

ADRIAN CONTRERAS-REBOLLAR,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent.


PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Comes now, respectfully, petitioner, Contreras-Rebollar, pro se, asking this Honorable Court, the U.S. Supreme Court, for an extension of time to file his writ of certiorari petition due in this Court on 9-24-18.

This date is due to the last ruling from the U.S. Ct. of Appeals for the 9th Cir. Case #: 17-35885, ruling of that Court's order denying petitioner's 'Motion For Reconsideration' which said order having been enacted on 6-26-18.

Hence, bringing this pro se petitioner's petition for Cert. being due on 9-24-18.

However, because he has 2 appeals pending, this one, and a separate State court appeal, he seeks for an additional 10 days in which to file his writ of certiorari with this Court to, 10-4-18. He is 90% done, but due to institutional delays of attending the Law Library of the Institution in which he is currently housed, he feels these additional 10 days would allow him the proper time in which to timely have his petition in this Court's hands on 10-4-18 or, by that date.



MOTION 1 of 1

ADRIAN CONTRERAS-REBOLLAR
Pro se
TRU
PO BOX 888
Monroe, WA. 98272

APPENDIX A - 1

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 20 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

ADRIAN CONTRERAS-REBOLLAR,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

JAMES KEY,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 17-35885

D.C. No. 3:15-cv-05471-BHS
Western District of Washington,
Tacoma

ORDER

Before: McKEOWN and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

This appeal is from the denial of appellant's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition and subsequent Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) motion. The request for a certificate of appealability is denied because appellant has not shown that "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012); *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003); *United States v. Winkles*, 795 F.3d 1134, 1143 (9th Cir. 2015), *cert. denied*, 136 S. Ct. 2462 (2016); *Lynch v. Blodgett*, 999 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1993) (order).

Any pending motions are denied as moot.

DENIED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUN 26 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

ADRIAN CONTRERAS-REBOLLAR,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

JAMES KEY,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 17-35885

D.C. No. 3:15-cv-05471-BHS
Western District of Washington,
Tacoma

ORDER

Before: PAEZ and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

The motion for reconsideration (Docket Entry No. 5) is denied. *See* 9th Cir.

R. 27-10.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

SUSAN L. CARLSON
SUPREME COURT CLERK

ERIN L. LENNON
DEPUTY CLERK/
CHIEF STAFF ATTORNEY

THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON



TEMPLE OF JUSTICE
P.O. BOX 40929
OLYMPIA, WA 98504-0929

(360) 357-2077
e-mail: supreme@courts.wa.gov
www.courts.wa.gov

August 31, 2018

LETTER SENT BY E-MAIL ONLY

Adrian Contreras-Rebollar (sent by U.S. mail only)
#819639
Monroe Correctional Complex
P.O. Box 7002
Monroe, WA 98272

Catherine E. Glinski
Glinski Law Firm PLLC
P.O. Box 761
Manchester, WA 98353-0761

Michelle Hyer
Pierce County Prosecutor
930 Tacoma Avenue S., Room 946
Tacoma, WA 98402-2102

Hon. Derek Byrne, Clerk
Division II, Court of Appeals
950 Broadway, Suite 300
MS-TB-06
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: Supreme Court No. 96243-0 - State of Washington v. Adrian Contreras-Rebollar
Court of Appeals No. 48923-6-II

Clerk, Counsel and Mr. Contreras-Rebollar:

The Court of Appeals has forwarded to this Court the "MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW," the "NOTICE OF APPEAL TO: THE WA. STATE SUPREME COURT" and the related Court of Appeals file in the referenced matter. The matter has been assigned the Supreme Court cause number indicated above. The Supreme Court Deputy Clerk has made the following ruling regarding the motion:

Motion granted. The petition for review should be served and filed by October 5, 2018. If the petition for review is not served and filed by October 5, 2018, this matter will likely be dismissed.

Mr. Contreras-Rebollar is directed to serve and file in this Court a petition for review pursuant to RAP 13.4, by October 5, 2018. Failure to serve and file the petition for review may result in the dismissal of this matter.

It is noted that Mr. Contreras-Rebollar will not be required to pay the filing fee because of his indigent status in the court of appeals.

The content and style of the petition should conform with the requirements of RAP 13.4(c). I have enclosed a copy of Forms 9, 5, 6 and part F of Form 3 from the appendix to the rules.



Page 2
No. 96243-0
August 31, 2018

The parties are advised that upon receipt of the petition for review, a due date will be established for the filing of any answer to the petition.

The parties are referred to the provisions of General Rule 31(e) regarding the requirement to omit certain personal identifiers from all documents filed in this court. This rule provides that parties "shall not include, and if present shall redact" social security numbers, financial account numbers and driver's license numbers. As indicated in the rule, the responsibility for redacting the personal identifiers rests solely with counsel and the parties. The Clerk's Office does not review documents for compliance with the rule. Because briefs and other documents in cases that are not sealed may be made available to the public on the court's internet website, or viewed in our office, it is imperative that such personal identifiers not be included in filed documents.

Correspondence from this Court will be sent to the Petitioner via U.S. mail. Correspondence from this Court will be sent to counsel for the Respondent by e-mail attachment, not by regular mail. This office uses the e-mail address that appears on the Washington State Bar Association lawyer directory. Counsel are responsible for maintaining a current business-related e-mail address in that directory.

Sincerely,



Erin L. Lennon
Supreme Court Deputy Clerk

ELL:sk

Enclosures as stated