

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT**

SUFFOLK, ss.

**APPEALS COURT
NO. 2026-P-0792
SJC NO. DAR-**

**COMMONWEALTH,
Appellee,**

v.

**KRISTIAN X. MARAJ,
Defendant-Appellant.**

**ON APPEAL FROM A JUDGMENT OF THE SUFFOLK COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT**

APPLICATION FOR DIRECT APPELLATE REVIEW

**KRISTIAN X. MARAJ
By his attorney,**

**Tara B. Ganguly
BBO No. 667163
P.O. Box 1135
Greenfield, MA 01302
(413) 475-3796
tara@ganguly-law.com**

JUNE 16, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REQUEST FOR DIRECT APPELLATE REVIEW.....	3
PRIOR PROCEEDINGS.....	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	5
ISSUE PRESENTED.....	9
ARGUMENT.....	10
STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY DIRECT APPELLATE REVIEW IS APPROPRIATE.....	18
APPENDIX/DOCKET ENTRIES.....	19
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	37
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	37
AFFIDAVIT OF COUNSEL PURSUANT TO M.R.A.P. 13(a).....	38

REQUEST FOR DIRECT APPELLATE REVIEW

Millions of homeowners and residents in Massachusetts utilize Google Nest and Ring camera devices on the outside of their houses. These devices intercept and record both audio and video footage of anyone who passes by on public sidewalks or streets. This case involves interplay among these recording devices, the Massachusetts Wiretap Statute, G.L. c. 272, § 99, and the admissibility of such recordings in criminal trials.

Specifically, a homeowner placed a Google Nest device on the outside of his house at 39 Stonehurst Street in Dorchester. The device captured both audio and video footage of passerby on the street at all times. In the early morning hours of July 5, 2020, the Google Nest device captured audio and video footage of an individual purported to be the defendant and two other individuals crossing the street and then walking/running down the street. The Google Nest device is an intercepting device pursuant to G.L. c. 272, § 99(B)(4). It captured various incriminatory statements that night, and the trial court later admitted this recording at the defendant's criminal trial.

This Court has long held that where a private party violates the wiretap statute, the evidence from the violation is still admissible at a defendant's criminal trial. In the 21 years since this Court has last analyzed this issue, surveillance technology has exploded, and citizens now regularly spy on their fellow citizens

with these Google Nest and Ring devices. They also work hand in hand with law enforcement and regularly provide the contents of their intercepting devices to police for use at criminal trials.

Trial counsel for the defendant filed a motion in limine to preclude the admission of the audio-visual recording in this case, but the trial judge ruled it admissible based on existing case law. The time has come for the Court to re-examine this issue and conclude that, pursuant to the text and preamble of the wiretap statute, secret recordings from Google Nest and similar devices are not admissible at criminal trials.

PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

On October 30, 2020, a Suffolk County grand jury returned an indictment against Kristian X. Maraj (“Mr. Maraj”) for 1) murder, in violation of G.L. c. 265, § 1; and 2) carrying a firearm without a license, in violation of G.L. c. 269, § 10(a). Mr. Maraj was arraigned on November 9, 2020 and pleaded not guilty.

On January 24, 2024, the Commonwealth filed a “Motion in Limine to Admit Audio from Surveillance Video.” On January 30, 2024, Mr. Maraj filed a “Motion in Opposition to the Introduction of the Nest Camera Audio.”¹ On January

¹ The trial court docket mistakenly identifies this pleading as coming from the Commonwealth. It did not. Trial counsel for the defendant drafted and filed this pleading.

31, 2024, the Commonwealth filed a “Response to the Defendant’s Opposition to the Nest.com Audio.”

Mr. Maraj was tried by a jury, Campo, J., presiding, on January 31 through February 9, 2024. On January 31, 2024, the first day of trial, the trial judge ruled the Google Nest audio and video recording was admissible in evidence. The jury convicted Mr. Maraj of voluntary manslaughter on Count 1 and Count 2 as charged. On March 25, 2024, the court sentenced Mr. Maraj to 17-20 years on Count 1 and 3-4 years concurrent on Count 2. Mr. Maraj timely filed his Notice of Appeal on March 25, 2024. This case was entered in the Appeals Court on June 5, 2026 as Docket No. 2026-P-0792.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Background

Barbara Rose (“Rose”) had lived in Dorchester for 55 years and lived at 37 Stonehurst Street with her family for over 20 years. Kerry Maraj (“Kerry”) and his family lived at 175 Hamilton Street. The distance between 37 Stonehurst Street and 175 Hamilton Street was approximately four houses. Rose identified the defendant in court as someone she had known “all his life.”

The Fight And The Shooting

Rose testified Felicity Coleman (“Coleman”) lived with her on and off for about three years. On the night of July 4, 2020 into the morning of July 5th, Rose

and Coleman were outside watching fireworks with other people. Rose saw Kerry and Mr. Maraj around 11:30 pm or midnight. Kerry was lighting off fireworks but Rose didn't remember if the defendant did so. Shortly before 3:00 a.m., there was a fight at the end of Rose's driveway. She saw Mr. Maraj and an unidentified man fighting. She stated the lighting in her area was "bright."

Rose testified Mr. Maraj pulled out a gun, the other person knocked him down, and the gun fell out of Mr. Maraj's hand. Rose had seen this other person before but did not know who he was. Rose described this person as "tall and Black." A third person she did not know then picked up the gun, Rose told him to get rid of it, and he took off down the street toward Hamilton Street. She first testified this person was Mr. Maraj's friend but then stated she did not know whether he was Mr. Maraj's or Kerry's friend. Rose testified Mr. Maraj was wearing a white t shirt, blue jeans, and Timberland boots. Rose stated Mr. Maraj wore his hair in a long ponytail, and his friend was bout 5'5", looked Cape Verdean, and had curly hair.

Rose did see Kerry out on the street during the fight, but she did not see him get stabbed. Rose did not know what ended the fight, but she saw Mr. Maraj and his father leave and head toward 175 Hamilton Street. The person who had left with the gun was already gone when Mr. Maraj and Kerry left. No one called 911 about the fight.

Rose testified that about a minute later, Mr. Maraj came running back from Hamilton Street, about two houses away, shooting a gun. Rose later told detectives that Mr. Maraj was shooting wildly and waving the gun around. Rose was sitting on the porch, and Coleman was standing in the yard. T3/121. Rose curled into a ball after the shooting began but Coleman was struck and fell to the ground.

Rose stated after the shots rang out Mr. Maraj ran back toward 175 Hamilton Street. At this point he had no shirt but was still wearing blue jeans and Timberland boots. Rose ran upstairs to grab her phone to call the police. She gave the 911 operator a description of what had just happened and who had been involved. Police and paramedics arrived within 2 minutes. Coleman was pronounced deceased on scene.

Arrest Of Mr. Maraj And Aftermath of Kerry's Stabbing

Mr. Maraj was arrested outside 175 Hamilton Street. He kept repeating, "my father is stabbed, my father is stabbed." Paramedics received a radio call regarding a stabbing at 3:17 a.m. When paramedics arrived at 175 Hamilton Street, Kerry identified himself and said he had been stabbed. He was stabled and transported to Boston Medical Center.

Miller Recording

When police first arrived on scene they searched for surveillance cameras in the area and made note of them. There were several cameras on various houses on

Stonehurst Street, Norton Street, and Hamilton Street. Joseph Downing (“Downing”), a detective at the Boston police department, responded to the scene of the shooting later in the day on July 5th. He was tasked with recovering video surveillance footage. Downing testified another detective had given him a list of locations to go to, talk to the residents, and collect video evidence. Downing went to various addresses and obtained the various recorded footage.

Kevin Miller (“Miller”) had lived at 39 Stonehurst Street since 1974. His cars had been broken into multiple times, so he purchased and installed a video and audio Google Nest camera as a “security monitor” and attached it to the side of his house facing his driveway. Miller testified police requested access to his Google Nest device. He downloaded the relevant time period from his device, and the recording captured both audio and video footage. Miller provided the recording to Downing and identified the recording as coming from his device. As a result of the trial judge’s earlier ruling, the court admitted this recording as part of Exhibit 2.² The black and white recording was played for the jury.

Approximately seven minutes into the recording, three male figures walk across the street, and “they stabbed my father” and “give me the gun” can be heard

² Exhibit 2 is a thumb drive containing many different pieces of digital video evidence in this case. At issue herein is the audio/video recording identified as being from 39 Stonehurst, July 5, 2020 at 3:00 am. The relevant footage begins at approximately 3:07 am. The recording will be referred to hereinafter as the “Miller” recording.

multiple times. Another voice says, “Kristian, Kristian.” One of the figures runs out of frame and 14 gunshots can be heard.

Relevant Criminalistics Evidence

Jacqueline Massua (“Massua”), a criminalist at the Boston Police Crime Lab, collected gunshot residue stubs from both of Mr. Maraj’s hands following his arrest. Amy Reynolds (“Reynolds”), another criminalist at the Boston Police Crime Lab, testified that she conducted the testing on the stubs taken from Mr. Maraj’s hands, and she concluded that there was primary gunshot residue on the stubs.

ISSUE PRESENTED

Whether the Court should adopt Justice Cowin’s concurrence in *Commonwealth v. Rivera*, 445 Mass. 119 (2005) because private citizens are violating the wiretap statute specifically to provide evidence of criminal conduct to law enforcement, and § 99(P) provides for suppression of such evidence.

Trial counsel’s motion in limine/opposition to the Commonwealth’s motion in limine generally presented the argument set forth herein. Trial counsel objected to the court’s ruling. Where a defendant objects to the court’s ruling during motions in limine, counsel is not required to again object at the time the evidence is admitted in order to preserve the error for appeal. *Commonwealth v. Espinal*, 482 Mass. 190, 203 n.18 (2019); *Commonwealth v. Grady*, 474 Mass. 715, 719 (2016). Counsel therefore properly preserved the error for appeal.

ARGUMENT

I. THE COURT SHOULD ADOPT JUSTICE COWIN’S CONCURRENCE IN *COMMONWEALTH V. RIVERA*, 445 MASS. 119 (2005) BECAUSE PRIVATE CITIZENS ARE VIOLATING THE WIRETAP STATUTE SPECIFICALLY TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND § 99(P) PROVIDES FOR SUPPRESSION OF SUCH EVIDENCE.

A. Massachusetts Wiretap Statute.

Section 99 of G.L. c. 272 is a “comprehensive statute prohibiting almost all forms of electronic interceptions of oral or wire communications and the disclosure or use of any communication obtained in violation of the statute. *Commonwealth v. Look*, 379 Mass. 893, 907 (1980). “It is apparent from the preamble that the legislative focus was on the protection of privacy rights and the deterrence of interference therewith by law enforcement officers’ surreptitious eavesdropping as an investigative tool.” *Commonwealth v. Gordan*, 422 Mass. 816, 833 (1996).

Google Nest devices give law enforcement a pass. Their ubiquity results in citizens doing the eavesdropping work for police. “In the absence of an express statutory provision, § 99 strictly prohibits the secret recording by a private individual of any oral communication.” *Commonwealth v. Wright*, 61 Mass. App. Ct. 790, 792 (2004). Current law permits citizens to violate § 99 and coordinate with law enforcement to pass on the fruits of the violation for the Commonwealth to use to prosecute the subject of the interception. This defies the Legislature’s intent.

B. A Google Nest Device Which Captures Audio Is A Secret Recording Pursuant To G.L. c. 272, § 99(B)(4).

Every person who moves through society has observed surveillance cameras in businesses and retail establishments. The open streets are different. We are at an inflection point where millions of private citizens install and utilize audio-video cameras on the outside of their homes. These devices are clandestinely recording the public at all times. No signage accompanies them. Individuals who pass a certain house do not have actual knowledge they are being recorded.

As of April 1, 2026, 61% of U.S. households now have at least one security camera, up from 52% in 2024.³ Citizens generally do not advise passerby they are being audio or video recorded. There is no evidence Miller did so. Massachusetts landlord associations explicitly advise their members about this pitfall:

In Massachusetts, you may not legally audio record anyone without their consent, according to MGL c. 272, § 99, the so-called wiretap law. . . For video recording, a notice or sign in common areas suffices to inform people that they are being video recorded or surveilled. But in the case of audio, you have to go further than just a sign or notice by receiving their consent to being audio recorded. This is partly because sound can travel around corners and pick up from off-camera, where a disclosure sign isn't visible. For this reason, most landlords install security cameras around rentals with audio turned off[.]

³ <https://www.safehome.org/resources/home-security-industry-annual/>

“Security Cameras Becoming Standard for Rentals,” first published June 1, 2022, updated April 21, 2023, <https://masslandlords.net/security-cameras-becoming-standard-for-rentals/>.

A nonjudicial legal advisory is not binding law. But no case law exists on whether Google Nest or Ring audio-inclusive cameras are “secret” recordings pursuant to § 99(B)(4). Common sense indicates Google Nest and Ring cameras are “secret” recording devices. Miller did not inform passerby that his Google Nest camera was audio-visually recording them. Should this Court conclude such intercepting devices are *not* secret, it will be a bold and worrisome proclamation about the state of surveillance in Massachusetts and beyond.

C. The Court Should Adopt Justice Cowin’s Concurrence In *Commonwealth v. Rivera*, 445 Mass. 119 (2005).

This Court should overrule prior case law and hold that where a private citizen illegally intercepts a defendant’s statements, such interception is not admissible in the defendant’s criminal trial. In this light, the trial court committed an error of law in admitting the Miller recording.⁴

⁴ Trial counsel did not file a motion to suppress pursuant to § 99(P) but instead argued this issue in a motion in limine format. Because Mr. Maraj is advocating for a change in the law, there is no basis to argue that trial counsel’s actions constituted ineffective assistance of counsel. The procedural mechanism for precluding the interception is less important than the reasoning for such admission or preclusion. Therefore, despite the lack of a formal motion to suppress the Miller recording, this Court should analyze the issues in terms of admissibility versus inadmissibility.

In *Commonwealth v. Santoro*, 406 Mass. 421 (1990), this Court held that an illegal wiretap made by a private individual could not be suppressed pursuant to § 99P. The Court grounded its holding in the fact that “no police or governmental conduct was involved in the recording of these telephone conversations.” *Id.* at 423. Fifteen years later, in *Commonwealth v. Rivera*, 445 Mass. 119 (2005), the Court reaffirmed *Santoro*’s holding. In *Rivera*, the defendant’s voice was recorded by a convenience store surveillance camera. The Court again concluded that “[a]bsent an explicit statement from the Legislature to the contrary, we will not read the “use” provisions of the wiretap statute as forcing police and prosecutors to avert their eyes from information procured by private individuals, without any encouragement from the State.” *Id.* at 125.

We have reached a point in our digital age where there is such encouragement from the state. The entire purpose of Google Nest devices is to capture evidence of criminal activity. Miller testified as much. His cars had been broken into multiple times, so he purchased and installed a video and audio Google Nest camera and attached it to his house.

Miller secretly and illegally recorded anyone and everyone who passed his house and who was in the vicinity of his device. § 99(B)(2) and (B)(4). The goal of his interception was *fully aligned* with the goals of law enforcement. Police know this. In the aftermath of a crime, officers go house to house to check if a resident

has surveillance footage that may have captured the incident and/or suspects. Here, Downing was so tasked. Downing testified he was given a list of locations, he spoke to the residents, and collected the recordings. This is a far cry from a recording “[falling] into [police] hands.” *Rivera, supra*, at 124. This widespread practice is distinct from cases where the person who conducted the illegal recording did so for an independent purpose. *See Commonwealth v. Barboza*, 54 Mass. App. Ct. 99, 103 (2002).

Notwithstanding the Court’s holdings in *Santoro* and *Rivera*, its language and conclusions in other wiretap cases illustrate the Court does not want citizens eavesdropping on each other. *Who* does the eavesdropping and *why* they do it is also of import in these opinions. The Court appears to favor prosecutions of illegal interceptions it deems unseemly, and excuses illegal interceptions it finds useful or advisable, despite the statutory preamble that “the secret use of such devices by private individuals must be prohibited.” § 99(A).

In *Commonwealth v. Hyde*, 434 Mass. 594, 600 (2001), the Commonwealth prosecuted a motorist for violating § 99 by secretly recording police officers’ statements during a routine traffic stop. The SJC affirmed the conviction, concluding that § 99 “strictly prohibits the secret recording by a private individual or any oral communication[.]” *Id.* at 595. Had the motorist recorded audio evidence of illegal statements/conduct by the officers, and had such evidence been

used to prosecute those officers, would the motorist be a private citizen who simply provided evidence to law enforcement rather than a criminal himself? The Court should wrestle with this question.

In *Commonwealth v. Tavares*, 459 Mass. 289, 295 (2011), the Court highlighted “the Legislature’s twin objectives to 1) curtail the uncontrolled development and unrestricted use of modern electronic devices, which the Legislature termed a danger to the privacy of all citizens, and to 2) combat the grave danger to the public welfare and safety and legitimate business activities posed by the increasing activities of organized crime” (internal citations omitted). These objectives are incompatible with permitting homeowners to eavesdrop on others in order to capture evidence of ordinary, nonorganized criminal activity solely for law-enforcement use.

Current law enforcement practices rely on Massachusetts courts’ dismissal of rampant violations of § 99. Police seek out these recordings for use at trial. The individuals on the street in the early morning of July 5, 2020 had no reason to believe or understand that their voices were being recorded. *Cf. Commonwealth v. Morris*, 492 Mass. 498, 505 (2023); *Commonwealth v. Rainey*, 491 Mass. 632, 634 (2023).

The time has come for this Court to overrule *Santoro* and *Rivera*, and to adopt the reasoning of Justice Cowin’s concurrence in *Rivera*.⁵ Rather than continue to “eviscerate the suppression provision” of § 99, this Court should “reject this confused precedent in favor of a more logical approach that adheres to the statute’s express language and vindicates its protective purpose: where an audio recording is obtained in violation of the wiretap statute, barring some statutorily conferred exception, that evidence should be suppressed.” *Rivera, supra*, at 136 (Cowin, J., concurring).

Justice Cowin reasoned:

In reading into the statute a blanket exemption for police officers to reap the benefits of violations of our wiretap statute by private citizens, the *Santoro* opinion (without citation) points to the general proposition that exclusionary rules are “intended to deter future police conduct in violation of constitutional or statutory rights.” *Id.* at 423. . . This misses the point. Our exclusionary rule need not do the work of prohibiting the introduction of illegally obtained wiretap evidence at trial where the wiretap statute would expressly do so itself.

Rivera, at 137, Cowin, J., concurring. Continued adherence to *Santoro* and the *Rivera* majority’s “striking conclusion that the police must be responsible for the

⁵ Justice Cowin concurred with the Court’s holding because “[t]he routine store surveillance that occurred here. . . was not the type of ‘secret’ or surreptitious eavesdropping that the Legislature expressly prohibited by the statute.” *Id.* at 134 (Cowin, J., concurring). Unlike persons in a convenience store, individuals walking along a public street “cannot be presumed to have had actual awareness of the devices and that [they] [were] under surveillance.” *Id.* (Cowin, J., concurring). Justice Cowin’s reasoning on this point is irrelevant to his conclusion that *Santoro* should be overruled.

illegal recording in order for that recording to be suppressed ignores clear statutory language barring the willful use and disclosure of illegally intercepted communications and the narrowly defined exceptions to that rule.” *Id.* at 137, Cowin, J., concurring. “Where the police ‘willfully use’ or ‘willfully disclose’ the contents of a secretly recorded communication made in violation of the statute to identify a defendant, obtain a confession, or ultimately prove guilt at trial, even where police officers played no role in the initial recording, they are acting in contravention of the plain language of the statute. *See* G.L. c. 272, § 99C(3).” *Rivera, supra*, at 137-138, Cowin, J., concurring. “A communication known to be recorded in violation of the statute, whether that violation was carried out by a private individual or a public official – and regardless how ‘heinous’ the crime captured by such a communication, cannot be said to be authorized by the statute within the meaning of the exceptions.” *Id.* at 138, Cowin, J., concurring.

This Court must grapple with the fundamental problem *Santoro* and *Rivera* present in the context of modern-day devices which monitor citizens’ every move and spoken word. “The Legislature, not this Court, should be given the final say on when and whether the police may exploit secret interceptions.” *Rivera*, at 139, Cowin, J., concurring. In the instant case, Miller made the secret recording, and the police immediately went to his house to obtain it. How “clean” are their hands? *See Rivera*, at 141-142, Cowin, J., concurring.

This Court has the opportunity to update the law in accordance with modern technology. Should the Court decline to do so, it is indeed “cause for concern. . . that the [C]ourt clings to a decision that so plainly does violence to the clear words of a statute.” *Rivera*, at 141, Cowin, J., concurring.

**STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY DIRECT APPELLATE REVIEW
IS APPROPRIATE**

Pursuant to Mass. R. App. P. 11(a), the Court should accept this case for review because 1) it presents a question of first impression or novel question of law which should be submitted for final determination to the Supreme Judicial Court, and 2) it presents a question of such public interest that justice requires a final determination by the full Supreme Judicial Court.

Respectfully submitted,

KRISTIAN X. MARAJ
By his attorney,

/s/ Tara B. Ganguly
Tara B. Ganguly
BBO No. 667163
P.O. Box 1135
Greenfield, MA 01302
(413) 475-3796
tara@ganguly-law.com

Dated: June 16, 2026

APPENDIX

Trial Court Docket Entries.20

2084CR00279 Commonwealth vs. Maraj, Kristian Xavier

- Case Type:
- Indictment
- Case Status:
- Open
- File Date
- 10/30/2020
- DCM Track:
-
- Initiating Action:
- MANSLAUGHTER c265 §13
- Status Date:
- 03/25/2024
- Case Judge:
- Campo, Hon. Anthony M.
- Next Event:
-

[All Information](#) [Party](#) [Charge](#) [Event](#) [Docket](#) [Disposition](#)

Party Information

Suffolk County District Attorney
- Prosecutor

[Alias](#)

Party Attorney

- Attorney
- Bradley, Esq., David Stuart
- Bar Code
- 649910
- Address
- Suffolk County District Attorney
- One Bulfinch Place
- Boston, MA 02114
- Phone Number
- (617)619-4000
- Attorney
- McGowan, Esq., David D
- Bar Code
- 670041
- Address
- Suffolk County District Attorney's Office
- One Bulfinch Place
- Boston, MA 02114
- Phone Number
- (617)619-4000

[More Party Information](#)

Maraj, Kristian Xavier
- Defendant

[Alias](#)

Party Attorney

- Attorney
- Ganguly, Esq., Tara Beth
- Bar Code
- 667163
- Address
- PO Box 1135
- Greenfield, MA 01302
- Phone Number
- (413)475-3796
- Attorney
- Tripp, Esq., Jessica L
- Bar Code
- 663367
- Address
- The Law Office of Jessica L. Tripp
- 540 Gallivan Boulevard Suite 4
- Dorchester Center, MA 02124
- Phone Number
- (617)282-0244

Party Charge Information• **Maraj, Kristian Xavier**

• - Defendant

Charge # 1:

265/1-0 - Felony MURDER c265 §1

• Original Charge

• 265/1-0 MURDER c265 §1 (Felony)

• Indicted Charge

•

• Amended Charge

•

Charge Disposition

Disposition Date

Disposition

02/09/2024

Guilty Verdict

• **Maraj, Kristian Xavier**

• - Defendant

Charge # 2:

269/10/J-1 - Felony FIREARM, CARRY WITHOUT LICENSE c269 §10(a)

• Original Charge

• 269/10/J-1 FIREARM, CARRY WITHOUT LICENSE c269 §10(a) (Felony)

• Indicted Charge

•

• Amended Charge

•

Charge Disposition

Disposition Date

Disposition

02/09/2024

Guilty Verdict

Events

<u>Date</u>	<u>Session</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Event Judge</u>	<u>Result</u>
11/09/2020 09:00 AM	Criminal 1		Arraignment	Locke, Hon. Jeffrey A	Held as Scheduled
12/15/2020 09:30 AM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Roach, Christine M	Rescheduled
01/26/2021 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status		Rescheduled
01/26/2021 02:30 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
03/11/2021 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
04/14/2021 02:30 PM	Criminal 6		Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
04/15/2021 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
06/08/2021 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
06/08/2021 02:20 PM	Criminal 6		Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
09/09/2021 02:30 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held via Video/Phone
11/16/2021 02:50 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
12/21/2021 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
01/06/2022 02:10 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held via Video/Phone

<u>Date</u>	<u>Session</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Event Judge</u>	<u>Result</u>
02/17/2022 11:30 AM	Criminal 6		Non-Evidentiary Hearing to Dismiss	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
05/10/2022 02:10 PM	Criminal 6		Non-Evidentiary Hearing to Dismiss	Ames, Hon. Mary K	Rescheduled
07/11/2022 02:00 PM	Criminal 6	BOS-9th FL, CR 906 (SC)	Trial Assignment Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
07/12/2022 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
07/14/2022 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
09/06/2022 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
01/12/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ames, Hon. Mary K	Held as Scheduled
04/06/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
05/25/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Conference to Review Status	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
08/29/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Trial Readiness Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
09/19/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Trial Readiness Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Held as Scheduled
10/31/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Final Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Canceled
11/14/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Jury Trial	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Canceled
12/19/2023 02:00 PM	Criminal 6		Final Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Canceled
01/08/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 6		Jury Trial	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Canceled
01/11/2024 02:00 PM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Conference to Review Status	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held via Video/Phone
01/24/2024 02:00 PM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Final Pre-Trial Conference	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
01/25/2024 02:00 PM	Criminal 6	BOS-9th FL, CR 907 (SC)	Final Pre-Trial Conference	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
01/30/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Hearing on Motion(s) in Limine	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
01/31/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 6	BOS-9th FL, CR 907 (SC)	Jury Trial	Ullmann, Hon. Robert L	Rescheduled
01/31/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/01/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/02/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/05/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/06/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/07/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Rescheduled
02/07/2024 10:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Conference to Review Status	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/08/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
02/09/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Jury Trial	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled

Date	Session	Location	Type	Event Judge	Result
02/27/2024 09:30 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Hearing for Sentence Imposition	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Rescheduled
02/27/2024 02:00 PM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Conference to Review Status	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled
03/19/2024 09:00 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Hearing for Sentence Imposition	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Rescheduled
03/25/2024 10:30 AM	Criminal 5	BOS-8th FL, CR 817 (SC)	Hearing for Sentence Imposition	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	Held as Scheduled

Docket Information

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
10/30/2020	Indictment(s) returned	1	
10/30/2020	Attorney appearance On this date David Stuart Bradley, Esq. added as Attorney for the Commonwealth for Prosecutor Suffolk County District Attorney		
10/30/2020	Commonwealth 's Motion for an arrest warrant Filed	2	
10/30/2020	Endorsement on Motion for an arrest warrant , (#2.0): ALLOWED		
10/30/2020	Issued: Straight Warrant issued on 10/30/2020 for Maraj, Kristian Xavier		
11/02/2020	Order of notice of finding of murder indictment faxed to Suffolk County Sheriff's Department on 11/02/2020		
11/02/2020	The following notice was generated: Notice to AG/CJ of Murder Indictment Sent On: 11/02/2020 10:49:06		
11/09/2020	Attorney appearance On this date Christopher P Belezos, Esq. added as Appointed - Indigent Defendant for Defendant Kristian Xavier Maraj Appointment made for the purpose of Case in Chief by Judge Hon. Jeffrey A Locke.		
11/09/2020	Recalled: Straight Warrant cancelled on 11/09/2020 for Maraj, Kristian Xavier		
11/09/2020	Order of Notice returned to court: SERVED Order of Notice read to defendant at Nashua Street Jail.		
11/09/2020	Defendant on Zoom at Nashua Street Jail. Zoom Conference held. Arraignment held. Continued to 12-15-20 by agreement for Status in Rm 906 at 9:30am(Custody at Nashua St). Event Result:: Arraignment scheduled on: 11/09/2020 09:00 AM Has been: Held as Scheduled Hon. Jeffrey A Locke, Presiding Staff: Carol Mullen-Maguire, Assistant Clerk Magistrate James Pardi, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA C. Belezos, Atty FTR 1:08pm		
11/09/2020	Defendant arraigned before Court.		
11/09/2020	Defendant waives reading of indictment #002		
11/09/2020	Plea of not guilty entered on all charges.		
11/09/2020	Court inquires of Commonwealth if abuse, as defined by G.L. c. 209A, § 1, is alleged to have occurred immediately prior to or in connection with the charged offense(s).		
11/09/2020	Court finds NO abuse is alleged in connection with the charged offense. G.L. c. 276, § 56A.		
11/09/2020	The defendant\petitioner is committed without bail for the following reason: Is charged with 1st degree murder. Without prejudice. Mittimus Issued.	3	

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	Judge: Locke, Hon. Jeffrey A		
11/09/2020	1st Degree Murder indictment read in open court.		
12/04/2020	Event Result:: Conference to Review Status scheduled on: 12/15/2020 09:30 AM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: By Court prior to date Christine M Roach, Presiding Staff: Stacey Pichardo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
01/22/2021	Commonwealth files the statement of the case.	4	
01/25/2021	Event Result:: Conference to Review Status scheduled on: 01/26/2021 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Other event activity needed Comments: Time changed from 2:00PM to 2:30PM Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Stacey Pichardo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		Image
01/26/2021	Defendant present via Zoom from Nashua Street Jail. Conference to review Status held via Zoom. By agreement, this matter is continued to 3/11/2021 at 2:00PM for Pre-Trial Conference in Courtroom 906 via Zoom. Ullmann, RAJ - S. Pichardo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA (via Zoom) - C. Belezos, Atty (via Zoom) - FTR 2:30PM		
01/27/2021	Commonwealth 's Notice of Discovery II	5	
01/27/2021	Commonwealth 's Motion for a Protective Order	6	Image 
02/08/2021	Commonwealth 's Notice of Discovery II	7	Image 
03/11/2021	Event Result:: Pre-Trial Conference scheduled on: 03/11/2021 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Court Order Comments: Session is unavailable on March 11, 2021. Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Stacey Pichardo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		Image
04/09/2021	Event Result:: Pre-Trial Conference scheduled on: 04/15/2021 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Court Order Comments: Case advanced to 4/14/2021 (from 4/15/2021) Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Stacey Pichardo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
04/14/2021	Defendant present via Zoom from Nashua Street Jail. Conference to review Status held via Zoom. By agreement, this matter is continued to 6/08/2021 at 2:00PM for Pre-Trial Conference in Courtroom 906 via Zoom. Ullmann, RAJ - S. Pichardo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA (via Zoom) - C. Belezos, Atty (via Zoom) - FTR 2:30PM		
06/02/2021	Event Result:: Pre-Trial Conference scheduled on: 06/08/2021 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Other event activity needed Comments: Time changed to 2:20PM (from 2:00PM) Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Stacey Pichardo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
06/08/2021	Defendant present via Zoom from South Bay. Conference to Review Status held via Zoom. By agreement, this matter is continued to 9/09/2021 at 2:00PM for Conference to Review Status re: Discovery in Courtroom 906 via Zoom. FURTHER ORDERS OF THE COURT: 1. Any discovery motions that the Defendant wishes to be heard on at the 9/9/21 hearing shall be filed no later than 8/30/2021. 2. Commonwealth shall file any responsive pleadings to the Defendant's discovery motions no later than 9/7/2021.		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	Ullmann, RAJ - S. Pichardo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA (via Zoom) - C. Belezos, Atty (via Zoom) - FTR 2:30PM		
06/14/2021	Defendant 's Motion First Motion for Additional Discovery	8	
09/09/2021	In custody defendant is brought to court on video via Zoom from SCHOC. Status conference is held as scheduled via Zoom. Case is continued by agreement to 11/16/21 for Status Conference in CTRM 906 via Zoom **Jail list at SCHOC via Zoom. Ullmann, J. (RAJ) - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - C. Belezos, Atty. - FTR 2:42pm		Image
11/16/2021	Event Result:: Conference to Review Status scheduled on: 11/16/2021 02:50 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Joint request of parties Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
12/21/2021	Event Result:: Conference to Review Status scheduled on: 12/21/2021 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Request of Commonwealth Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding		
01/06/2022	In custody defendant is brought to court on video from NSJ. Status conference is held as scheduled via Zoom videoconferencing. Case is continued by agreement to 2/17/22 at 2:00pm for Motion to Dismiss. Out of court filing date for Motion to Dismiss is no later than 2/7/22 with a response due no later than 2/15/22. Ullmann, J (RAJ) - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - C. Belezos, Atty. - FTR 2:11 pm		
02/17/2022	Event Result:: Non-Evidentiary Hearing to Dismiss scheduled on: 02/17/2022 11:30 AM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: By Court prior to date Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
05/10/2022	Event Result:: Non-Evidentiary Hearing to Dismiss scheduled on: 05/10/2022 02:10 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Request of Commonwealth Comments: Agreed upon Deft present via Zoom from SBAY Motion to continue filed and allowed as endorsed. Commonwealth shall file Opposition by June 20,2022 Continued to 7/11/22 by agreement Re; Trial assignment (VI, 906) 2pm Zoom Jail list at SBAY Hon. Mary K Ames, Presiding Appeared: D. Bradley, ADA - C. Belezos, Atty. M Regan, Assistant Clerk Magistrate FTR: 2PM		
05/10/2022	Commonwealth 's Motion agreed upon Motion to Continue, Filed and Allowed by agreement, Hearing on July 11, 2022. Commonwealth shall file its Opposition on or before June 11, 2022, Ames/J Attorney: Bradley, Esq., David Stuart Judge: Ames, Hon. Mary K Applies To: Bradley, Esq., David Stuart (Attorney) on behalf of Suffolk County District Attorney (Prosecutor); Belezos, Esq., Christopher P (Attorney) on behalf of Maraj, Kristian Xavier (Defendant)	9	 Image
06/24/2022	Christopher P Belezos, Esq.'s Motion for Leave to Withdraw	10	
06/24/2022	Other 's Notice of Appearance (Jessica Tripp)	11	 Image
06/24/2022	Attorney appearance On this date Jessica L Tripp, Esq. added as Appointed - Indigent Defendant for Defendant Kristian Xavier Maraj Appointment made for the purpose of Case in Chief by Judge Hon. Mary K Ames.		Image
06/27/2022	Endorsement on Motion for Leave to Withdraw, (#10.0): ALLOWED		
06/27/2022	Attorney appearance On this date Christopher P Belezos, Esq. dismissed/withdrawn as Appointed - Indigent Defendant for		Image

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	Defendant Kristian Xavier Maraj		
07/07/2022	Commonwealth 's Motion to Continue, filed.	12	
07/08/2022	Event Result:: Trial Assignment Conference scheduled on: 07/11/2022 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Request of Commonwealth - see Motion P# 12 Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Tiffany Castillo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		Image
07/08/2022	Endorsement on Commonwealth's Motion to Continue, (#12.0): ALLOWED "Allowed in part to the extent that the Court will set a new date at a status conference on 7/12/22 at 2PM." Ullmann, J., 7/8/22.		 Image
07/12/2022	Event Result:: Conference to Review Status scheduled on: 07/12/2022 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Commonwealth failed to appear Comments: Commonwealth in Fourth Session. Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
07/14/2022	In custody defendant is brought to court on video from SCHOC. Status conference is held as scheduled. Case is continued by agreement to 9/6/22 at 2:00pm for Status Conference in Courtroom 906. Ullmann, J (RAJ) - T. Castillo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - FTR 2:37 pm		
09/06/2022	In custody defendant is brought to court on video via Zoom. Status conference is held. Hearing on Co-defendant's motion to dismiss is held and taken under advisement. Case is continued by agreement as follows: 01/12/23 at 2:00 pm in CTRM 906 for Status Conference 10/31/23 at 2:00 pm in CTRM 906 for Final Pre-Trial Hearing 11/14/23 at 9:00 am in CTRM 906 for Jury Trial Ullmann, J. (RAJ) - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - FTR		
09/07/2022	Scheduled: Event: Jury Trial Date: 11/14/2023 Time: 02:00 PM Result: Canceled		
01/12/2023	Defendant 's Motion for Return of Personal Property	13	
01/12/2023	In custody defendant is brought to court on video via Zoom. Status conference is held as scheduled. Case is continued by agreement to 4/6/23 at 2:00 pm in CTRM 906 for Motion Hearing re: Return of Property Ames, J. - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - 2:35 pm		Image
01/17/2023	Defendant 's Motion for Funds for Investigator	14	
01/17/2023	Endorsement on Motion for Funds for Investigator, (#14.0): ALLOWED in the procedures and rates established by CPCS		Image  Image
04/06/2023	In custody defendant is brought to on video via Zoom. Status conference is held as scheduled. Case is continued by agreement to 5/25/23 at 2:00 pm in CTRM 906 for Status Conference Ullmann, J. (RAJ) - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - FTR 2:55 pm		
05/25/2023	Endorsement on Motion for Return of Personal Property, (#13.0): ALLOWED without opposition		 Image
05/25/2023	In custody defendant is brought to court on video via Zoom. Status conference is held as scheduled. Case is continued by agreement to 8/29/23 at 2:00pm in CTRM 906 for Trial Readiness Conference. Ullmann, J. (RAJ) - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - FTR 2:25 pm		
05/30/2023	Scheduled: Event: Trial Readiness Conference Date: 08/29/2023 Time: 02:00 PM Result: Rescheduled		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
08/21/2023	Scheduled: Judge: Ullmann, Hon. Robert L Event: Trial Readiness Conference Date: 09/19/2023 Time: 02:00 PM Result: Held as Scheduled		
08/21/2023	Event Result:: Trial Readiness Conference scheduled on: 08/29/2023 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: By Court prior to date Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
09/19/2023	In custody defendant is brought to court on video via Zoom. Trial readiness conference is held as scheduled. Commonwealth's oral request to reschedule the Final Pre-Trial and Jury Trial dates is ALLOWED over the Defendant's objection. Court's Rule 36 findings are made on the record and the time between 9/19/23 - 1/8/24 is excluded. Case is continued as follows: 12/19/23 at 2:00 pm in CTRM 906 for Final Pre-Trial 01/08/24 at 9:00 am in CTRM 906 for Jury Trial (excluding 1/10/24) Ullmann, J. (RAJ) - J. Araujo, ACM - D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - FTR 3:06 pm		
09/20/2023	Event Result:: Jury Trial scheduled on: 11/14/2023 02:00 PM Has been: Canceled For the following reason: Request of Commonwealth Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
09/20/2023	Scheduled: Event: Jury Trial Date: 01/08/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Canceled		
12/01/2023	Commonwealth, Defendant 's Motion to Continue ALLOWED. No further continuances absent compelling circumstances. Ullmann, J. (12/4/23) Parties notified by electronic mail	15	 Image
12/05/2023	Event Result:: Jury Trial scheduled on: 01/08/2024 09:00 AM Has been: Canceled For the following reason: Joint request of parties Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
12/08/2023	Scheduled: Judge: Ullmann, Hon. Robert L Event: Jury Trial Date: 01/31/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Rescheduled		
12/08/2023	Docket Note: Motions in limine to be filed no later than 1/11/24 with responses due no later than 1/23/24		
01/11/2024	Defendant brought into court by Zoom. Status held as scheduled. All motions in limine to be filed by 1/24/24. FPTC rescheduled from 1/25/24 to 1/24/24 at 2PM. Case continued to 1/24/24. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty FTR - Zoom - 2:05 PM		
01/11/2024	Event Result:: Final Pre-Trial Conference scheduled on: 01/25/2024 02:00 PM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Transferred to another session Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
01/11/2024	Event Result:: Jury Trial scheduled on: 01/31/2024 09:00 AM		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: Transferred to another session Hon. Robert L Ullmann, Presiding Staff: Joanne Araujo, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
01/11/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 01/31/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		
01/22/2024	Defendant 's EX PARTE Motion for funds for a GSR expert; affidavit in support; filed and ALLOWED. (Campo, J.)	16	
01/22/2024	Defendant 's EX PARTE Motion for funds for investigator; affidavit in support; Filed and ALLOWED. (Campo, J.)	17	
01/24/2024	Defendant brought into court. Parties report ready for trial on 1/31/24 as scheduled. FPTC held. After hearing, case continued to 1/30/24 at 9:00 AM for hearing on motions in limine and for further FPTC. Empanelment to begin on 1/31/24 at previously scheduled. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty FTR - 2:27 PM		
01/24/2024	Request for jurors		
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion for reciprocal discovery; filed and ALLOWED. (Campo, J.)	18	
01/24/2024	Defendant 's proposed voir dire questions for the jury	19	
01/24/2024	Defendant 's Motion in limine to exclude the defendant's prior convictions	20	
01/24/2024	Defendant 's Motion in limine to sequester witnesses	21	
01/24/2024	Defendant 's Motion in limine to exclude any reference to alleged prior or subsequent bad acts of the defendant	22	
01/24/2024	Defendant 's Motion in limine to prohibit decedent's family from testifying	23	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth, Defendant 's Joint Pretrial Memorandum	24	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's proposed individual voir dire questions for purposes of jury empanelment	25	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine to allow a family photograph of the victim	26	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion for view	27	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's motion for judicial inquiry into criminal history records of potential trial jurors or in the alternative, notice of intent to independently seek such information for limited purposes of jury empanelment	28	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's motion for the trial judge to make specific factual findings regarding every potential juror and notice of process for evaluating whether a prima facie showing has been made of an improper use of peremptory challenge	29	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine to admit autopsy photographs	30	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine to admit audio from surveillance video	31	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine to exempt family members from the general order of sequestration	32	
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion to admit the 911 calls	33	

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
01/24/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion for the jury list	34	
01/25/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion to allow a demonstrative aid	34.11	 Image
01/26/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/02/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		 Image
01/26/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/05/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		
01/26/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/01/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of discovery III	34.1	
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of discovery IV	34.2	 Image
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of discovery V	34.3	 Image
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of discovery VI	34.4	 Image
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of discovery VII	34.5	 Image
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of discovery VIII	34.6	 Image
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's notice of disclosure	34.7	 Image
01/28/2024	Commonwealth 's Certificate of compliance regarding pre-trial discovery	34.8	 Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion for the Jury List, (#34.0): ALLOWED		 Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion for Judicial Inquiry into Criminal History Records of Potential Trial Jurors, or in the alternative, Notice of intent to independently seek such information for limited purposes of Jury Empanelment, (#28.0): ALLOWED		 Image Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion in Limine for specific factual findings regarding every potential Juror, (#29.0): DENIED as submitted. Court outlined it's procedure. Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M.		 Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion in limine to admit autopsy photographs, (#30.0): ALLOWED limited to 3. (Campo, J.) Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M.		 Image
01/30/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine to preclude the defendant from admitting, or referring to, evidence of his statements unless the Commonwealth introduces, or refers to, the statements first; filed ALLOWED; no objection. (Campo, J.)	35	 Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion to admit the 911 calls, (#33.0): ALLOWED as to Barbara Rose; RESERVED as to other 911 calls. (Campo, J.)		 Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion in limine to prohibit decedent's family from testifying, (#23.0): RESERVED. (Campo, J.)		 Image
01/30/2024	Endorsement on Motion in limine to exempt family members from the general order of sequestration, (#32.0): ALLOWED as to aunt, as discussed in open court. (Campo, J.) Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M.		 Image
01/30/2024	Defendant brought into court. Hearing on motions in limine held as scheduled. Case continued to tomorrow January 31, 2024 at 9:00 AM for jury selection. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty FTR - 9:30 AM		
01/30/2024	Defendant 's Motion for written McFarlane disclosures	36	
01/30/2024	Commonwealth 's list of potential witnesses	37	
01/30/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in opposition to the introduction of the Nest camera audio	35.1	
01/30/2024	Defendant 's Motion for disclosure of promises, rewards and inducements	35.2	
01/31/2024	Defendant brought into court. The Court finds that the courtroom is open to the public. Hearing held re: motions in limine, see record. Commonwealth orally moves to amend the indictments to correct spelling of the defendant's name; ALLOWED without objection. Case called for trial before Justice Campo. Commonwealth orally moves for trial, with defendant answering ready for trial. Defendant set at the bar for trial. Venire sworn. Jury selection begins. Eleven (11) seated jurors allowed to separate and are to return Friday February 2, 2024 at 9:00 AM for trial to commence. Case continued to tomorrow February 1, 2024 at 9:00 AM for jury selection to resume. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty F. LeRoux, C.R. Held in CRTM 817		
01/31/2024	Commonwealth 's Response to the defendant's opposition to the Nest.com audio	37.1	
01/31/2024	Commonwealth 's Notice of discovery IX	37.2	
01/31/2024	Commonwealth 's Notice of discovery X	37.3	
02/01/2024	Defendant brought into court. The Court finds that the courtroom is open to the public. Venire sworn. Empanelment resumes before Justice Campo. Five (5) additional seated jurors allowed to separate and are to return Friday February 2, 2024 at 9:00 AM. Case continued to tomorrow February 2, 2024 at 9:00 AM for trial to commence. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty F. LeRoux, C.R. Held in CRTM 817		
02/01/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/06/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
02/02/2024	Event Result:: Jury Trial scheduled on: 02/02/2024 09:00 AM Has been: Held as Scheduled 9:17am Deft brought into court 9:28am Voir Dire of witness Zandra Coleman held Note: Witness Zandra Coleman has an open warrant out of Dorchester BMC It is determined that after the witness testifies she will be taken into custody. ADA D. Bradley is to arrange transportation by the Boston Police to Dorchester Court this day. Transportation Mittimus Issued to docket 2107CR003532 9:50Am 16 Jurors present - Parties answer content with the Jury Court Finds the Court room open to the public 16 Jurors sworn - Indictments read-Pre Charge given Opening Statements. Evidence begins at 10:26 AM. By agreement trial suspends for the day at 3:50 PM. Sixteen (16) sworn jurors allowed to separate and are to return Monday February 5, 2024 at 9:00 AM. Case continued to Monday February 5, 2024 at 9:00 AM for trial to resume. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Appeared: ADA/ D. Bradley, Atty./ J. Tripp M. Regan / Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate F. Leroux, Court Reporter		
02/02/2024	Mittimus for Transportation for witness filed. Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	38	 Image
02/02/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine to prevent testimony regarding 911 calls and police reports involving eye witness	38.1	 Image
02/02/2024	Commonwealth 's Notice of discovery XII	38.2	 Image
02/02/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion in limine regarding McFarlane disclosures	38.3	 Image
02/02/2024	Commonwealth 's Notice of discovery XIII	38.4	 Image
02/02/2024	Defendant 's Motion allow inquiry regarding 911 calls for 37 Stonehurst Street	38.5	 Image
02/02/2024	Commonwealth 's Motion to exclude warrant evidence as irrelevant	38.6	 Image
02/02/2024	Commonwealth 's Notice of discovery XI	38.7	 Image
02/05/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/07/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Rescheduled		
02/05/2024	Defendant brought into court. Trial resumes with all sixteen (16) sworn jurors before Justice Campo at 9:21 AM. The Court goes on a view with the sixteen (16) sworn jurors. Court Officers sworn for the view. Evidence continues after return from the view at 11:30 AM. By agreement trial suspends for the day at 4:00 PM. Sixteen (16) sworn jurors allowed to separate and are to return tomorrow February 6, 2024 at 9:00 AM for trial to resume. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	F. LeRoux, C.R. Held in CRTM 817		
02/06/2024	Defendant 's Request for Voluntary Manslaughter Instruction	39	
02/06/2024	Defendant 's Motion that the "Reasonable Doubt" Charge be Given Last	40	
02/06/2024	Event Result:: Jury Trial scheduled on: 02/06/2024 09:00 AM Has been: Held as Scheduled Custody Defendant brought into court. Trial resumes before Campo, J. with sixteen (16) jurors present. Court inquires of Juror #4 in seat 1 at sidebar. After inquiry, both parties are content. (FTR 9:28am) Court makes a finding that the courtroom is open to the public. Evidences resumes at 9:34am. Commonwealth rests at 3:12pm. After hearing on the Defendant's Motion for a Required Finding of Not Guilty at the Close of the Commonwealth's Case, the motion is DENIED. (FTR 3:16pm). Court allows the sixteen (16) jurors to depart with instructions to return on Thursday 2/8/24 at 9:00am. Court conducts colloquy with Defendant at sidebar regarding his right not to testify. Continued by agreement to 2/7/24 for Status Conference (Charge Conference) at 10:00am in CTRM 817. Continued by agreement to 2/8/24 for Jury Trial at 9:00am in CTRM 817. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding - D.Bradley, ADA - J.Tripp, Esq. - F.LeRoux, Court Reporter - FTR 9:22am Staff: Abigail Bryan, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
02/06/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/08/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		
02/06/2024	Event Result:: Jury Trial scheduled on: 02/07/2024 09:00 AM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: By Court prior to date Comments: Trial to resume on Thursday 2/8/24 at Defendant's request. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Staff: Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
02/06/2024	Defendant 's Motion for a Required Finding of Not Guilty at the Close of the Commonwealth's Case is filed and DENIED after hearing.	41	
02/06/2024	Commonwealth 's Request for jury instructions	41.1	
02/06/2024	Commonwealth 's opposition to a manslaughter instruction	41.2	
02/07/2024	Event Result:: Conference to Review Status scheduled on: 02/07/2024 10:00 AM Has been: Held as Scheduled Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Staff: Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate Defendant brought into Court; Charge conference held; matter continued to 2/8.24 for Arguments & Charge. Campo,J. - D.Bradley, ADA - J.Tripp, Attny -FTR @ 10:00AM & F.LeRoux, C/R.		
02/08/2024	Defendant brought into Court; arguments and charge held; juror in seat #'s 1,3,4 & 8 selected as alternates; juror in seat #14 chosen as foreperson; jury sent out for deliberations @ 11:30AM. Jury Question received at 2:31 PM is marked "K" for Identification. The Court's response to the Jury Question is included in ID-K. Jury deliberations suspend for the day at 4:00 PM. Twelve (12) deliberating jurors and four (4)		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	alternate jurors are allowed to depart with instructions from the Court and shall reconvene on February 9, 2024, at 9:00 AM for Continuation of Jury Deliberations in Courtroom 817. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Appeared: D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - F. Leroux, C/R Staff: Rourke Donnelly, Assistant Clerk Magistrate Rebeca Figueroa, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
02/08/2024	Defendant 's Motion for Required Finding of Not Guilty at the Close of the Evidence filed After hearing, denied - Campo,J.	42	 Image
02/08/2024	Scheduled: Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M. Event: Jury Trial Date: 02/09/2024 Time: 09:00 AM Result: Held as Scheduled		
02/09/2024	Custody Defendant is brought into court from the Suffolk County Jail. Jury Trial continues with a panel of twelve (12) deliberating jurors and four (4) alternate jurors present before Campo, J. The Court, Campo, J., makes a finding that the courtroom is open. Jury deliberations resume at 9:30 AM. Verdict returned at 12:25 PM. As to Offense #001 - Guilty of Manslaughter As to Offense #002 - Guilty of Offense as Charged The Defendant remains held on a mittimus without bail. Continued by Agreement to February 27, 2024, at 9:30 AM for Hearing Re: Sentence Imposition in Courtroom 817. - Jail List Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Appeared: D. Bradley, ADA - J. Tripp, Atty. - F. Leroux, C/R Staff: Rebeca Figueroa, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
02/09/2024	Offense Disposition:: Charge #1 MANSLAUGHTER c265 §13 265/13/A-0 On: 02/09/2024 Judge: Hon. Anthony M. Campo By: Jury Trial Guilty Verdict Charge #2 FIREARM, CARRY WITHOUT LICENSE c269 §10(a) On: 02/09/2024 Judge: Hon. Anthony M. Campo By: Jury Trial Guilty Verdict		
02/09/2024	Verdict affirmed, verdict slip filed As to Offense #001 - Guilty of Manslaughter	43	 Image
02/09/2024	Verdict affirmed, verdict slip filed As to Offense #002 - Guilty of the Offense as Charged	44	 Image
02/09/2024	Witness list Jury Trial Applies To: Suffolk County District Attorney (Prosecutor); Maraj, Kristian Xavier (Defendant)	45	
02/14/2024	List of exhibits Jury Trial Applies To: Suffolk County District Attorney (Prosecutor); Maraj, Kristian Xavier (Defendant)	46	 Image
02/20/2024	Defendant 's EX PARTE Motion for funds for a social worker; affidavit in support; filed and ALLOWED. (Campo, J.)	47	 Image
02/21/2024	Event Result:: Hearing for Sentence Imposition scheduled on: 02/27/2024 09:30 AM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: By Court prior to date Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
	Staff: Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
02/27/2024	Exhibits Returned Exhibit #s 12 - 23, 31, 32, 34, and 41 returned to ADA Bradley	48	 Image
02/27/2024	Defendant brought into court by Zoom. Status held as scheduled. By agreement, case continued to 3/19/24 at 9AM for sentencing. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty FTR - 2:09 PM		
03/12/2024	Commonwealth files sentence recommendation	49	 Image
03/13/2024	Defendant files sentence recommendation ; aid in sentencing report attached (IMPOUNDED)	50	 Image
03/15/2024	Event Result:: Hearing for Sentence Imposition scheduled on: 03/19/2024 09:00 AM Has been: Rescheduled For the following reason: By Court prior to date Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Staff: Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate		
03/25/2024	Defendant sentenced:: Sentence Date: 03/25/2024 Judge: Hon. Anthony M. Campo Charge #: 1 MANSLAUGHTER c265 §13 State Prison Sentence Not Less Than: 17 Years, 0 Months, 0 Days Not More Than: 20 Years, 0 Months, 0 Days Charge #: 2 FIREARM, CARRY WITHOUT LICENSE c269 §10(a) State Prison Sentence Not Less Than: 3 Years, 0 Months, 0 Days Not More Than: 4 Years, 0 Months, 0 Days Served Concurrently Committed to Souza Baranowski Correctional Center Credits 1358 Days		
03/25/2024	Issued on this date: Mittimus for Sentence (All Charges) Sent On: 03/25/2024 11:53:18	51	 Image
03/25/2024	Defendant brought into court. Sentencing held as scheduled. Victim impact statements given to the Court. After hearing the Court sentences the defendant: Offense #001: 17 YEARS - 20 YEARS imprisoned at the Souza Baranowski Correctional Center (1,358 days credit). Offense #002: 3 YEARS - 4 YEARS imprisoned at the Souza Baranowski Correctional Center, concurrent with sentence imposed on Offense #001. Defendant notified of obligation to submit a DNA sample. The Court waives \$110 DNA fee and \$90 VWF and vacates the \$150 LCF. Defendant notified of rights of appeal pursuant to Superior Court Rules 64 and 65. Defendant committed pursuant to this sentence. Hon. Anthony M. Campo, Presiding Danielle Bisson, Assistant Clerk Magistrate D. Bradley, ADA J. Tripp, Atty FTR - 11:18AM, 11:45AM		

Docket Date	Docket Text	File Ref Nbr.	Image Avail.
03/25/2024	Findings and Order of Statutory Fees Vacated \$150 LCF waived \$110 DNA \$90 VWF Judge: Campo, Hon. Anthony M.	52	 Image
03/25/2024	Defendant 's Motion to withdraw; filed and ALLOWED. (Campo, J.)	53	 Image
03/25/2024	Notice of appeal filed. Applies To: Maraj, Kristian Xavier (Defendant)	54	 Image
04/02/2024	Notice of appeal from sentence to Souza Baranowski Correctional Center filed by defendant	55	 Image
04/02/2024	Notification to the Appellate Division sent.		
04/03/2024	Document: Letter to the Appellate Division Sent On: 04/03/2024 10:10:54		
04/03/2024	Appeal for review of sentence entered at the Appellate Division: Originating Court: Suffolk County Criminal Receiving Court: Suffolk County Criminal Case Number: 2484AD092-SU ;		
08/15/2024	Pro Se Defendant 's Motion to be declared indigent with affidavit of indigency and supporting documents, filed. (affidavit of indigency and supporting documents SEALED) (notice, copy of motion and docket sheets sent to Campo, J.)	56	 Image
08/26/2024	Endorsement on Pro Se Defendant 's Motion to be declared indigent with affidavit of indigency and supporting documents, (#56.0): ALLOWED 8/26/24- Allowed. Campo, J. (Copy of Endorsement, and Clerk's Notice Sent To ADA D. Bradley, Pro Se Defendant, and Emailed To D. Mele CPCS)		 Image
10/21/2024	ORDER: The appeal of the defendant for review of sentence to the Souza Baranowski Correctional Center, imposed March 25, 2024 on indictment 2084CR00279 and by the Superior Court Department for the County of Suffolk having been heard and reviewed, it is ORDERED: that the judgments imposing said sentences stand and that said appeal be and is hereby dismissed. McGuire, Sullivan & Ames, JJ	57	 Image
03/03/2025	Attorney appearance On this date Tara Beth Ganguly, Esq. added as Appointed - Appellate Action for Defendant Kristian Xavier Maraj		
03/03/2025	Tara Beth Ganguly, Esq.'s Notice of Appearance, filed.	58	 Image
03/05/2025	General correspondence regarding letter received from CPCS assigning Attorney Tara Beth Ganguly, filed.	59	 Image
04/28/2025	CD of Transcript of 01/30/2024 09:00 AM Hearing on Motion(s) in Limine, 02/27/2024 09:30 AM Hearing for Sentence Imposition, 03/25/2024 10:30 AM Hearing for Sentence Imposition received from Jolanta Ewing.		
06/01/2026	CD of Transcript of 01/31/2024 09:00 AM Jury Trial, 02/01/2024 09:00 AM Jury Trial, 02/02/2024 09:00 AM Jury Trial, 02/05/2024 09:00 AM Jury Trial, 02/06/2024 09:00 AM Jury Trial, 02/07/2024 10:00 AM Conference to Review Status, 03/25/2024 10:30 AM Hearing for Sentence Imposition received from Attorney Tara Ganguly.		
06/05/2026	Attorney appearance On this date David D McGowan, Esq. added as Attorney for the Commonwealth for Prosecutor Suffolk County District Attorney		
06/05/2026	Appeal: Statement of the Case on Appeal (Cover Sheet).	60	 Image
06/05/2026	Notice of assembly of record sent to Counsel		
06/05/2026	Notice to Clerk of the Appeals Court of Assembly of Record		
06/08/2026	Appeal entered in Appeals Court on 06/05/2026 docket number 2026-P-0792	61	 Image

Case Disposition		
Disposition	Date	Case Judge
Disposed by Jury Verdict	03/25/2024	Campo, Hon. Anthony M.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify consistent with Mass. R. App. P. 16(k) that this Application For Direct Appellate Review complies with the rules of court that pertain to the filing of briefs, including, but not limited to: Mass. R. App. P. 16(a)(13), 16(e), 18, 20, and 21. This Application For Direct Appellate Review contains 1,996 non-excludable words in Times New Roman 14 pt proportionally spaced type in the Argument section. Microsoft Word Version 2026 was used to prepare this brief.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this 16th day of June 2026.

/s/ Tara B. Ganguly

Tara B. Ganguly
BBO No. 667163
P.O. Box 1135
Greenfield, MA 01302
(413) 475-3796
tara@ganguly-law.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 16, 2026 I filed this Application For Direct Appellate Review through the Electronic Filing Service Provider (Provider) for electronic service to the following registered User: ADA David D. McGowan of the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office. Non-registered user service was not required.

/s/ Tara B. Ganguly

Tara B. Ganguly
BBO No. 667163
P.O. Box 1135
Greenfield, MA 01302
(413) 475-3796
tara@ganguly-law.com

AFFIDAVIT OF COUNSEL PURSUANT TO M.R.A.P. 13(a)

I, Tara B. Ganguly, counsel for the defendant-appellant, Kristian X. Maraj, in the above-entitled matter, hereby certify, in accordance with Massachusetts Rule of Appellate Procedure 13(a), that I filed the Application For Direct Appellate Review for Defendant-Appellant, via the Electronic Filing Service Provider, on June 16, 2026 before the date the Application was due.

SIGNED UNDER THE PAINS AND PENALTIES OF PERJURY THIS
16th DAY OF JUNE 2026.

/s/ Tara B. Ganguly

Tara B. Ganguly
BBO No. 667163
P.O. Box 1135
Greenfield, MA 01302
(413) 475-3796
tara@ganguly-law.com