

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SUPERIOR COURT
MERRIMACK COUNTY, SS

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

Case No.: 217-2024-CR-1167

vs.

ANNA BARBARA HANTZ MARCONI,

**PROPOSED INTERVENOR’S OMNIBUS
REPLY TO DEFENDANT & STATE’S
OBJECTION TO STAY**

Pursuant to local rule, **forced *pro se*** Proposed Intervenor Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith (“Griffith”) hereby respectfully submits this instant reply to Defendant Anna Barbara Hantz Marconi (“Marconi,” “Defendant”) and the Attorney General’s (“State,” “AG”) *Objections* (Doc. 99, 100) to Intervenor’s *Urgent Ex-Parte Motion to Stay...* (Doc. 96). In response and in support of the stay, Proposed Intervenor states as follows.

1. As a threshold issue, Intervenor was not aware, and did not become aware, of the Honorable Court’s *Order* (Doc. 98) instructing the State and Defendant to respond to Intervenor’s *Ex-Parte Motion to Stay...* (Doc. 96) until June 23rd, 2025, when Intervenor reviewed the Judicial Branch’s webpage¹ for this instant trial. Intervenor became aware of Defendant’s reply on June 12th, 2025, via email from Defendant Marconi’s counsel. See attached Exhibit 1. At no point did the State furnish Intervenor with notice of the State’s objection, by mail, email, or otherwise.²

¹ <https://www.courts.nh.gov/media/requested-cases/criminal/state-nh-v-anna-barbara-hantz-marconi>

² To wit, Defendant Marconi’s counsel furnished a copy of their *Objection* (Doc. 99) additionally via mail, postmarked June 11th, 2023. Intervenor received no notice of the Court’s *Order* (Doc. 96) or the State’s *Objection* (Doc. 100) via mail, or otherwise.

1 2. Accordingly, putative Intervenor humbly and respectfully requests that this Honorable Court
2 treat this instant filing as properly filed and timely, for purposes of applying N.H. R. Crim.
3 Proc. Rule 35, and/or Rule 37(a).
4

5 **RESPONSE IN SUPPORT OF STAY**

6 I. The Trial Court is Divested of Jurisdiction Pending Appeal Perfection

7 3. First, the question of whether *vel non* Intervenor has standing to intervene within this instant
8 criminal case at bar is not within this Court’s present jurisdiction. Defendant Marconi, a
9 Supreme Court Justice, curiously overlooks New Hampshire Supreme Court Rule 7-A,
10 “Motion for Stay or Remand,” which prescribes that an Appellant must have “first
11 unsuccessfully sought similar relief from the lower tribunal.” See N.H. Supr. Ct. R. 7-A.
12 Further, Rule 7-A “vests exclusive jurisdiction in the supreme court over those matters
13 arising out of, and directly related to, the issues presented in an appeal” while such appeal is
14 being “perfected.” *Id.*, “Comment,” citing Rautenberg v. Munnis, 107 N.H. 446, 447-448
15 (1966).
16
17

18 4. Notwithstanding Defendant’s conclusory allegations that Intervenor lacks standing,
19 Intervenor respectfully states that question has never been fully tested by this Honorable
20 Court, Defendant has offered no authority in support of same, and this question is squarely
21 covered via Intervenor’s present appeal. *Ergo*, Defendant’s contention that this Honorable
22 Court’s determination that Intervenor “lacks standing” is a basis for denying Intervenor’s
23 request for a stay is fatally flawed. The Court lacks jurisdiction over the topic while
24 Intervenor’s appeal is pending perfection. However, Intervenor respectfully notes that this
25 Honorable Court may “make such orders and decrees as may be necessary for the protection
26 and preservation of the subject matter of the appeal,” such as entering a stay, because “when
27
28

1 an appeal is taken, it does affect the operation or execution of the order... from which the
2 appeal is taken, and any matters embraced therein.” Rautenberg, supra at 447. Accordingly,
3 this Honorable Court striking the present trial date and entering a stay is entirely justified,
4 proper, and crucially – vital to the preservation of putative Intervenor’s Constitutional Rights
5 - among others – both state and federal.
6

7 II. Intervenors Constitutional Rights are at Stake

- 8 5. Second, the subject matter of the appeal is, including but not limited to, putative Intervenor’s
9 Constitutional rights, including but not limited to, 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 14th, under the United
10 States Constitution, and New Hampshire Constitutional rights under Part I, sec. 14 and 15.
11 Accordingly, further attempts at intervention would be warranted. The New Hampshire
12 Supreme Court has held that held that a non-party has a right to intervene in a criminal case,
13 provided certain exceptions are met, such as when the intervenor’s constitutional or other
14 rights are implicated by the resolution of a particular motion, request, or other issue during a
15 criminal case. See In Re Rubenzer, No. 2015-0037, 2016 N.H. LEXIS 157 (Sep. 24th, 2025),
16 quoting United States v. Carmichael, 342 F. Supp. 2d 1070, 1072 (M.D. Ala. 2004). Given
17 that the Defendant has filed various additional motions to dismiss (Doc. 53, 54, 55, 62, 64,
18 65, 66, 67, 68, 69), which appear to be re-litigating issues this Court has already considered
19 and disposed of (Doc. 36, 45), putative Intervenor would be justified to further intervention
20 until his rights are satisfied and vindicated, as any resolution of these pending motions
21 directly threaten those rights. See Snyder v. N.H. Savings Bank, 135 NH 32, 35 (1991); See
22 also Lamarche v. McCarthy, 158 N.H. 197, 200 – 201 (2008)
23
24 6. While putative Intervenor reserves all rights and will further intervene as necessary,
25
26 Intervenor respectfully states a stay is warranted pending the outcome of the current appeal,
27
28

1 as not to waste precious judicial resources needlessly, while the Supreme Court deliberates
2 and the appeal is perfected.

3 III. Defendant’s Objection (Doc. 100) Offers No Basis to Avoid a Stay

- 4
5 7. Third, as addressed prior, this Honorable Court is presently divested of jurisdiction over
6 whether *vel non* putative Intervenor has standing, and accordingly, the subject matter and
7 orders this Court has issued prior cease to operate and/or be executable. Rautenberg, *supra*, at
8 447. The arguments presented by Defendant Marconi over ¶¶ 2 – 4 of the motion cannot
9 form a basis for denial of a stay, and Intervenor respectfully states would constitute a
10 reversible error. Intervenor respectfully adds that his *Motion for Summary Reversal* is
11 likewise pending adjudication by the Supreme Court, which has, at minimum, equal
12 likelihood of success. See Case No. 2025-203, *Appel’t Mot. for Summ. Reversal* and
13 *Memorandum of Law*. (June 11th, 2025, Supr. Ct. N.H.).
14
15 8. Further, troublingly, Defendant Marconi alleges the existence of a “vast judicial conspiracy”
16 (Doc. 100, ¶ 4). For sake of absolute clarity, putative Intervenor is not aware of any “vast
17 judicial conspiracy,” nor is Intervenor alleging the existence of same³. Intervenor has, by
18 virtue of his prior motions, addressed the damaging ripple effect Defendant Marconi’s
19 actions on the judiciary, by virtue of Intervenor’s improperly denied appeals, and Defendant
20 Marconi’s meetings with then-Governor Sununu, Steve Duprey, and possibly others.
21 Intervenor has also credibly alleged his direct, proximate, and causal nexus of interest in the
22 evidence in this instant criminal trial, and the right to same, among other things.
23
24
25
26

27
28 ³ As Defendant Marconi has opened the door to this allegation, putative Intervenor reserves all
rights, waives none, in this, and in other actions.

1 9. Given that Defendant Marconi has alleged the existence of this “vast judicial conspiracy,”
2 and vaguely alleged prior the existence of improper conduct by then-Governor Sununu and
3 Attorney General Formella, with the prescient warnings that “if the case moves forward,
4 other conflicts are likely to arise,” (See Doc. 13, ¶ 46) this lends added credibility to putative
5 Intervenor’s right and/or interest at stake in this proceeding. Further this adds additional
6 probable cause to believe the existence of other evidence of which Intervenor is presently not
7 aware.
8

9 10. Despite Defendant’s contention, echoed by the State, putative Intervenor respectfully states
10 that this Honorable Court did not direct intervenor to refrain from “further filings in this
11 case,” as this would be a plain violation of, among other things, putative Intervenor’s
12 Constitutional rights – state, federal, common law, and/or otherwise. The Court would not
13 have made any such ruling, as that would be a plain and reversible error that affects
14 substantial rights – and crucially – would conflict with ample precedent and caselaw in New
15 Hampshire.
16

17 11. While Defendant has argued that it should be awarded fees, this is also an unsustainable
18 argument. As Defendant rightly notes (Doc. 100, ¶ 3), the Court ruled that putative
19 Intervenor “lacks standing to intervene.” As Intervenor has argued prior, the Court is
20 divested of jurisdiction over such question while appeal is pending. *Arguendo*, this
21 Honorable Court has no jurisdiction over putative Intervenor, and therefore lacks subject
22 matter jurisdiction over Intervenor to award fees, and hypothetically has no authority to
23 establish jurisdiction over Intervenor while such appeal is pending. Even if Defendant’s
24 request for fees and to “enforce” an order that does not exist had merit (which it plainly does
25 not), there would be a substantial question of jurisdiction, which would only lead to further
26
27
28

1 appeals. However, as this is beyond the subject matter of the stay, Intervenor elaborates no
2 further, but reserves all rights.

3 IV. The State’s Objection Reiterates the Defendant’s Arguments, and Should Also Fail

4
5 12. As explained in ¶ 1 of this instant *Reply*, putative Intervenor received no notice or awareness
6 of the Court’s Order, and the State never made Intervenor aware, or otherwise served notice
7 on Intervenor, of the States Objection, until Intervenor discovered same at time of filing,
8 June 23rd, 2025. However, the arguments in the State’s *Objection* (Doc. 99) merely reiterate
9 the same arguments of Defendant, which were addressed prior.

10
11 13. To briefly address the only perceived difference, the State has alleged that it has
12 “investigated Defendant’s conduct” and that it has “nothing remotely to do with Woodward-
13 Griffith.” (Doc. 99, ¶ 2) This is a highly specious argument.

14
15 14. First, the Court would have to accept that the Attorney General is intimately aware of
16 Intervenor’s multi-year civil claims and litigations, has studied them closely, intricately
17 understands the caselaw, allegations, standards of proof, necessary evidence, the individual
18 Defendants therein and their inter-relations – among many other things. *Ipsa facto*, if the
19 Attorney General is so intimately aware of Intervenor’s civil litigations that it can make this
20 grandiose claim, this should more than raise the Court’s interest and alarm, *as to why the*
21 *Attorney General is so interested in Intervenor’s civil litigations*, while simultaneously
22 steadfastly seeking to hide evidence in Defendant Marconi’s criminal trial from the public
23 eye. As explained in Intervenor’s *Memorandum of Law* to the Supreme Court, there is ample
24 precedent to establish that these grand jury materials must be made public. See Case No.
25 2025-203, *Appel’t Memorandum of Law* (June 11th, 2025 Supr. Ct. N.H.).
26
27
28

1 15. Second, the Attorney General states that “if the State had reason to believe that Woodward-
2 Griffith” was relevant to Defendant Marconi’s criminal trial, “Woodward-Griffith would
3 have been interviewed.” (Doc. 99, ¶ 2). While this proposition may be true, the State offers
4 no explanation as to why highlighting this point is material to the question at hand.
5

6 Furthermore, the State could settle this controversy by simply seeking to make public the
7 grand jury materials it has gather – as it is already seeking to do in Geno Marconi’s criminal
8 trial. See State v. Geno Marconi, Case No. 218-2024-CR-01426, at Doc. 20, 26.

9 Additionally, the State may have made a substantial error by failing to take Intervenor’s
10 testimony – which is precisely the reason *why* these grand jury materials are required to be
11 public in the first instance: “[p]ublic scrutiny can expose corruption, incompetence,
12 inefficiency, prejudice, and favoritism.” Pro. Firefighters of New Hampshire v. Loc. Gov't
13 Ctr., Inc., 159 N.H. 699, 709 (2010); See also Reid v. N.H. Attorney General, 169 N.H. 509
14 (2016) (applying the balancing test of disclosure of exempt materials, and finding that there
15 was obvious public interest favoring disclosure, where high-profile allegations of public
16 official’s corruption and misconduct were involved).
17
18

19 16. Third, to the extent the State and/or Defendant Marconi suggest that they are “confused” by
20 Griffith’s attempts at intervention, New Hampshire precedent amply supports that Griffith
21 can express his constitutional or statutory rights, such as a right to evidence, or disclosure
22 under N.H. RSA 91-A, through intervention – and further – it is undisputably proper, even in
23 a criminal trial. See e.g., Lamarche v. McCarthy, 158 N.H. 197, 200 – 201 (2008), State v.
24 Letendre, Case No. 219-2020-CR-00792 (Feb. 4, 2021, Rock. Super.); In Re Rubenzer, No.
25 2015-0037, 2016 N.H. LEXIS 157 (Sep. 24th, 2025), quoting United States v. Carmichael,

1 342 F. Supp. 2d 1070, 1072 (M.D. Ala. 2004). Neither the State or Marconi has offered any
2 authority to the contrary – except as a blatant misstatement of the law.

3 17. Accordingly, the State’s request for fees is likewise without merit, and should be denied.
4

5 **CONCLUSION & PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 In sum, putative Intervenor respectfully states that while this is an extreme and unusual
7 circumstance, a stay is both proper and warranted, so that not only Intervenor’s Constitutional,
8 Statutory, and Federal rights are protected and observed, but crucially, the New Hampshire
9 public’s absolute Constitutional rights to an open, transparent, and accountable government are
10 likewise protected. The public interests present here far outweighs any significance or
11 importance of the underlying criminal trial, at this present procedural posture.
12

13 **WHEREFORE**, without prejudice and without waiving any rights, putative Intervenor
14 humbly and respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

- 15 a. Enter a STAY and STRIKE the present jury trial and scheduling, pursuant to perfection
16 of Intervenor’s current appeal;
17
18 b. Treat this present reply as timely;
19
20 c. Any such other and further relief this Honorable Court deems just, necessary, equitable,
21 and proper.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 Dated this 23rd of June, 2025.

3
4 /s/Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith

5

Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith, *pro se*

6 471 Silver Street, Apt. 105

7 Manchester, NH, 03103

8 brokgrf@gmail.com

9 603.325.0749

10 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

11 I hereby certify that a copy has been provided
12 to all parties via the Court's e-File service.

13 /s/**Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith**

14 **FACTUAL AVERMENT**

15 I hereby make oath and state that the facts
16 and allegations made herein are true and
17 accurate to the best of my knowledge, belief,
18 recollection, and ability, without waiving the
19 right to amend and/or supplement same as
20 facts and/or circumstance so dictate. Further
21 affiant sayeth naught.

22 /s/**Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith**

EXHIBIT 1



Brok-Alan Griffith <brokgrf@gmail.com>

State v. AB Hantz Marconi

2 messages

Kristen Maclean <kristen@nhdefender.com>
To: Brok-Alan Griffith <brokgrf@gmail.com>


Tue, Jun 10, 2025 at 11:15 AM

Mr. Griffith,

Please find attached an objection to your motion to stay that was filed today.

Kristen

Kristen Maclean
Paralegal
Lothstein Guerriero PLLC
[39 Central Square, Suite 202](#)
[Keene, NH 03431](#)
603-352-5000
603-218-6503 (f)
kristen@nhdefender.com

 **2025-06-10 Obj to Ex-Parte Mot.pdf**
120K

Brok-Alan Griffith <brokgrf@gmail.com>
To: Kristen Maclean <kristen@nhdefender.com>

Thu, Jun 12, 2025 at 11:58 AM

Thank you, Ms. Maclean,

I will review.

Regards,
Brok Griffith
[Quoted text hidden]