

NOTICE: All slip opinions and orders are subject to formal revision and are superseded by the advance sheets and bound volumes of the Official Reports. If you find a typographical error or other formal error, please notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Judicial Court, John Adams Courthouse, 1 Pemberton Square, Suite 2500, Boston, MA, 02108-1750; (617) 557-1030; SJCReporter@sjc.state.ma.us

SJC-13894
SJC-13902
SJC-13905

JANET J. PIDGE vs. THE GOVERNOR & others.¹

October 22, 2026.

Supreme Judicial Court, Superintendence of inferior courts.
Practice, Civil, Service.

In December 2025, the petitioner, Janet J. Pidge, filed a petition pursuant to G. L. c. 211, § 3, in the county court asking the court to vacate two decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts; vacate a Housing Court judgment; and order the respondents to make a monetary settlement. A single justice (first single justice) denied the petition. Although Pidge filed a timely notice of appeal and the record was assembled, the full court returned the record to the county court because Pidge had failed to comply with Mass. R. A. P. 10 (a), as appearing in 481 Mass. 1618 (2019), or S.J.C. Rule 2:21, as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001). Pidge thereafter filed a motion in the county court to reinstate the appeal; she also sought appointment of counsel. A different single justice (second single justice) allowed the motion to reinstate the appeal but denied the motion for appointment of counsel. The appeal was subsequently entered in the full court on February 20, 2026.

On that same date, Pidge filed, in the full court, another motion for appointment of counsel, which was referred to the second single justice for disposition and denied. Shortly thereafter, on February 26, 2026, Pidge filed a memorandum

¹ Various local, State, and Federal officials and entities.

pursuant to S.J.C. Rule 2:21, as well as a motion for alternative service. The latter was referred to the second single justice and denied. In addition to the underlying appeal from the denial of her G. L. c. 211, § 3, petition, Pidge has also appealed from the denials of the two referred motions, i.e., the denial of her motion for appointment of counsel and the denial of her motion for alternative service. Those appeals were entered in the full court on February 27, 2026, and March 3, 2026, respectively. In both of those appeals, as in the underlying appeal, Pidge has filed a memorandum pursuant to rule 2:21.

Notwithstanding the denial of Pidge's motion for alternative service, she failed to file, in any of the three appeals, certificates of service demonstrating that she had properly served each of the respondents in compliance with Mass. R. A. P. 13, as appearing in 481 Mass. 1624 (2019). Moreover, even if she had complied with the rule, and had effectuated proper service on all parties, she would not be entitled to relief in any event. The first single justice did not err or abuse his discretion in denying Pidge's G. L. c. 211, § 3, petition. As he rightly noted, where Pidge sought relief from two Federal court decisions, Pidge's remedy lies with the Federal court. There was, similarly, no error or abuse of discretion in the second single justice's denial of Pidge's motion for appointment counsel -- something to which Pidge is not entitled -- or her motion for alternative service.

Appeals dismissed.

The cases were submitted on the papers filed, accompanied by memoranda of law.

Janet J. Pidge, pro se.