STATE OF MAIN	E
CUMBERLAND, 9	SS.

## SUPERIOR COURT DOCKET NO.: PORDC-PA-2022-00120

ANN MARIE MAKSYMOWICZ	]	
	]	
	]	MOTION TO VACATE
	]	ORDER DATED 4-26-22
	]	RECEIVED 5-5-22
Plaintiff,	]	
	]	
	]	
V.	]	
	]	
MICHAEL A. DOYLE	]	
	]	
Defendant.	]	
	]	

## FACTS:

- The Defendant is the editor and the publisher of the online news site found at and
  has been a practicing member of the news media for the past several years. The
  Plaintiff's news site can be seen at <a href="https://www.falmouthtoday.me">www.falmouthtoday.me</a>.
- 2. Consequently, the Defendant was well known to the officials of the municipality of Cumberland, Maine as being a member of the news media when he was illegally arrested for making honest comments about Ann stealing Defendant's sign format and lying by omission by failing to disclose the theft (admitted at the hearing before Judge Goranities and CPD Sgt. Jake LaChance), her excuse for taking the sign off the news site as it was not copyrighted, during her testimony on L.D. 1939 at the Legislature.

The entire site is copyrighted and all pages on the site. This theft prompted Plaintiff to Predict that someone would steal something from Ann's lawn and destroy it. That never occurred.

- 3. Defendant cites *Lozman v. Riviera Beach, FL* No. 17-21 SCOTUS. This litigation and the back and forth between the complaining party and Defendant was the product of the antagonism generated by the complaining party sitting during the pledge of allegiance, as a member, at a school board meeting. Plaintiff was leading the pledge to honor all the men and women serving in the military all over the world to protect our Freedom of Speech.
- 4. This order violates all the SCOTUS rulings protecting Defendant's First Amendment rights. It should be VACATED immediately to save the Court's time answering an appeal to the Maine Supreme Court, First Circuit and finally SCOTUS. At some point along this line of appeals a superior court to this one, will reverse this decision as it violates the law handed down repeatedly by SCOTUS. Plaintiff has noted the case comments in bold to make them easily read by the court.

## APPLICABLE LAW

5. The First Amendment right to "petition the Government for a redress of grievances" is so fundamental as to be "implied by '[t]he very idea of a government, republican in form." BE&K Const. Co. v. NLRB, 536 U.S. 516, 524-525 (2002)

(quoting United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 552 (1876)).

- 6. With respect to Defendant's criticisms of the conduct and false statements of the Complainant leading up to the arrest. This sort of expression lies at the heart of the speech the First Amendment protects. Because "the Constitution created a form of government, under which '[t]he people not the government, possess the absolute sovereignty," the right of free public discussion of the stewardship of public officials" is "fundamental." *N.Y. Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 274-275 (1964) (quoting James Madison, Report of 1800, in 4 Elliot's Debates on the Federal Constitution 569 (1863).
- 7. Precisely because litigation and public criticism are essential to holding government accountable, this Court (SCOTUS) "has frequently reaffirmed that speech on public issues occupies the highest rung on the 'hierarchy of First Amendment values,' and is entitled to special protection." Connick v. Meyers, 461 U.S. 138, 145 (1983) (quoting NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware, 458 U.S. 886, 913 (1982)). This is particularly true where, as here, the expression comes from a private citizen.
  Relying on this principle, this court (SCOTUS) has explained that "[s]uch speech cannot be restricted simply because it is upsetting." Snyder v. Phelps, 562 U.S. 443 458 (2011). It is a "bedrock principle underlying the First Amendment" that "the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable." Texas v. Johnson, 491 U.S. 397, 414

(1989). Even less can it suppress expressions on the ground that the expression is

upsetting, offensive, or disagreeable to government officials. "[D]ebate on public

issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open," and "it may well include

vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and

public officials." N.Y. Times Co. 376 U.S. at 270. This Court (SCOTUS) long ago

repudiated the doctrine of seditious libel in favor of a "theory of our Constitution,"

which values free speech as essential to, not subject to the vicissitudes of, our

political system." Bd. of Cty. Comm'rs v. Umbehr, 518 U.S. 668, 681 (1996) (quoting

Abrams v. United States, 250 U.S. 616, 630 (1919) (Holmes, J., dissenting)).

The First Amendment forbids the government from abusing its arrest powers to

retaliate against protected activity.

WHEREFORE: Defendant respectfully moves this Court pursuant to public policy

and pursuant to the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that

this Order be Vacated.

MICHAEL DOYLE, Defendant

PMB 329

1465 Woodbury Ave.

Portsmouth, NH 03801

207.766.6644

May 6, 2022

4