

STATE OF MAINE

v.

JEREMY L. PIERCE

Submitted on Briefs February 21, 2024  
Decided February 29, 2024

Panel: MEAD, HORTON, CONNORS, LAWRENCE, and DOUGLAS, JJ.

## MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Jeremy L. Pierce appeals from a judgment of conviction of criminal speeding (Class E), 29-A M.R.S. § 2074(3) (2023), entered by the trial court (Aroostook County, *Stokes, A.R.J.*) after a jury trial. Although Pierce raises multiple arguments concerning the applicable law, we disagree with his contentions and affirm the judgment.

The Uniform Commercial Code, cited by Pierce, does not apply. *See* 11 M.R.S. §§ 1-1102, 1-1308 (2023); *see also* 11-A M.R.S. §§ 2-101 to 10-108 (2023). The court also did not commit obvious error in concluding that 18 U.S.C.A. § 242 (Westlaw through Pub. L. No. 118-39) does not apply because Pierce offered neither evidence nor argument that he was deprived of rights “on account of [him] being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race,” *id.*; *see State v. Carey*, 2013 ME 83, ¶ 28, 77 A.3d 471. Nor has the court unconstitutionally interfered with Pierce’s right to travel, *see* U.S. Const. amend. V; U.S. Const. amend. XIV; *Light v. D’Amato*, 2014 ME 134, ¶ 18, 105 A.3d 447; *State v. Salisbury*, 2017 ME 215, ¶ 2, 173 A.3d 146; his confrontation rights, *see* U.S. Const. amend. VI; *State v. Jones*, 2018 ME 17, ¶ 8, 178 A.3d 481; or his right to be free from excessive fines or cruel and unusual punishment, U.S. Const.

amend. VIII; *State v. Rosario*, 2022 ME 46, ¶ 41, 280 A.3d 199; *State v. Bennett*, 2015 ME 46, ¶ 15, 114 A.3d 994, as he has argued.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, Pierce lacks standing to challenge the statutory requirement that a person sign “a written promise to appear” when issued a uniform summons and complaint. 29-A M.R.S. § 2601(1) (2023). Because he signed the promise to appear and appeared in court as required, he suffered no harm from which to seek relief on appeal. *See Collins v. State*, 2000 ME 85, ¶ 7, 750 A.2d 1257.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Jeremy L. Pierce, appellant pro se

The State of Maine did not file a brief

Aroostook County Unified Criminal Docket docket number CR-2022-40036  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ninth Amendment, also referenced by Pierce, does not independently confer any right, and Pierce has identified no independent legal basis for us to vacate the judgment of conviction. *See* U.S. Const. amend. IX; *Metz v. McKinley*, 583 F. Supp. 683, 688 n.4 (S.D. Ga.) (“[T]he Ninth Amendment standing alone houses no constitutional guarantees of freedom.”), *aff’d*, 747 F.2d 709 (11th Cir. 1984).