

No. _____

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**
2018


Jori Vazeen,
(pro se) Applicant,
v.

Michelle Vazin
Respondent.

**Application for an Extension of Time
To File Petition for a Writ of Certiorari**

**APPLICATION TO THE HONORABLE
CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR.
AS CIRCUIT JUSTICE**

July 10, 2018



PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Applicant (pro se): Jon Vazeen

**P.O. Box 9094
Knoxville, TN 37940
Tel: (615) 673-0777
email: jon@vazeen.com**

Respondent: Michelle Vazin represented by

**Ms. Virginia Connell
MTR Family Law PLLC
205 23rd Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37203-1501**

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Pursuant to this court's Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.3, applicant Jon Vazeen hereby request at least a 60 day extension of time in order to file a writ of certiorari in this case.

JUDGMENT FOR WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT

The judgment sought to be reviewed are the historic determinations by the trial court and whether a court (trial court in this case) has a right to make laws, force people to sign off their property under the threat of jail and, to mold a case into having an outcome desired by the court..

The 3rd Circuit Court of Davidson County, Tennessee (trial court, case #14D-2614) in addition to making a few truly historic determinations, repeatedly and openly *violated applicant's rights*. In one of its most bizarre determinations that is comparable with *Galileo's prosecution* nearly 400 years ago, the trial court rejected the research by NSF (National Science Foundation) and punished the applicant for being a forward thinking scientist!

The Court of Appeals for Middle Tennessee added to the confusion by changing its order 3 times from "*Vacate and Remand*" to "*Dismiss and Remand*" to "*Dismiss the Appeal*" (case# M06-01133-COA-R3-CV). The court of appeal did not respond favorably to applicant's petition for reconsideration.

On 4/18/18, the Tennessee Supreme Court denied applicant's application for permission to appeal (Exhibit 1).

The Court of Appeals for Middle Tennessee cited that the court of appeals cannot make a ruling when there are no prior cases. However, trial court's determinations are so out of the norm that there were (are) no prior cases to reference. As an example, there is not a single prior case where a court while on one hand has totally ignored the withdraw of \$40,000 by one party (respondent) out of her account just days before filing for divorce, has, on the other hand, classified the efforts of an inventor (applicant) in manufacturing/ marketing his award winning inventions as "asset dissipation" – that is historic! In the absence of any prior case, trial court's determinations fall into the category of making laws and that is where the guidance of this respectful court is crucial.

REASONS JUSTIFYING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant respectfully requests at least a 60-day extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of the decisions of trial/appeal/supreme courts of Tennessee.

1. Applicant who is near 70 years old, has multitude of health issues that include limitations in using a keyboard due to painful fingers/wrists/shoulders.
2. Applicant who has been a litigant, mostly as a pro se, in his divorce case for nearly 4 years now decided yesterday (July 9, 2018) that before this historic case and its eye-catching title "PROSECUTION OF GALILEO IN TENNESSEE" get national and international broadcasts,


he must first knock on all available doors to seek justice. Applicant learned yesterday about the 90 days time limit for filing a writ with US Supreme Court.

3. Applicant is a part-time university faculty where obligations to students can't be delayed or extended.
4. Applicant is a pro se litigant in a case against his former fraudulent divorce attorney who had infused fake charges in his invoice. Applicant is forced to devote time/efforts to that case for a foreseeable future.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicant respectfully asks that in deciding about the minimum 60 days extension, in addition to the above mentioned contributing factors, this respectful Court should give special attention to the fact that this is one incredibly unique and historically important case.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Vazeen', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Jon Vazeen (pro se applicant)
P.O. Box 9094
Knoxville, TN 37940
Tel: (615) 673-0777
email: jon@vazeen.com