

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Nature of the underlying cause of action	p 1
Jurisdiction	p 6
Standing	p 7
Parties	p 8

Introduction

A. Necessitated urgent and ex-parte relief	p 21
B. Well established pattern of abuse of power by Massachusetts public officials and gross lack of Oversight by the Commonwealth	p 30
C. Well established awareness by Legislators (state and federal) and the American Bar Association of financial exploitation and abuse of elders by court appointed guardians and conservators as a nation-wide crisis since 1989	p 31
D. Established widespread improper partisanship amongst members of the Massachusetts judiciary, regulatory agencies and attorneys	p 34
American Inns of Court	p 35
MBF Society of Fellows	p 41
E. Change of attitude by the Supreme Judicial Court regarding administration of justice after the institution of various Massachusetts chapters of the American Inn of Courts	p 45
Lessened judicial accountability	p 45
Specific ties of individual justices of the Supreme Judicial Court	p 48
Opportunity and motive for corruption through the Massachusetts Judicial Selection Process	p 50
Visible post-1989 adverse change in attitude by the State appellate courts regarding due process for alleged incapacitated individuals	p 51

Visible post-1989 adverse change in attitude by the State appellate courts regarding pro se litigants p 55

Statement of Facts

I. Overview of the criminal enterprise embedded in the Massachusetts Probate & Family Court	p 59
A. Broad scope	p 59
Established pattern of illicit conduct by designated Defendants Attorneys who regularly provide private estate planning services while acting as court appointees for Massachusetts Probate & Family Courts	
Specific and concrete illustrations of improper use of the Massachusetts Probate & Family Courts by privately retained counsel	
B. Defendants’ use of influence—fostered through exclusive memberships—to facilitate illegal acts	p 69
Evidence of Defendants’ incestuous-like relationships as SJC Rule 1:07 court appointees	p 69
Evidenced tendency of designated judges of the Essex Probate & Family Court involving bribery and illicit collusion	p 85
Evidence of designated Defendants’ actual use of bribery in the matter of In re Marvin H. Siegel	p 87
Evidence of designated Defendants’ actual use of bribery in the matters of In re James and Hope Pentoliros	p 94
Suspect routine pattern of Defendant Attorney Ledoux seeking court ordered DNR/DNIs—on his own and not at the request of family members	p 98
Defendants’ use of relationship with medical facilities to prey on patients who appear to have no close family relations	p 99
Pattern of suspect concerted conduct involving the Essex Probate & Family Court and various local medical/nursing facilities	p 100

Partisan relationships between SJC Rule 1:07 court appointees and professional organizations	p 108
Misuse of influence amongst State agencies specifically designated for the elderly	p 109
Defendants' improper use of influence with the Judicial Conduct Commission	p 113
Defendants' improper use of influence with the Board of Bar Overseers and Office of Bar Counsel	p 118
II. Deliberate disregard by then-Attorney General Martha Coakley, the Supreme Judicial Court, & other regulatory entities of presented evidence of corruption	p 127
A. Well-established overt knowledge by Attorney General Martha Coakley of prevalent elder abuse by nursing homes regarding unnecessary use of antipsychotics	p 127
B. Well-established overt knowledge by Attorney General Martha Coakley Of unlawful and unjustified use of antipsychotics with specific regard to In re Marvin H. Siegel	p 131
C. Evidence of Defendants' improper use of influence with other regulatory Entities	p 147
III. The Massachusetts Probate & Family Court system as a criminal enterprise	p 147
A. Means used to facilitate financial exploitation: money laundering	p 147
B. SJC Rule 1:07—Fee Generating Appointments—used as a central instrument to facilitate exploitation of elders	p 173
IV. Established pattern of conduct by Massachusetts Probate & Family Court Judges evidencing collusion with attorneys regularly appointed as fiduciaries as fiduciaries and GALs	p 175
A. Routine disregard by Probate & Family Court judges of the cornerstone Directives by the Massachusetts Uniform Probate Code (MUPC)	p 175

B. Modus operandi of SJC Rule 1:07 court appointees	p 182
V. Corruption specific to In re Marvin H. Siegel	p 196
A. Background regarding Father’s prior executed DPOA, other estate planning instruments and family dynamics	p 196
B. Events that led up to Father being taken to Defendant Beverly Hospital	p 207
C. Evaluation at Emergency Room at Defendant Beverly Hospital	p 213
D. Involuntary admission of Plaintiffs father to Defendant Whittier Pavilion	p 214
E. Conspired fraud and deception by Defendant Brian Nagle of Defendant BNY Mellon and Defendant Attorney Tarlow to dismantle Father’s 2003 DPOA to gain control of the DSL Trust for ill-gotten gain	p 216
F. Conspired fraud and deception by Defendant BNY Mellon, Defendant Law Firm TBHR and Defendant Whittier Pavilion During litigation	p 228
G. Defendants’ concerted efforts to manufacture incriminating evidence to oust Plaintiff Daughter Lisa as Father’s attorney-in-fact and as nominated guardian	p 252
H. Events Following Defendant ESMV’s motion to Intervene	p 286
I. Court proceeding of August 17, 2011	p 289
J. Subsequent to the court proceeding of August 17, 2011, over acts By Defendant Attorney Kazarosian against Father’s expressed desires and intentions	p 300
K. Defendant’s misuse of court proceedings to facilitate illicit activity	p 306
L. Retaliation for Plaintiff Daughter exposing Defendants’ knowingly unlawful administration of antipsychotics to Father	p322

M. Defendants schemed to have Father involuntarily committed under Section 12 to further facilitate financial exploitation of the DSL Trust	p 336
N. Illicit manner in which Defendants sought court order for forced Administration of antipsychotics	p 343
O. Continued fraud and deception relating to continued court ordered Forced administering of antipsychotics and other sought court orders	p 357
P. Evidence that the court appointments of Defendant Attorney Cuffe and Defendant Attorney Feld were the result of collusion with deliberate intention to embezzle money from the DSL Trust	p 374

Claims For Relief

Declaratory Claims	p 387
Fraud Claims	p 402
RICO Claims	p 410
Section 1983 Claims	p 422
Common Law Claims	p 448
Injunctive Relief Claims	p 457

