

**EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST FOR A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**In The Supreme Court Of The United States**

William L. Robinson, Jr.

Petitioner

v.

Dore

Respondent

**MOTION TO DIRECT THE CLERK OF THE COURT TO FILE THIS  
PETITION OUT OF TIME**

**To the Honorable (Justice) of the U.S. Supreme Court:**

Petitioner (William L. Robinson, Jr.) request an extension of time to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The amount of time requested is thirty (30) days from October 23, 2019. The final judgement by the Maryland Court of Appeals was entered on July 26, 2019. Therefore, the request should have been filed before October 24, 2019. The Writ was prepared but not delivered to the US Supreme Court until October 28, 2019. At issue is whether:

1 - According to Maryland Law Re: Exceptions to a sale, a foreclosure Defendant can only challenge procedural irregularities in the foreclosure sale or the underlying validity of the mortgage, *Jones v. Rosenberg*, 178 M. App 54, 68 (2008); *Bierman v. Hunter* 190 Md. App. 250, 988 A 2d 530, 542 (2010).


2 – Notice of the pending sale must be published in the newspaper for three (3) successive weeks and mailed to borrower 10-30 days before the sale take place. Md Code Ann., 7-105.1 & 7-105.2. The Automatic Stay impose by the Circuit Court regarding collection actions and foreclosure guidelines was entered on February 5, 2015 and wasn't terminated by the Circuit Court until August 7, 2015. Therefore any announcements, advertisements or publication of the pending sale prior to lifting of the Stay were procedurally irregular and should be voidable. The sale took place on August 18, 2015, and

3 – The purpose of the Automatic Stay is to tell creditors and others what they can and cannot do after a bankruptcy is filed. So, if one of the proscribed acts is committed, the Automatic Stay

is violated. The question is whether the violation is compensable? In other words, the question is whether the person or company or entity violating the Stay has to pay someone for the damages, including all attorney's fees and cost incurred in litigating the violation? An individual injured by the violation of the Automatic Stay is allowed to recover damages, including attorney's fee and cost, and the possibility of punitive damages, if the violation is "willful." All United States Circuit Courts of Appeal agree.

The Petitioner is attaching a copy of the majority and dissenting opinions from the Maryland Court of Appeals already submitted to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office. This request is being made because of the violent death to an unarmed good Samaritan musician in the Petitioner's immediate family who was shot and killed attempting to stop a fight. The event was devastating and became emotionally challenging for Petitioner's family and resulted with the Petitioner missing the required filing date. The funeral was on October 23, 2019. No prior extension of time requests have been made.

Respectfully submitted,



William L. Robinson,, Jr.  
5914 Greenspring Avenue  
Baltimore, Maryland 21209  
(443) 320-3123

Pro Se

November 22, 2019

**WILLIAM L. ROBINSON, JR.**

**v.**

**THOMAS P. DORE, SUBSTITUTE**

\*      **IN THE**  
\*      **COURT OF APPEALS**  
\*      **OF MARYLAND**  
\*      **Petition Docket No. 94**  
\*      **September Term, 2019**  
\*      **(No. 2621, Sept. Term, 2017**  
\*      **Court of Special Appeals)**  
\*      **(No. 24-O-12-000471, Circuit**  
\*      **Court for Baltimore City)**

**O R D E R**

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Special Appeals filed in the above entitled case, it is

ORDERED, by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, that the petition be, and it is hereby, denied as there has been no showing that review by certiorari is desirable and in the public interest.

*/s/ Mary Ellen Barbera*

---

Chief Judge

DATE: July 26, 2019

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