IN RE: JTforME.COM — NOTICE OF SUBSTANTIAL REVISION, EIGHT BOOKS, ONE RECKONING, AND THE APPARENT NEED TO EXPLAIN PUBLIC SERVICE TO ITS PROFESSIONAL CUSTODIANS

Justin A. Tahai

Publication date: this 30th day of October 2026.

TO THE INCUMBENT HOLDERS OF PUBLIC OFFICE; THE MEMBERS OF THE SELF-STYLED LEARNED PROFESSIONS; THE CUSTODIANS OF MAINE'S PUBLIC PURSE; AND ALL OTHER PERSONS WHO HAVE COME TO REGARD THEIR OCCUPATIONAL TITLES AS A REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION THAT OUGHT NEVER, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, ACTUALLY TO BE REBUTTED:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that JTforME.com has been substantially revised, enlarged, and equipped with additional research, practical resources, and proposed reforms. The work is published for public examination—not as yet another ceremony at which citizens are invited to admire the architecture of an institution while being advised, regrettably, that its doors remain unavailable to them.

WHEREAS, the existence of a procedure is not proof that it works; the issuance of an order is not proof that its practical purpose has been accomplished; and the generation of a receipt is not proof that anything useful was received;

WHEREAS, the public did not create courts, legislatures, or executive departments to provide lifetime employment in the production of impressively formatted explanations for why no one can presently do anything;

WHEREAS, a child's birthday cannot be restored by order nunc pro tunc, childhood cannot be stayed pending administrative convenience, and the passage of a year is not cured by affixing the word expedited to a filing;

NOW, THEREFORE, the following is submitted for inspection, serious rebuttal, and such peaceful civic action as the evidence and the People may warrant. Objections resting exclusively upon wounded professional dignity are respectfully noted and afforded no evidentiary weight whatsoever.

I. THE REFORM DESK — EVIDENCE INTO ACTION, RATHER THAN EVIDENCE INTO ANOTHER INBOX

JTforME now presents The Reform Desk, a research-and-public-resource undertaking addressing court rules, eFiling barriers, family records, implementation failures, public-sector performance, and proposed legislative repairs. Its purpose is embarrassingly straightforward: identify a problem, show the source, specify the corrective action, identify who owns it, and measure whether it happened.

The Reform Desk is supported by a TAHAI Press-compatible, publisher-owned editorial workflow. This is not a representation that the complete upstream TAHAI Press generator has been installed or that every production integration is live. Unlike some institutions discussed herein, this publication intends to distinguish the completion of work from the ceremonial announcement of its imminent completion.

II. ONE RULE. ONE FIX. AN OCCASIONAL MIRACLE CALLED AN ANSWER

Each examination proceeds from an identifiable rule or operating practice to an identified defect, a proposed improvement, and a test of whether the improvement actually works.

The traditional incantation “that is how it has always been done” is hereby entered into evidence solely as an admission that the speaker knows the age of the practice. It establishes neither wisdom nor legality, neither efficiency nor fairness, and certainly no entitlement to invoice the public for the privilege of hearing it again.

For avoidance of doubt, a meeting is not a remedy; a referral is not a resolution; a docket entry is not implementation; and a motion marked pending is not a childhood placed in secure storage.

III. PUBLIC RECORDS, PRACTICAL TOOLS, AND THE RADICAL NOTION OF CORRECTING AN ERROR

The publication distinguishes official records, party allegations, analysis, opinion, and proposed reforms. Its free administrative resources include chronology worksheets, record indexes, correspondence trackers, and implementation checklists. These are practical aids, not a law practice, adjudication, or invitation to publish a child's private life.

Corrections supported by evidence are welcome. An institution confident in its conclusions should welcome the same exercise. If the proposition is true, show the source. If it is contested, disclose the dispute. If it is wrong, correct it. The professional ability to say “upon further review, we were mistaken” would, in several bureaucratic settings, qualify as a genuinely disruptive innovation.

IV. EIGHT BOOKS. ONE RECKONING. NO REQUIREMENT THAT THE READER FIRST PURCHASE AN OPINION

This related literary and civic undertaking comprises seven books across two series and an eighth, free civic companion.

The No “Moore” Harm Series: Carpooling to Hell; IN RE: The Tyranny of Family Law; and Trial by Fire.

Treasonous Cowards: The Legal Racket; Duties of Candor; Insidious Ignorance; and Organized Treason.

The free companion: The Call Out: War.

The books examine personal records, professional ethics, institutional incentives, risks to children and families, public expenditures, and public accountability. Their titles are intentionally severe. They are not, by themselves, proof of any alleged crime. In particular, Organized Treason is a political and moral indictment, not a claim that the strictly defined constitutional offense of treason has been judicially established.

Readers are invited to examine the arguments. Those preferring to litigate the emotional effect of the titles while leaving their actual premises unanswered are reminded that offense is not an evidentiary exhibit, and indignation is not a counterargument.

V. THE SO-CALLED LEARNED PROFESSION — A FORMAL REQUEST THAT THE LEARNING COMMENCE

To the profession proudly calling itself learned: the public has one modest inquiry. At what point, precisely, does the learning begin to show in the result?

A juris doctorate establishes the completion of an academic course. It does not confer infallibility, manufacture good judgment, suspend the laws of child development, or transform a failure of implementation into success through the application of sufficiently ornate Latin.

A black robe is not a performance metric. An impressive caption is not a functioning remedy. A seventeen-page explanation that a parent has filed the wrong attachment may be a triumph of document classification; it is not necessarily a triumph of justice. The mere fact that a profession can produce a footnote should not mean that the public must thereafter live beneath it.

Research concerning adverse childhood experiences, chronic conflict, and protective relationships supplies reasons to assess foreseeable risk carefully. It does not decide an individual custody dispute, justify unsafe contact, or establish that an identified official caused a particular outcome. It does, however, challenge any system that treats evidence about human consequences as an optional appendix to the preservation of professional routine.

One would hope that a profession capable of distinguishing res judicata from stare decisis could, with a little additional training, distinguish a child from a case number.

The public is not asking credentialed professionals to abandon their training. It is asking them, finally, to put the training to work.

VI. COMPETING HARMS — THE APPARENTLY ADVANCED MATHEMATICS OF COUNTING TO TWO

Maine's competing-harms defense, 17-A M.R.S. § 103, is a narrow doctrine of criminal law concerning imminent physical harm. It does not control family-contact orders, displace the best-interests standard, or authorize anyone to disobey an order. The reference here is an ethical analogy, not a legal defense.

The analogy is this: a decision-maker confronted with credible risks should identify and examine all material risks, not become so pleased with having recognized the first that the second is deemed an affront to professional dignity.

Unsafe contact must be taken seriously. So must the potential consequences of unnecessary or prolonged separation from a safe, nurturing relationship. The answer is not a slogan or a presumption for either parent. It is competent assessment, safe alternatives, clear reasons, workable logistics, a duration, a review trigger, and accountability for what happens next.

If an institution can perceive one harm only by becoming institutionally blind to another, it has not performed a sophisticated balancing test. It has demonstrated the practical hazards of having only one eye open while charging the public for binoculars.

VII. PUBLIC MONEY, PRIVATE DELIVERY, AND THE MIRACULOUS SELF-CERTIFYING INVOICE

A contract is not proof of an effective service. A vendor's completion report is not proof of a successful public outcome. Nor does an unhappy user's experience, without more, establish fraud, breach, or conspiracy. Those are evidentiary questions, which is precisely why the questions must actually be asked.

What was purchased? What were the acceptance criteria? What was paid? Which defects were reported? Who had authority to approve the work? What corrections occurred? What changed for the public?

The taxpayer, having already purchased the service, should not also be obliged to purchase a translator, a procedural education, and a commemorative mug announcing that the defect has been forwarded to the appropriate department.

A purchase order can establish that money moved. It cannot establish that justice followed.

VIII. THE COLD WAR, THE HUMAN SHADOW, AND THE UNSPORTING REQUIREMENT OF SELF-EXAMINATION

The phrase cold war describes procedural attrition and institutional inertia, not literal combat. The titles and rhetoric of the publications are political criticism, not findings of criminal guilt.

There is, however, a more uncomfortable principle: vanity, anger, pride, fear of embarrassment, loyalty to colleagues, and the irresistible pleasure of being right are not defects exclusive to the legal profession. They are human tendencies. Public authority merely gives them greater reach, greater cost, and sometimes an exceptionally well-appointed office.

The author is bound by the same standard demanded of everyone else: preserve adverse evidence, distinguish assertion from finding, admit a correction when due, and refuse to make a child carry an adult's desire for vindication.

No one gets to claim the moral high ground by constructing a private elevator to it.

IX. THE ABRIDGED GOOD-FAITH WARNING — FOR PERSONS IN NEED OF REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SUBSTANCE OVER STATIONERY

TAKE FURTHER NOTICE: certain exceedingly educated persons appear to have mistaken politeness for good faith, profanity for proof of danger, and professional discomfort for a legally cognizable injury.

A politely spoken “please come closer” can, in context, be a statement of bad intent. An exasperated “get the fuck out of my way and stop harming my child” can, in context, be a perfectly sincere demand to cease obstruction and protect a child. Neither sentence is judged by upholstery, letterhead, diction, or the number of initials following the speaker's name. Intent and threat must be evaluated in context, by actual words and conduct—not by whether the speaker has offended the linguistic preferences of a person wearing a tie.

These are children and their futures. Their safety, stability, and access to genuinely protective relationships deserve more than a succession of appointments to discuss whether another appointment should be scheduled. The legitimate obligation to prevent one danger does not excuse indifference to another. That is the good-faith warning.

LET THE RECORD REFLECT: this is a demand for lawful, nonviolent public accountability—transparent review, evidence-based correction, peaceful petition, political action, elections, oversight, and, where the public concludes it warranted, resignation. It is no threat of force, no invitation to harass or intimidate anyone, and no permission to disobey a court order.

Taxes and tea made for a memorable civics lesson. Children losing irreplaceable years should make for a more urgent one.

X. DEMAND FOR RESIGNATIONS — A BRIEF PROCEDURE REQUIRING NO NEW SOFTWARE, TASK FORCE, OR CONTINUANCE

AND NOW, IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE FOREGOING GOOD-FAITH WARNING, SPECIFIC NOTICE IS ADDRESSED TO:

THE PRESENTLY SEATED JUSTICES OF THE MAINE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT SITTING AS THE LAW COURT; GOVERNOR JANET T. MILLS AND THE EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP OF HER ADMINISTRATION; AND THE INCUMBENT MEMBERS OF THE MAINE SENATE, WITHOUT REGARD TO PARTY AFFILIATION.

SHOW SOME GODDAMN CLASS FOR ONCE IN YOUR CAREERS.

If you are no longer prepared to defend your institution's performance with evidence, candor, competent administration, and actual results, then consider the rare public-sector reform achievable without a new appropriations request: resign.

Accordingly, the undersigned publicly calls upon the identified officeholders voluntarily to tender their resignations by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Friday, November 6, 2026, and to make way—through the lawful constitutional and democratic procedures applicable to each office—for persons willing to accept that public servant describes a duty, not a social rank.

No special committee is required to determine whether this proposal is understood. No consultant need be retained to translate the word resign. No state-funded feasibility study need investigate whether an officeholder can locate a pen. No expert testimony required to adjudicate your incompetence. Should any of you insist upon a continuance for purposes of locating the requisite professional dignity, that motion is opposed as untimely, unnecessary, and spectacularly beside the point.

This is a political demand, not a legally binding deadline or a claimed power of removal. An officeholder may decline. The People may respond through peaceful criticism, petitions, elections, lawful oversight, and the ordinary constitutional mechanisms of accountability. No violence, unlawful obstruction, or coercion is requested or endorsed.

A title is not a defense. A résumé is not a remedy. And the continued occupancy of an office shall not be mistaken for evidence that the occupant has fulfilled its purpose.

XI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS — INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO ASK WHAT, IF ANYTHING, WAS ACCOMPLISHED

The legislative proposals remain drafts, not enacted law or an official ballot measure. The Reform Desk is not a court, an attorney, or a private case-intake service. Personal allegations are not presented as judicial findings; I write with a level of candor clearly unknown to the judiciary. Research about populations is not a verdict in an individual case. And a publishing workflow is not declared complete merely because its name appears in the footer.

Substantive rebuttal is welcome. Identify the inaccurate fact, supply the contrary evidence, explain the rule, defend the measured outcome, or propose a better remedy. The author will apply the same standard to his own work.

WHEREFORE, all interested persons are invited to examine the publication, inspect the sources, challenge the conclusions, and demand improvements where the record warrants them. Requests that criticism be deferred until institutional self-esteem has recovered are DENIED, with prejudice to further delay without explicitly promised promptness (Me. Const. art. I, § 19).

The Reform Desk: https://www.jtforme.com/reform-desk/ The public project: https://www.jtforme.com/

Respectfully submitted. Deference expressly withheld.

/s/Justin Aryan Tahai, Potentially Prospective Father of the Founding-variety

Sources for further reading: Maine's competing-harms statute, 17-A M.R.S. § 103; CDC, Preventing Adverse Childhood Experiences; CDC, Risk and Protective Factors; U.S. Constitution, Article III.