

EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST FOR A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

No. \_\_\_\_\_

In the Supreme Court of the United States of America

Jeffrey A. Stevens

v.

United States

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

Appeal No. 17-5044

**To the Honorable Justice Sonia Sotomayor of the Tenth Circuit:**

I, Petitioner, Jeffrey A. Stevens (myself, Pro Se) do hereby request an extension of time to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari. A full 90 days of time from receipt is requested. Denial to consider or even view my Legally Sound and Timely Filed Petition for Rehearing and Petition for Rehearing En Banc was issued April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018 by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. At that time I was being detained. Even though they (the Tenth Circuit) had Danbury FCI as my current address, the Clerk of Court failed to send Notice of Denial to me at the Detention Facility and instead mailed it to my home. I did not receive a copy of Notice of Denial until May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018. I was released from detention June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018. The standard 90 days from Denial would be July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Subsequently though, Supervised Release Conditions which are subject to widely varied interpretation prohibit me from using any electronic device that can conceivably be connected to the Internet, thereby inhibiting my researching for and creation of a Request for Writ of Certiorari that is proper in both form and procedure and further diminishes my role as a member of this 21<sup>st</sup> Century Society in a perceived effort to stifle dissent and “Legally” not only inhibit my First Amendment rights, but to prevent exactly this; Appeal of blatant injustice. Access to and use of Word Processing and Legal research capability can be had at what is currently great expense for me, but would entail agents of the DOJ being privy to everything I query or create (Device Monitoring). Not only is this tantamount to the Defense being forced to allow the opposition into it's camp and be a part of the Defense's strategy (violation of Attorney/Client Privilege), but given the ambiguity of the conditions

exposes me to, at the whim or preferred interpretation of the Monitor, immediate re-detention. Given the extents to which the opposition has already gone to keep complete information out of the "Official Record" of this case, my apprehension is warranted. Merely discovering how to do this properly, that is request an Extension of Time, was a Herculean time-consuming, tricky & possibly risky task.

This Case is a straightforward First Amendment issue which impacts every United States Citizen. The Precedent created by the Courts in this case threaten to completely change the nature of our right to "Freedom of Speech" and the very nature of who We, the United States of America are as a Nation.

I am not including any Majority or Dissenting Opinions because as this is a very basic and impactful Precedent, therefore, clearly, no relevant documented history exists. Never in the entire history of the United States (that I have been able to find), not in State, U.S. District, U.S. Circuit or the U.S. Supreme Court have Predictions, Prophecy or any other synonym thereof been charged as "Threat" or "Intent to Injure".

The actions of the Prosecution and the District and Circuit Courts in this matter are in direct opposition to and in conflict with the very essence of and the genesis of our Constitutional First Amendment, which guarantees being able to speak out, without reprisal, against tyranny and oppression by and corruption in Government, and predict grave consequences for those who commit these acts against the Citizenry. I ask that the United States Supreme Court allow the time for me to properly present this issue of Exceptional Importance for it's deliberation.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Stevens  
20 Church Lane, Unit 10  
East Lyme, CT 06333  
(860) 389-5751  
Pro Se