

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 2018

Re: Kevin Michael Jones v. Commonwealth of Virginia,  
United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, No. 18-1203  
Eastern District of Virginia United States District Court, Civil Action No. 3:17-788.

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

To: The Honorable, John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States  
and Circuit Justice for the Fourth Circuit:

The Petitioner, Kevin Michael Jones, Pursuant to *Title 28 U.S.C., Section 2101(c)*, and  
*Supreme Court Rule 13*, Application Is Hereby Made for an Extension of Time in which to File a  
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari from August 27, 2018, to and Including October 26, 2018, or  
November 11, 2018, on June 14, 2018, Denial of Timely Petition for Rehearing.

1. The Judgment Sought To Be Reviewed Is That of the United States Court of Appeals for the  
Fourth Circuit, in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, No. 18-1203, from  
the Eastern District of Virginia United States District Court, Civil Action No. 3:17-788.

2. The Judgment Sought To Be Reviewed Was Entered, on May 29, 2018, from which, the Time  
Allowed by Law for Filing a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari Will Expire, on August 27, 2018; A  
Timely Notice of Intention to File Petition for Rehearing Was Denied, on June 14, 2018, to  
which, the Court's Mandate Was Issued, on June 20, 2018.

3. The Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Affirms, a Default  
Judgment, See: *Schoney v. Memorial Estates, 863 P.2d 59*. Without a Hearing, on Denial(s) of  
Substantial Right under *Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1915*, and Denial of a Substantive *Sixth*  
*Amendment* Constitutional Right, to Represent Oneself, *In Forma Pauperis*, in the Eastern

District of Virginia United States District Court, on Said Court's ORDER Granting Permanent Injunctions, See: Greyhound v. Tacoma, 503 P.2d 117. and Dismissing a Complaint in an Injunction Action. See: Safeway v. Coe, 136 F.2d 771. A Copy of the Opinion(s) of the Court(s) Below Is Appended Hereto and Was Reported at Jones v. Commonwealth of Va., No. 3:17-788.

4. The Jurisdiction of This Court Is Invoked under *Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1257.*


5. This Case Involves Grate and Immediate Danger to Constitutional Rights, on a Miscarriage(s) of Justice, where a Court of the United States under *Title 28 U.S., Section 2283*, May Not Grant an Injunction to Stay Proceedings in a State Court Except as Expressly Authorized by Act of Congress, Particularly the Civil Rights Act under *Title 42 U.S.C., Section 1983*, and the Declaratory Judgment Act under *Title 28 U.S.C., Section 2201*; on Request for an Interlocutory or Permanent Injunction Restraining the Enforcement, Operation or Execution of Any State Statute by Restraining the Action of Any Officer in the Enforcement or Execution of such Statute or an ORDER Made by an Administrative Board or Commission Acting under State Statutes; upon the Precedential Force of Panel Law or the Interpanel Rule, which States, That under the Doctrine of Intracourt Comity, Judges of Coordinate Jurisdiction Within a Jurisdiction Should Follow Rulings of Other Judges Except in Unusual or Exceptional Circumstances; See: U.S. v. Anaya, 509 F. Supp. 289. Whereby, the Courts Have Developed the Interpanel Doctrine: No Panel Can Overrule the Precedent Established by Any Panel in the Same Circuit - All Panels Are Bound by Prior Panel Decisions in the Same Circuit, See: U.S. v. Walling, 936 F.2d 472. on the Court Made Rule: That If a Panel's Decision Is Inconsistent with the Previous Panel Decision in the Same Circuit, the Later Decision Is Not the Law, It Is Invalid, See: Smith v. Penrod, 960 F.2d 456. where a Three-Judge District Court under *Title 28 U.S.C., Section 2284*, Is Required to Hear Request for Injunctions against the Operation of State Laws Because If such

Operation Is To Be Enjoined, It Should Require the Agreement of at Least Two (2) Judges,  
Rather Than the Decision of Just a Single Judge.

6. The Extension Is Requested Because the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth  
Circuit, Failed to Respond, Within Thirty (30) Days, to Its *Appellant's* Motion for an Indicative  
Ruling, Served, by Certificate of Mailing, on June 28, 2018, in the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, No. 18-1203.

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner, Kevin Michael Jones, Prays That the Time Within Which to  
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari Herein Be EXTENDED to and Including October 26, 2018, or  
November 11, 2018.

Date: August 16, 2018.

  
Kevin M. Jones, Pro-Se  
11975 Bowman Towne  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
(703) 437-1975