

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. _____


DR. USHA JAIN AND MANOHAR JAIN

Petitioners,

v.

BAY HILL PROPERTY OWNERS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Respondents,



**APPLICATION OF DR. USHA JAIN AND MANOHAR JAIN FOR AN EXTENSION OF
TIME WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

To the Clerk of the Court or Honorable Justice Clarence Thomas (Justice of the above circuit)

Petitioners Dr. Usha Jain and Manohar Jain appearing *pro se*, pursuant to Rule 13(5) of the Rules of this Court hereby moves for an extension of appropriate time of 60 days, to and including July 3, 2019, for the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the eleventh circuit dated February 26, 2019 (Exhibit 1), on which a timely petition for rehearing and for rehearing en banc was denied on April 3, 2019 (Exhibit 2). The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1257 (a)

The application for extension is being filed more than 10 days prior to the due date of July 3, 2019 and copies of opinions are attached as an exhibit per rule.

1. The date within which a petition for writ of certiorari would be due, if not extended, is

July 3, 2019.

2. This court has jurisdiction to hear the judgment of highest court of the state regarding the Federal Law and the Constitution of United States of America

3. The petition is worth the time because there is a violation of fourteenth amendment, constitutional rights and equal protection under Federal laws of the United States of America by the state officers in the case.

4. The petition is necessary for the violation of 14th amendment of equal protection under the laws of pro se litigants which affect millions of people in the country every day.

5. The petition is worth the time because of unlawful discrimination for older age and race of ethnic origin (Indian) which also affects millions of people.

6. Failure to afford a due process due to certain class of people (age, sex, national origin, disabled and pro se status and determining Important questions of the law adversely by the court below and affirmed by appeal court which becomes a precedent case and defy and defiles the law.

7. Coercing and Discrimination by the giant corporation against pro se litigants and also the solo attorney affecting millions of people

8. The ruling of this court with affirmation in the appeal court is in conflict and against the ruling of US Supreme Court of United Stated of America.

9. In this case the constitutionality of FS is drawn in to a question and State Officers are involved. (FS 720.311(2)(b) of Florida Homeowners Act

10. The ruling of this court with affirmation in the appeal court is against the Constitutional rights and is in conflict and against the ruling of US Supreme Court of United Stated of America.

11. Extension is requested because the motion for fraud upon the Court with clear and convincing evidence is waiting to be heard but is not heard for two years. Constitutional rights are not given of due process and equal opportunity to be heard because of pro se status, old, lady doctor of an Indian origin.

12. Plaintiff's entire case rest on a false foundation and but due to discrimination and no due process the case had proceeded all the way to attorney fees. Deceitful abusive and discriminatory tactics by the attorney and state officers in the case against an Indian old lady doctor and pro se status of the Defendants is against the Constitution of United States of America.

13. The constitutional rights are being violated. The Defendants have not been provided an evidentiary hearing for fraud upon the court which needs to be heard first. The hearing for attorney fees is set to be heard on June 18, 2019

14. The whole case can be dismissed if the Fraud upon the court and jurisdiction is taken in to the consideration but no constitutional rights are provided,

15. State officers do not provide the dates for the evidentiary hearing and Defendants may need the order from the court so pro se litigants could be heard.

16. The petitioner have two cases of similar homeowner issue where the Constitutional rights are violated in both cases by the State Court officers and discrimination is done which would lead to expelling the petitioners from the wealthy neighborhood is done.

Respectfully submitted on this 13 the day of June, 2019.



Dr. Usha Jain *Pro Se*
4800 S. Apopka-Vineland Rd
Orlando, FL 32819
(407) 876-5555
Fax: (407) 876-5557
Email:drjainproselitigant@outlook.com