THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

HILLSBOROUGH 9TH CIRCUIT-DISTRICT DIVISION

NASHUA DOCKET No. 459-2021-CR-00606

STATE of NEW HAMPSHIRE

v.

LAURIE ORTOLANO

**MOTION TO REQUEST A DATE FOR A NOTICE OF DECISION**

The Defendant, Laurie Ortolano is requesting the Court kindly provide an anticipated date for the ruling on the Motion to Intervene filed by the City of Nashua on September 12, 2022 and the Motion for Annulment filed on July 2, 2022.

The Defendant was well represented by Attorney Timothy Goulden on this matter. Attorney Goulden believed an order on this matter would be forthcoming within a month of filing. Attorney Goulden is baffled by the Court’s delay and did not want to bug the Court because of the potential negative ramifications to the case and his reputation.

It is unfortunate that paid Attorneys are concerned about communicating with the Court about grossly missed deadlines. Ortolano has requested that Attorney Goulden remove himself as counsel so she can address this matter with the Court. It is punitive and unprofessional for the Courts to force citizens to pay legal bills to try to figure out why order are not forthcoming.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The Defendant believes that the Court has a responsibility to conduct business in a professional manner. The deadline missed is this case is unprofessional and attempting to follow up has yielded unresponsive results.

Annulments are granted to permit citizens to move their lives forward in a positive and productive manner. The failure to act on the motion to intervene and the annulment has had a major impact on the Defendant’s life. Ortolano understands that the Court probably could care less about the lives of its citizens, but Ortolano believes she is entitled to an efficient, reasonable and professional response from the Court.

The Defendant has numerous cases in Civil Court before Judge Temple. As a pro se Plaintiff, a hearing was held on November 10, 2022 on 4 matters. The Judge was to produce an order within 60 days. At 75 days, Ortolano planned on writing to the Civil court and requesting an update on the motions before the Court. To her pleasure and welcomed surprise, the Court issued a Notice on January 23, 2020, noting that the orders were late and would be forthcoming by February 3, 2023.

The Defendant has been told in civil court that the timeframe for orders to be issued is 60 days or less. What is the timeframe set for criminal court? When the court misses its deadlines, why are not new deadlines set and sent to the parties? In the absence of information, when one is left to formulate an opinion, it is not typically positive. The Defendant’s opinions are not positive.

The annulment has been before the Court for approximately 200 days and the City of Nashua’s Motion to intervene and request for a hearing has been before the court for approximately 135 days. The clerks at the criminal counter are very professional but are unable to provide any response to an anticipated closure for this matter.[[2]](#footnote-2) The Defendant is being strung along.

In November 2022, Attorney Goulden followed up on the matter and learned from a clerk that the file was on the Judge’s desk. Attorney Goulden conveyed that a decision would be “any day.”

In mid-December 2022, Ortolano went to the clerk’s counter to inquire about a filing noted on the Court index dated July 7, 2022, titled “Notice of Decision”. Ortolano learned that the Department of Corrections runs a report to determine if various state agencies support the annulment. Ortolano requested a copy of this record and Melissa agreed to look into it but no one provide the record.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Per Part 1, Article 8 of the Bill of Rights of the NH Constitution, Ortolano is requesting a copy or inspection of the record sent by the Agency that investigated the request for annulment.

In December 2022, Attorney Goulden followed up again and was told the Judge denied the City’s Motion to Intervene and the order would be mailed within a day. No order arrived.

On or about December 22, 2022, the Defendant went to the clerk’s counter and requested a copy. Melissa explained that the Judge forgot to rule on the annulment and the file was sent back to the Judge’s desk. Melissa compassionately stated that she hoped it would be out next week.

On or about January 9, 2023, Attorney Goulden called the Court requesting an update. The Clerk stated that she would work to get the order signed.

Today, January 26, 2023, the Defendant went to the Clerk’s desk to see of the order was completed. It was not and remains on the Judge’s Desk.

The Defendant respectfully requests an anticipated date for closure for this matter and requests that the Court institute a system that responds to missed deadlines and provides professional responses to those in Criminal Court.

Date

 Sincerely,

January 26, 2023,

 /s/Laurie Ortolano

 41 Berkeley St

 Nashua, NH 03064

 603-930-2853

 laurieortolano@gmail.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A copy of this Motion has been given to the Nashua Police Department, Legal Bureau.

/s/Laurie Ortolano

1. The Defendant has paid more than $300,000 into the legal system since January 2020 on Right-to-Know Petitions and a criminal case. The Defendant is tired of funding court inefficiency. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ortolano spoke with Melissa numerous times, Lisa and Kim. She believes she might have spoken to Sherri Bisson as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ortolano called the Department of Corrections and, the week prior to Christmas, was able to speak with the man who sent the report to the Court. He conveyed that there were no issues in the State report and was clear that the Judge could overrule their input. He could not provide a copy of the report because he stated that they are deleted from their system when they are sent to the Court. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)