

FILED  
JAN 11 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. 18 A 990

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Attention Justice Clarence Thomas

---



Saul E. Camilo - Petitioner

v.

United States - Respondant

---

MOTION TO REQUEST AN EXTENSION TO FILE A WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI PER RULE 30.3 OF THE SUPREME COURT




To the Honorable Justice Clearence Thomas,

Comes now Petitioner, Saul Elias Camilo, Pro Se who request that this Court construe this Motion liberally per Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).

Due to the environment of being incarcerated and being a layman of the law this request for an extension of 60 days under Rule 30.3 is made to the Court. This request is so that the Petitioner may properly prepare his application for a Writ of Cetiorari. The Petitioner apologizes to the Court for the delay making this Motion necessary, but as a layman and only having an eighth grade education, the law is difficult to read and understand delaying my comprehension and response to new information. Please find attached, as Appendix A, the Petitioners last decision by a court in his case.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Saul Elias Camilo  
#06368-104  
FCI-Coleman-Medium  
P.O. Box 1032  
Coleman, Fl 33521

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 18-11345-J

---

SAUL ELIAS CAMILO,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Florida

---

Before: WILLIAM PRYOR and NEWSOM, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Saul Elias Camilo has filed a motion for reconsideration, pursuant to 11th Cir. R. 22-1(c) and 27-2, of this Court's order dated August 28, 2018, denying his motion for a certificate of appealability and denying as moot his motion for leave to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* in the appeal of the district court's denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion to vacate. Because Camilo has not alleged any points of law or fact that this Court overlooked or misapprehended in denying his motions, his motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**