lemelin@legislature.maine.gov, karen.montell@legislature.maine.gov, randall.greenwood@legislature.maine.gov, tavis.hasenfus@legislature.maine.gov, sharon.frost@legislature.maine.gov, william.bridgeo@legislature.maine.gov, alicia.collins@legislature.maine.gov, katrina.smith@legislature.maine.gov, paul.flynn@legislature.maine.gov, flavia.debrito@legislature.maine.gov, cassie.julia@legislature.maine.gov, amanda.collamore@legislature.maine.gov, dean.cray@legislature.maine.gov, jennifer.poirier@legislature.maine.gov, jack.ducharme@legislature.maine.gov, michael.soboleski@legislature.maine.gov, russell.black@legislature.maine.gov, sheila.lyman@legislature.maine.gov, tammy.schmersal-burgess@legislature.maine.gov, rachel.henderson@legislature.maine.gov, michael.lance@legislature.maine.gov, mark.walker@legislature.maine.gov, david.boyer@legislature.maine.gov, adam.lee@legislature.maine.gov, jeffrey.timberlake@legislature.maine.gov, stephen.wood@legislature.maine.gov, julia.mccabe@legislature.maine.gov, scott.harriman@legislature.maine.gov, kilton.webb@legislature.maine.gov, cheryl.golek@legislature.maine.gov, daniel.ankeles@legislature.maine.gov, poppy.arford@legislature.maine.gov, anne.graham@legislature.maine.gov, parnell.terry@legislature.maine.gov, christina.mitchell@legislature.maine.gov, amy.kuhn@legislature.maine.gov, grayson.lookner@legislature.maine.gov, sam.zager@legislature.maine.gov, yusuf.yusuf@legislature.maine.gov, matthew.beck@legislature.maine.gov, michelle.boyer@legislature.maine.gov, kelly.murphy@legislature.maine.gov, andrew.gattine@legislature.maine.gov, morgan.rielly@legislature.maine.gov, suzanne.salisbury@legislature.maine.gov, marshall.archer@legislature.maine.gov, lynn.copeland@legislature.maine.gov, marc.malon@legislature.maine.gov, traci.gere@legislature.maine.gov, john.eder@legislature.maine.gov, wayne.parry@legislature.maine.gov, gerry.runte@legislature.maine.gov, holly.sargent@legislature.maine.gov, kristi.mathieson@legislature.maine.gov, lucien.daigle@legislature.maine.gov, chad.perkins@legislature.maine.gov, elizabeth.caruso@legislature.maine.gov, william.faulkingham@legislature.maine.gov, nicole.grohoski@legislature.maine.gov, mike.tipping@legislature.maine.gov, amy.roeder@legislature.maine.gov, david.haggan@legislature.maine.gov, chip.curry@legislature.maine.gov, ann.matlack@legislature.maine.gov, cameron.reny@legislature.maine.gov, craig.hickman@legislature.maine.gov, richard.mason@legislature.maine.gov, joseph.martin@legislature.maine.gov, kimberly.pomerleau@legislature.maine.gov, denise.tepler@legislature.maine.gov, timothy.nangle@legislature.maine.gov, jill.duson@legislature.maine.gov, rachel.talbotross@legislature.maine.gov, anne.carney@legislature.maine.gov, sophia.warren@legislature.maine.gov, donna.bailey@legislature.maine.gov, henry.ingwersen@legislature.maine.gov, matthew.harrington@legislature.maine.gov, daniel.sayre@legislature.maine.gov, michele.meyer@legislature.maine.gov, mana.abdi@legislature.maine.gov, jeffrey.adams@legislature.maine.gov, amy.arata@legislature.maine.gov, mark.babin@legislature.maine.gov, barbara.bagshaw@legislature.maine.gov, arthur.bell@legislature.maine.gov, mark.blier@legislature.maine.gov, michael.brennan@legislature.maine.gov, stephan.bunker@legislature.maine.gov, nathan.carlow@legislature.maine.gov, quentin.chapman@legislature.maine.gov, marygrace.cimino@legislature.maine.gov, mark.cooper@legislature.maine.gov, lydia.crafts@legislature.maine.gov, ed.crockett@legislature.maine.gov, aaron.dana@legislature.maine.gov, deqa.dhalac@legislature.maine.gov, jan.dodge@legislature.maine.gov, vicki.doudera@legislature.maine.gov, gary.drinkwater@legislature.maine.gov, robert.foley@legislature.maine.gov, steven.foster@legislature.maine.gov, ann.fredericks@legislature.maine.gov, lori.gramlich@legislature.maine.gov, abigail.griffin@legislature.maine.gov, randall.hall@legislature.maine.gov, allison.hepler@legislature.maine.gov, caldwell.jackson@legislature.maine.gov, christopher.kessler@legislature.maine.gov,

michel.lajoie@legislature.maine.gov, lucas.lanigan@legislature.maine.gov, thomas.lavigne@legislature.maine.gov, laurel.libby@legislature.maine.gov, anne-marie.mastraccio@legislature.maine.gov, joshua.morris@legislature.maine.gov, robert.nutting@legislature.maine.gov, rolf.olsen@legislature.maine.gov, bill.pluecker@legislature.maine.gov, dylan.pugh@legislature.maine.gov, brian.reynolds@legislature.maine.gov, tiffany.roberts@legislature.maine.gov, david.rollins@legislature.maine.gov, shelley.rudnicki@legislature.maine.gov, melanie.sachs@legislature.maine.gov, eleanor.sato@legislature.maine.gov, daniel.shagoury@legislature.maine.gov, abden.simmons@legislature.maine.gov, charles.skold@legislature.maine.gov, holly.stover@legislature.maine.gov, gregory.swallow@legislature.maine.gov, joseph.underwood@legislature.maine.gov, nathan.wadsworth@legislature.maine.gov, peter.wood@legislature.maine.gov, david.woodsome@legislature.maine.gov, joe.baldacci@legislature.maine.gov, anne.beebe-center@legislature.maine.gov, richard.bennett@legislature.maine.gov, bruce.bickford@legislature.maine.gov, dick.bradstreet@legislature.maine.gov, stacy.brenner@legislature.maine.gov, scott.cyrway@legislature.maine.gov, brad.farrin@legislature.maine.gov, mark.lawrence@legislature.maine.gov, james.libby@legislature.maine.gov, marianne.moore@legislature.maine.gov, joe.rafferty@legislature.maine.gov, margaret.rotundo@legislature.maine.gov, 8investigates@wmtw.com, contact@themainemonitor.org, editor@themainemirror.com, Bangor Daily News Newsroom <news@bangordailynews.com>, news@centralmaine.com, Portland Press Herald News Tips <news@pressherald.com>, news@seacoastonline.com, news@sunjournal.com, news@wagmtv.com, tips@mainepublic.org, tips@themainewire.com, tips@wgme.com, wabi@wabi.tv, desk@newscentermaine.com, news@560wgan.com, editor@amjamboafrica.com, info@harpswellanchor.org, info@mainemorningstar.com, news@boothbayregister.com, news@ellsworthamerican.com, news@lcnme.com, news@penbaypilot.com, news@thecounty.me, news@timesrecord.com, valerie.stanfill@courts.maine.gov, andrew.m.mead@courts.maine.gov, catherine.connors@courts.maine.gov, rick.e.lawrence@courts.maine.gov, wayne.douglas@courts.maine.gov, julia.lipez@courts.maine.gov, christopher.taub@courts.maine.gov, robert.e.mullen@courts.maine.gov, james.martemucci@courts.maine.gov, jennifer.archer@courts.maine.gov, daniel.billings@courts.maine.gov, deborah.p.cashman@courts.maine.gov, roland.a.cole@courts.maine.gov, marygay.kennedy@courts.maine.gov, patrick.larson@courts.maine.gov, bruce.c.mallonee@courts.maine.gov, darcie.mcelwee@courts.maine.gov, thomas.mckeon@courts.maine.gov, nancy.mills@courts.maine.gov, daniel.mitchell@courts.maine.gov, m.michaela.murphy@courts.maine.gov, ann.m.murray@courts.maine.gov, stephen.nelson@courts.maine.gov, sean.ociepka@courts.maine.gov, john.oneil.jr@courts.maine.gov, julia.g.pitney@courts.maine.gov, harold.stewart@courts.maine.gov, thomas.d.warren@courts.maine.gov, brent.davis@courts.maine.gov, eric.walker@courts.maine.gov, erika.bristol@courts.maine.gov, gregory.campbell@courts.maine.gov, sarah.churchill@courts.maine.gov, arnold.clark@courts.maine.gov, peter.darvin@courts.maine.gov, amy.dieterich@courts.maine.gov, charles.dow@courts.maine.gov, susan.driscoll@courts.maine.gov, michael.a.duddy@courts.maine.gov, amy.faircloth@courts.maine.gov, rae.ann.french@courts.maine.gov, sarah.gilbert@courts.maine.gov, peter.j.goranites@courts.maine.gov, tracy.gorham@courts.maine.gov, tammy.ham-thompson@courts.maine.gov, terence.harrigan@courts.maine.gov, theodore.irwin@courts.maine.gov, e.mary.kelly@courts.maine.gov, carrie.linthicum@courts.maine.gov, andrew.lizotte@courts.maine.gov, john.lucy@courts.maine.gov, sean.magenis@courts.maine.gov, peter.malia@courts.maine.gov, john.martin@courts.maine.gov, jeana.mccormick@courts.maine.gov, philip.mohlar@courts.maine.gov, jeffrey.h.moskowitz@courts.maine.gov, jennifer.nofsinger@courts.maine.gov, susan.oram@courts.maine.gov, keith.a.powers@courts.maine.gov, barbara.raimondi@courts.maine.gov, andrew.robinson@courts.maine.gov, heather.seasonwein@courts.maine.gov, raphaelle.silver@courts.maine.gov, lea-anne.sutton@courts.maine.gov, meghan.szylvian@courts.maine.gov, matthew.tice@courts.maine.gov, katherine.tierney@courts.maine.gov, jeffrey.wilson@courts.maine.gov, patricia.g.worth@courts.maine.gov, tracie.l.adamson@courts.maine.gov, lindsay.cadwallader@courts.maine.gov, steve.chandler@courts.maine.gov, alicia.cushing@courts.maine.gov, robert.laskey@courts.maine.gov, brianne.martin@courts.maine.gov, loralie.spooner@courts.maine.gov, richard.mulhern@courts.maine.gov

Governor Mills, Governor-elect Pingree, Clerk Pollack, and recipients:

I will speak respectfully to any seat of government engaging in a good-faith effort to help the children and families of Maine. Respectful engagement is available. Obsequiousness is not. My criticism is directed at institutional failure and its defenders—not at anyone actually doing the work of identifying and correcting it.

Governor-elect Pingree, in your November 6 Instagram post on @hannahpingreeforgovernor about your transition meeting with Governor Mills, you wrote: “She gave me the opportunity to tackle critical issues for Maine families.” You were thanking Governor Mills for an opportunity to serve. That opportunity must be measured by results for Maine’s families—not by the gratitude exchanged between officeholders.

HA. What a fucking gift. I will thank no one for the opportunity to spend my life demanding correction of harms to my family. Helping Maine's children and families is the work of government—not a favor for which those families must supply gratitude in advance. The opportunity you describe belongs to public service; the obligation to deliver belongs to those entrusted with it. Turn that opportunity into demonstrable correction, not another occasion for institutional congratulations.

Your November 6 post also said that the challenges facing Maine people do not pause between administrations—and neither would you. I demand that the same urgency extend to the justice system's treatment of children and families. My son's childhood is not suspended until January 6. Neither should the work of examining and correcting the harms I have documented be suspended for the convenience of a political transition.

The administration of injustice needs to be replaced with justice. All are better off if the judicial branch is made respectable by modern standards instead of continuing down its current path. That means demonstrated competence, transparent administration, accessible processes, measurable correction, and reasoning evaluated against evidence—not the institution's estimation of itself.

The public will hear it one way or another. It would be better for them to hear a candid account and a concrete correction plan from those entrusted with seats of authority than solely from a heartbroken, disenfranchised father. If any of you care about your political careers, demonstrate that you care about the children and families you serve. Your response—or your continued silence—is part of the public record of your performance. The accountability I am pursuing is public, evidentiary, and political.

The attached Cloudflare screenshot for JTforME.com displays 26.47k "Unique Visitors" and 417.04k "Total Requests" for October 15–November 14, 2026. Those are the dashboard's traffic metrics, not a claim that every request represents a human reader or endorsement. I will continue making my evidence-supported criticism available for public scrutiny. Institutional silence will not be mistaken for an answer.

I demand a substantive written response identifying who will examine the administrative failures described below, how those failures will be assessed, and what concrete steps your offices are prepared to pursue within their respective authority. This is a demand for public accountability and systemic reform, not a request that the executive dictate the outcome of a pending case. The public-accountability demand is distinct from the filing and administrative-routing request addressed to the Law Court Clerk below.

REQUEST TO THE LAW COURT CLERK — FILING / ADMINISTRATIVE ROUTING

Clerk Pollack: I submit the attached text-based PDF, "Public Accountability Correspondence and Request for Filing or Administrative Routing," and request that it be filed as correspondence associated with Yor-26-118 to the extent permitted by the applicable rules and existing orders. Confirm receipt, whether a docket entry is made, and whether the document is presented to the Court; those are separate events. If filing or presentment is not permitted, identify the controlling rule or order and route the systemic-administration concerns to the appropriate Judicial Branch administrative office, or identify that office and its submission procedure in writing.

This is a request to receive and accurately classify the correspondence—not an assertion that copying the Clerk makes it filed, that correspondence overrides an existing filing restriction, or that this statement is a motion for reconsideration. No reopening of the merits, deadline extension, or alteration of the November 10 decision is requested through this correspondence. Counsel for the opposing party remains copied. The attached PDF includes the complete public statement and the public screenshots referred to in the email.

The full public statement follows.

PUBLIC NOTICE OF NON-ACQUIESCENCE AND EXPRESS REPUDIATION OF OBSEQUIOUSNESS

Concerning the “Learned” Profession, Its Institutional Self-Importance, and Its Idiocy of Antiquity

To the deplorable, despicable, degenerate, dishonorable douchebags who mistake possession of institutional authority for proof of intellectual or moral superiority:

Let notice be taken: my participation is not allegiance. My compliance is not admiration. My submission of documents is not the submission of my judgment.

My participation constitutes a good-faith best effort to prevent additional harm, obtain substantive redress, and avoid the necessity of further litigation and public-accountability proceedings. It is neither an endorsement of the conduct challenged nor an undertaking to provide ceremonial admiration to those responsible for answering the challenge.

Do not mistake my continued resort to lawful process for acquiescence in its alleged failures. I do not solicit institutional self-correction as a discretionary courtesy. I demand it. Examine the alleged failures. Answer the evidence. Correct established errors. Demonstrate the competence you presume to demand of everyone else.

Let your indignation at being scrutinized be returned with interest: indignation at institutional indifference; indignation at incompetence presented as inevitability; indignation at intransigence masquerading as integrity; and indignation at the insufferable presumption that criticism constitutes insubordination.

Your irritation is not a finding. Your injured self-importance is not a rebuttal. Your institutional indignation is not an answer on the merits.

I am not applying for permission to notice that correction is overdue. I demand competent administration and lawful accountability—not another elaborately upholstered explanation of why institutional inadequacy must be endured in reverential silence.

For the avoidance of manufactured ambiguity, the escalation contemplated here consists of evidence-supported complaints, available judicial review, legislative advocacy, and lawful public scrutiny. The object is correction and accountability—not injury to anyone.

I am not applying for membership in your profession, admission to your social circle, or permission to find your performance disgraceful. I am placing an objection before the public—and your displeasure with its presentation is not a disposition on the merits.

The objection is this:

You are a legacy institution demanding administrator privileges while refusing to open the error log.

You want the authority to change the conditions of people's lives, the presumption that your decisions deserve confidence, and the deference associated with expertise. Then demonstrate the competence. Produce the reasoning. Make the failures reviewable.

The greater the power, the more exacting the examination ought to be.

An administrator account does not make its holder competent. A robe is not an audit. An honorific is not evidence that the underlying work was done correctly.

And "because we said so," furnished with citations and ceremonial throat-clearing, remains an inadequate answer to an identified error.

I. NOTICE THAT REVERENCE WILL NOT BE PROVIDED

The undersigned expressly repudiates any supposed obligation to confuse institutional longevity with merit, professional vocabulary with understanding, or an officeholder's wounded pride with a substantive defect in criticism.

My respect for justice does not require a devotional relationship with its administrators.

You may explain your decisions. You may challenge my assertions. You may identify contrary evidence. You may demonstrate that my criticism is mistaken.

You may not expect your title to perform that work for you.

My allegations should withstand scrutiny. So should your answers. Neither my anger nor your cowardly composure behind armed marshals determines what the evidence establishes.

As to your respective craniums' apparent establishment of permanent residence within your backsides, the undersigned declines involvement in that unfortunate occupancy arrangement. Voluntary relocation is recommended so that the evidence may, at last, fall within your field of observation. Your familiarity with the premises does not establish subject-matter expertise, and the resulting obstruction of your view is not a defect in the record.

I seek no diminution of your intelligence. I seek some discernible indication that it has entered an appearance.

Accordingly, any request that I substitute obsequiousness for examination is declined. Any expectation that I congratulate an institution merely for processing the paperwork associated with its own alleged failures is likewise declined.

Your professional comfort is not the relief requested.

II. THE IDIOCY OF ANTIQUITY IS NOT A DEFENSE

A practice does not become reasonable through prolonged exposure to mahogany.

A preventable failure does not become necessary because generations of credentialed people have become accustomed to it. A procedure does not justify itself by supplying the vocabulary with which its defenders describe it.

“This is how we have always done it” establishes duration. It does not establish wisdom.

When a rule protects notice, reliable evidence, confidentiality, or a meaningful opportunity to respond, explain that function. When a requirement merely reproduces information already available, identify the necessity. When a correctable clerical defect sends a person through another rejection cycle, examine whether the process could have identified and prevented it.

Distinguish a safeguard from an inconvenience. Then stop demanding reverence for the inconvenience.

Do not tell me that modernization is beneath the dignity of the law while expecting families to spend their lives compensating for defective administration.

There is nothing intellectually distinguished about knowing precisely how an obsolete process operates while refusing to consider whether it ought to operate that way at all.

A “learned” profession should be capable of learning something beyond the approved explanation for why nothing will change.

III. OPEN THE GODDAMN ERROR LOG

Identify what was submitted, what was received, what was rejected, what was reviewed, and what remains unanswered.

Start with the actual eFileMaine communication load. A fresh Gmail inventory completed November 14, 2026, for the March 30–November 14 review period returned 1,408 messages from the Tyler eFiling notification domain. Within that total were 335 messages with “rejected” in the subject and 176 “Confirmation of Entry” messages. The rejection-subject total includes 125 messages using the specific “Rejected Filing Notification” wording; the broader total also captures notices sent through the File & Serve channel. These are counts of matching messages, not 335 independent rejected motions, not a statewide error rate, and not a finding that every return was wrongful. Repeated notices and document-level events must be linked to their envelopes and underlying submission chains before making those claims.

But 1,408 messages in one account is a communication burden worth examining—not a ceremonial substitute for a coherent, intelligible path to substantive consideration. Open the transaction history. Identify the distinct filings, the repeat attempts, the reasons, the corrections, the elapsed time, and the work imposed on the parent and the public. Do not conflate a generated notification with a resolved problem.

The November record supplies concrete examples, not merely adjectives. Envelope 315672, submitted November 12, generated a return explaining that a proposed order had been uploaded as a lead filing rather than associated with its motion in the required manner. The notice then supplied a four-business-

day resubmission instruction and prescribed text for the “Comments to Court” field. Separately, envelope 315673 was confirmed entered on November 13 at 10:43 a.m. The record includes acceptance as well as rejection. Neither event, by itself, establishes that the underlying child-and-family issue received a substantive decision.

My objection is not that notice, service, or an intelligible proposed order should disappear. It is that a purportedly modern system should help a parent associate the right document with the right motion, identify mechanically detectable defects before submission, preserve the correction history, and provide one intelligible path through the process. When clerical defects are discoverable, identify them together. Do not make the correction process itself another procedural examination.

It is absurd. It is egregiously absurd: an antiquated digital experience burdened with even more antiquated procedural absurdity.

A parent seeking help for their child and family should not be required to choose between bankruptcy to finance another lawyer’s new vacation home and having to earn a doctorate in asinine operational incompetence of antiquity overnight for justice to be served.

That is an indictment of the access-to-justice bargain, not an allegation about any particular lawyer’s real-estate purchases. A family’s need for relief is not a luxury revenue stream, and a parent’s inability to purchase representation is not an invitation to turn elementary administration into a postgraduate hazing ritual.

Explain the failure. Identify responsibility for correcting it. Preserve the history so that independent review does not depend on the recollection of whoever presently controls the file.

A rejection notice should identify the defects and provide intelligible correction instructions. A status inquiry should not require reconstructing the institution’s internal workflow. A recurring error should prompt investigation of its cause—not another lecture to the next person who encounters it.

“User error” is a conclusion to establish, not a ceremonial absolution for the people who designed the system.

And when a person has actually made an error, correction should serve the proceeding—not become a separate endurance contest.

The public should not have to demonstrate operational competence on behalf of the institution demanding it.

Count the resubmissions. Count the unanswered inquiries. Count the repeated entry of information already supplied. Count the hours that families spend discovering whether their request has reached someone authorized to address it.

Do not report a cost as eliminated when you have merely transferred it to the person least able to absorb it.

IV. SUBSTANTIVE JUSTICE IS THE PURPOSE

That is not an attack on justice. That is a demand that its administrators learn how to administer substantive justice instead of procedural absurdity.

The mission is meaningful justice. The machinery is supposed to provide competent administration.

And you continue to fail at both!

A perfectly routed document is not the same thing as an answered question. A closed administrative task is not necessarily a resolved problem. A completed proceeding does not, by its completion alone, demonstrate that its reasoning was sound or its result just.

Do not invite applause for the movement of paper while the underlying issue remains unaddressed.

And where children are concerned, stop treating time as though it belongs exclusively to the institution managing the calendar.

A child's remaining childhood is not an extension of your litigation schedule.

No subsequent explanation can recreate a missed year. That is precisely why avoidable delay deserves examination rather than a solemn recital of how ordinarily it occurred.

V. WHEREFORE: NO ACQUIESCENCE

I demand reasoned answers, reviewable records, independent scrutiny, correction of established errors, and lawful accountability where misconduct is proven.

I will not call institutional self-protection "dignity." I will not call resistance to examination "expertise." I will not call an avoidable burden "necessary" merely because its administrators prefer not to reconsider it.

Your credentials are an invitation to higher expectations—not an exemption from them.

To the seven "injustices" of Maine's highest court: consider this the motivational inspiration apparently required to abdicate your cranio-rectal entrenchments of substantively substantial depths. Voluntarily relocate your attention to the evidence, the consequences, and the century in which the public is presently attempting to live. An exalted seat does not confer an exemption from elementary operational competence. This criticism addresses the institution and its governance, not a claim that seven justices participated in my particular appeal.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned declines to furnish reverence as a filing fee, admiration as a prerequisite to relief, or silence as a professional courtesy.

Answer the allegations. Identify the evidence. Explain the reasoning. Correct established errors. Your objection to my vocabulary may be stated, preserved, embossed, and bound in leather; it will still not constitute an answer on the merits.

Open the error log. Answer the evidence. Correct the failures.

Until then, spare the public the insidiously ignorant, unusually unscrupulous and sanctimonious demand that it admire the administrators while doing their troubleshooting for them.

The relief sought is the operational and organizational competence expected of modern organizations—organizational organizations operating reasonably organized places of occupation—delivered with even a fraction of the exquisite opulence devoted to this institution's estimation of itself. The insanity is not demanding that competence; it is presuming it has already been attained merely because the institution has declared itself magnificent.

The obsequiousness is not forthcoming.

Justice may be blind; she need not be an idiot.

Justice is not your cult's to continue debauching—it belongs to the People. Restore it.

And stop harming kids. Especially mine.

#StopHarmingOurKids

Source for the opportunity statement and transition commitment: @hannahpingreeforgovernor, Instagram post dated November 6. The two attached Instagram screenshots preserve the quoted wording, the surrounding transition statement, and the visible post date.

Source for eFileMaine counts: live Gmail searches completed November 14, 2026, excluding Spam and Trash, using the Tyler notification sender domain and the stated date window. All result pages were enumerated. The count is a mailbox inventory, not an audited count of unique filings, judicial errors, or avoidable staff hours. Original notices control. November examples: Tyler return for envelope 315672 (message 1a1d2ed68cf605cc) and entry confirmation for envelope 315673 (message 1a1d593fc5fec989).

Justin A. Tahai

Father • Engineer • Author

JTforME.com • North Berwick, Maine

THE CALL OUT: WAR — Read the free book

Justice may be blind; she need not be an idiot.

#StopHarmingOurKids

Justin A. Tahai

Father • Engineer • Author

Apparently, the paperwork needed a racing division.

CARPOOLING TO HELL: PROCEDURAL GRAND PRIX

Play the game | Print the procedural shoehorn | Read the book

Meanwhile, buckle up. We're CARPOOLING TO HELL. Race you there.

The finish line has retained counsel. Counsel is pro se and overqualified. Discovery is now a systems problem.

And for those who prefer a good fight:

3...

2...

1...

LITIGATE!

PROCEDURAL II → ***procedural2.jtforme.com***

---

5 attachments

- **Broken_Blood_Red_Scales_Justin_Tahai.jpg**
  280 KB
- **JTforME_Cloudflare_Oct15_Nov14_2026.jpg**
  92 KB
- **Pingree_Instagram_November_6_Opportunity_Context.jpg**
  224 KB
- **Pingree_Instagram_November_6_Full_Caption_and_Date.jpg**
  230 KB
- **Yor-26-118_Public_Accountability_Correspondence_2026-11-14.pdf**
  1.1 MB