


Clerk of the Court  
United States Supreme Court  
1 1ST St. NE  
Washington, D.C. 20543  
United States

09/02/18 - SENT VIA LEGAL MAIL

Re: 10-CR-771(NG), 15-CV-2327(NG)



Greetings Clerk of the Court,

Defendant, Dr. Gustave Drivas respectfully requests a (60) sixty day extension in order to file his WRIT OF CERTIORARI. This request is grounded upon the Defendant being transferred from various federal prisons which temporarily disabled normal access to his legal property, email, phones, computers and the law libraries.

Time is of the essence.

Best Regards,

/s/

Gustave Drivas

Cc: AUSA Campo  
Reg. No. 65285-053

E.D.N.Y.-Bklyn  
15-cv-2327  
Gershon, J.

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE  
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of June, two thousand eighteen.

Present:

José A. Cabranes,  
Gerard E. Lynch,  
Susan L. Carney,  
*Circuit Judges.*

---

Gustave S. Drivas,

*Petitioner-Appellant,*

v.

17-3874

United States of America,

*Respondent-Appellee.*

---

Appellant, pro se, moves for a certificate of appealability, leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and remand. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion is DENIED and the appeal is DISMISSED because Appellant has not “made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); *see also Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003).

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

*Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe*  


Supreme Court of the United States  
Office of the Clerk  
Washington, DC 20543-0001

September 16th, 2018

RE: Application for Extension of Time/(60) sixty days

Dear Clerks:

In response to your response to my Application for (60) day Extension of Time to file a WRIT OF CERTIORARI please see enclosures of the lower court's opinion/mandate appended to the application pursuant to Rule 13.5.


A copy of the corrected application has been served upon the opposing party/AUSA Campo, 271 Cadman Plaza, East Brooklyn, NY 11201.

Best Regards,

/s/

Dr. Gustave Drivas

Cc: AUSA Campo



**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

September 11, 2018

Gustave Drivas  
#65285-053  
FCI - Schuylkill  
P.O. Box 759  
Minersville, PA 17959

**RE: Application for an Extension of Time**

Dear Mr. Drivas:

The application for an extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case was postmarked September 3, 2018 and received September 11, 2018. The application is returned for the following reason(s):

The lower court opinion must be appended to the application. Rule 13.5.

The order denying rehearing must be appended (if applicable). Rule 13.5.

It is impossible to determine the timeliness of your application for an extension of time without the lower court opinions.

A copy of the corrected application must be served on opposing counsel.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:

Lisa Nesbitt  
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

# MANDATE

E.D.N.Y.-Bklyn  
15-cv-2327  
Gershon, J.

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE  
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of June, two thousand eighteen.

Present:

José A. Cabranes,  
Gerard E. Lynch,  
Susan L. Carney,  
*Circuit Judges.*

Gustave S. Drivas,

*Petitioner-Appellant,*

v.

17-3874

United States of America,

*Respondent-Appellee.*

Appellant, pro se, moves for a certificate of appealability, leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and remand. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion is DENIED and the appeal is DISMISSED because Appellant has not "made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); *see also Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003).

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court


*Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe*



A True Copy

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit



*Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe*

MANDATE ISSUED ON 08/14/2018