

VERMONT SUPERIOR COURT  
Windham Unit  
7 Court Street  
Newfane VT 05345  
802-365-7979  
www.vermontjudiciary.org



CIVIL DIVISION  
Case No. 22-CV-03222

**Jeffrey Rivard v. Town of Brattleboro**

**ENTRY REGARDING MOTION**

Title: Motion to Join (Motion: 6)  
Filer: Jeffrey M Rivard  
Filed Date: August 06, 2023

Plaintiff Jeffrey Rivard filed a motion titled “Motion to Enjoin,” which Plaintiff presents as a motion for joinder. Defendant opposes Plaintiff’s motion. The motion is **DENIED**.

**Background**

On April 25, 2023, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting joinder of parties pursuant to V.R.C.P. 20. Request for Joinder of Parties dated April 25, 2023. On July 24, 2023, that motion was denied by this court. Entry Regarding Motion dated July 24, 2023.

Cognizant of Plaintiff’s pro se status, the court’s entry provided Plaintiff with a sample of what a proper motion for joinder might say. *Id.* Ultimately though, the court concluded that the facts provided by Plaintiff did not explain why joinder was appropriate. *Id.*

On August 6, 2023, Plaintiff filed another motion titled “Motion to Enjoin.” Plaintiff’s Motion to Enjoin dated August 6, 2023. This time, Plaintiff does not specify under which rule Plaintiff seeks to pursue joinder, though he appears to be seeking to join the present docket with dockets 23-CV-00255, 23-CV-01280, and 23-CV-02763. *Id.* at 2. Engaging in speculation, the court finds that as grounds for joinder, Plaintiff cites

a pattern of negligence and a denial of Constitutional protections by a department Brattleboro Police and by it [sic] Citizens [sic] Police Communication Committee, ... unlawful search and seizure, ... Americans with Disabilities Act, ... failure to provide accommodations with Vermont statute, ... [and a]n unlawful arrest....

*Id.* at 1–2.

Plaintiff cites no applicable rule supporting his motion.

## Analysis

Rule 7(b)(1) of Vermont Rules of Civil Procedure requires a motion to “state with particularity the grounds [on which Plaintiff relies], including a concise statement of the facts and law relied on. The fragmented general assertions that Plaintiff provides in his motion do not state *with particularity* the grounds on which Plaintiff wishes to rely. To the extent that Plaintiff’s assertions could be considered “stated with particularity,” the court is not able to divine in what way they would support joinder under any rule. And while the statement of facts in Plaintiff’s motion appears to be concise, Plaintiff does not include a concise statement of law upon which he relies. As a result, the court cannot be sure how the content of the motion supports joinder. As this court had already stated in the present case,

[t]he court will try very hard to give effect to the motion of self-represented litigant and will make reasonable inferences in order to try to help the self-represented litigant accomplish what he or she is trying to accomplish; however even self-represented litigants are required to abide by Rule 7. That means providing what law the litigant relies on and stating with particularity the facts that relate to the law in concise statement so the court can figure out whether the facts as asserted by the litigant qualify for the legal remedy the litigant is seeking.

Entry Regarding Motion dated July 24, 2023.

## Order

As with the earlier motion for joinder in the present case, the court concludes that the motion does not establish that joinder is appropriate, and that Plaintiff has also failed to follow Rule 7(b)(1) of Vermont Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, based on the foregoing, Plaintiff’s motion for joinder is **DENIED**.

**Signed electronically October 26, 2023 pursuant to V.R.E.F 9(d).**



---

**David Barra**  
**Superior Court Judge**