

No. _____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

◇
◆
Fernando Shahpouri, *Petitioner*,

v.

Nicholette Ann Remmel, *Respondent*.

◇
◆
On Application For Extension Of Time
To The Supreme Court Of California

◇
◆
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

◇
◆
Fernando Shahpouri

Pro Se

2671 Moss Ave,
Los Angeles, CA 90065
f_Shahpouri@yahoo.com
(650) 776-5087
December 10, 2021

RECEIVED

DEC 14 2021

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

With veneration, the receiver, Fernando Shahpouri the Defendant and Appellant, pursuant to 13.5, and Rule 21. (c) moves **Motion For Extension Of Time.**

With homage the purpose of this motion is to extend time for Petition For Writ Of Certiorari to present the facts clearly before *The Supreme Court Of The United States*, which largely affects the nation, its citizen's wellbeing, and their constitutional rights. Such fact includes numerous constitutional violations, state and federal law violations with habitual denial of rights to the appellant. Respectfully. All of which takes **massive and extensive** time to organize and present in a clear and concise manner with **over one hundred violations** of law. With

commendation, no such case should see the light of day in our nation of liberty and justice or be considered lawful with its severe disregard for our laws and history.

With reverence, *The Supreme Court Of The United States* must demand judges who choose to break law to either vacate or implement the law. Respectfully, in regards to law this case is educationally easily vacated, and failure to do so is a clear sign of obstruction of justice. The minds of lesser men by the guise of inferior judges have continued to disregard law in highest degree with notions that there is no law, as such, habitual damage with abuse of citizens continues to an extreme so vast that the general public readily lives in fear and real inequality, this is contrast the check and balance provided by the laws of our

great nation.

With admiration, additional facts and legal arguments show requirement for extension, extensive legal research, case study, and time. **(1)** With praise, this case is completely “MOOT” and a **Demand Trial By Jury** was denied. With homage time for filing a motion to vacate for mootness is demanded and shows quick and easy solution to end litigation. **(2)** With approbation, the case order has **no original document** filed with clerk and lacks authenticity. Nor would the inferior courts be able to provide an authentic sampled and tested original to *The Supreme Court Of The United State* for review. **(3)** With high regard, the appellee Nicolette Ann Rimmel has failed to respond to **all jurisdictional statements, disputes, and claims on record** by

the appellant Fernando Shahpouri. California Supreme Court is maliciously violating Federal Law Rule 28 (b). and violating U.S.A. Constitution and California Constitution Art. 6. §§ (10) (11) and the appellee shows **no statute or statement** on record that proves or disputes jurisdiction.

BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

With adulation, **diversity jurisdiction** is present due to the appellee's claim of 25k to unlimited damages. This exceeds the required 75k jurisdictional amount for federal courts. Although, no such proof by the appellee has been brought forward to the record nor confirmed with any evidence or testimony to prove such damages, the inferior courts of California maliciously prosecuted without subject jurisdiction and all

jurisdiction arguments should be reviewed De
Novo jurisdiction. Respectfully, damages to the
appellant Fernando Shahpouri exceed 75k due to
litigation cost, loss of life, loss of business, loss of
work, substantial emotional distress with
irreparable harm, civil rights violations, physical
severe damages, medical costs, and severe
psychological torment. Fear and intimidation was
also used with harassment, a body was thrown
from the appellants roof before deadlines, car
tires were tampered with numerous times, cyber
hacking, and the appellants mail was ran through
by which all of which was reported to the police.

With homage, it's clear the state courts
did not have **Subject-Matter Jurisdiction** due
to exercising 25k to unlimited jurisdiction in a
Limited Case, which is a constitutional

violation, which gives *The Supreme Court Of The United States* **Subject-Matter Jurisdiction**.

“The jurisdictional power arises to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this constitution etc.” (See U.S. Const. Art. III Sec. 2.)

With reverence, another constitutional violation is that the case was a “**Quasi-Crime**”, hence a crime which effects constitutional rights, a criminal trial would need take place to remove any Second Amendment “**rights to bare arms**”, and not a civil one. Which the district jurisdiction should have been in Los Angeles, where the allege actions took place, and not San Diego.

Respectfully, *The Supreme Court Of The United States* has **Subject-Matter Jurisdiction**, due to the state courts denying **De Novo jurisdiction**, which are the questions of law, and the questions of the of the United States Constitution.

“On hearing “De Novo” courts hear matter as **court of original** and not appellate Jurisdiction.” (Collier & Wallis v. Astor, 9 Cal.2d 202. 70 P.2d. 171, 173; Black’s Law Dictionary Revised p 852.) **(Bold Added)**

With veneration, *The Supreme Court Of The United States* has **Subject-Matter Jurisdiction** due to conflicts of interest violating due process shown on the record. Former DA Pedro Bernal was referred to the appellee Nicolette Ann Remmel by inferior judge Your Honor Matt Brower of the San Diego Superior Court. The appellee has been **represented for free** throughout the appeal proceedings, which further violate Due Process. Pedro Bernal and inferior judge Your Honor Matt Brower were long time close friends who worked together closely in the DA’s office for **10 years**. Respectfully, Pedro Bernal works in the same building as the District

Four Division One Appellate court and Clerk's Office, further violating due process by conflict of interest. Continuances for oral argument was denied, waived oral argument for Pedro Bernal was allowed **without notice** to all parties, and extension dates were shortened against the appellant while grounds were denied to the appellant among other reoccurring prejudices.

“No state shall make or enforce any law, which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” (See U.S.A. Const. XIV Sec 1.)

With high esteem, *The Supreme Court Of*

The United States has **Federal Question**

Jurisdiction due to that fact that appellee

Nicolette Ann Rimmel was traveling across state lines and outside the country during alleged

actions selling sunscreen for company SurfDurt,
doing drugs, and all the while evading taxes
which is a federal offense.

IDENTIFYING THE JUDGMENT

Court Order:

“The Court finds that the Petitioner has met the high burden of Proof that is required. The petitioner has proved the case by a Clear and Convincing Evidence under CCP Sec. 527.6 et seq. **Therefore, the request for injunction is GRANTED.**”

“The Court’s decision is based on the law that governs CCP 527.6 et seq.”

“Petitioner is told that if an extension beyond the expiration date is requested the Petitioner must make that request at least three month prior to the expiration of the restraining order.”

With adulation, the appellee has made **no request to extend** order beyond the expiration date, which show the case is “**Moot.**”

Respectfully, the Court’s decision is ambiguous

due to the fact that it does not explain how CCP 527.6 was violated and leaves no grounds for the appellant to oppose in appeals. Furthermore with laudation, the Trial Courts decision fails to govern law equally denying civil rights to appellant for statutes such as 527.6 (g) and 527.6 (f) that were violated by the appellee's party and the Trial Courts, but please take note that Subdivision g and f are included in the legal language "et. seq."

"Restraining order as requested against Fernando Shapouri is granted with a 100-yard stay away order to expire 05/06/24."

With admiration, this is clearly not needed, due to the fact that no close contact ever occurred during allegations, and as the two parties were always in different counties. Also, the appellee does not state that the appellant will obstruct her

passage to her automobile nor does she list her vehicle as protected. Respectfully, Nor do they ever claim in the Response Brief on record that the appellant will break the order, nor do they state appellant will continue alleged actions, nor do they state the appellant will harm or hurt the appellee, nor do they state that her safety is in jeopardy, or that the appellant is direly needed to be restrained. Nor do they bring forward any proof of substantial emotional distress within the four corners, but base claims on a declaration, which legally do not stand as proof in the court of law. With homage, these order are not meant for frivolous claims, but meant for dire immediate action against great and irreparable harm.

“Other persons protected under these order include: Marina Remmel.” 5/07/2019

With great laudation, Marina Rimmel an adult was never present in court nor is she allowing Nicolette Ann Rimmel to speak on her behalf. She states she is not involved on affidavit.

Opinion:

“APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Matthew Brower, Judge, Affirmed.” “Fernando Shapouri. Who is self-represented, appeals from the court’s order granting respondent N.R.’s request for a civil harassment restraining order (Code of Civ. Proc.,1 § 527.6) protecting herself and her mother against”

With veneration, take notice the language never states what the appellee is protecting her self from although states its request. This is ambiguous and none satisfactory exhibiting the frivolous nature of the case where they are unable to identify how and in what way the appellant

violated law. Respectfully, the inferior judges conceal Nicolette Ann Rimmel name for the first time on record without request on record or reason exhibiting a violation of due process and discrimination.

“The order is affirmed. N.R. is awarded cost on appeal.” “O’ROURKE, J. We concur: BENKE, Acting P. J. Haller, J.” July 19, 2021

Opinion Modification Order:

“THE COURT: It is ordered that the opinion filed on July 19, 2021 be modified as follows:”
“There is no change in the Judgment. The petition for rehearing is denied.”

With obeisance, the inferior judges clearly made substantial factual errors, alleging the appellant’s council had relationship to Your Honor Matt Brower, and although the opposite was true proving on the record the appellee’s council Pedro Bernal had relationship with Your

honor Matt Brower instead. This can be looked as an admission that the appellant's council had an undisclosed relationship to Your Honor Matt Brower creating an additional conflict of interest. Respectfully, clear Legal errors, factual errors, and a failure to make consistent corrections to this relationship through the whole opinion appear. Also, the opinion fails to recognize a 10-year DA working relationship between Pedro Bernal and Your Honor Matt Brower.

“There is no change in the Judgment.” “The Petition for rehearing is denied.” “HALLER, Acting P.J. Copies to: All parties” 08/09/2021

California Supreme Court final decision:

In The Supreme Court of California En Banc “Petition for review and application for stay are denied.” CANTIL-SAKAUYE Chief Justice 9/22/2021

With admiration, although the decision is En Banc, only one judge signs off on the decision, and nor does it list the other judge's names.

Remitter:

“I, Kevin J. Lane, Clerk of the Court of Appeal of the State of California, for the Fourth Appellate District, certify the attached is a true and correct copy of the original opinion or decision entered in the above-entitled case on July 19, 2021, and that this opinion or decision has now become final.”

“Witness my hand and the seal of the Court affixed this September 29, 2021” Kevin J. Lane
Clerk By: Michael Hubbard Clerk, Deputy Clerk.

With reverence, it's clearly a **Moot** decision as the appellee requests no costs from the appellant, and the case needed to be vacated immediately. With homage, the parties live in different counties and were separated by counties during all alleged allegations so there is no cause to assume any contact. Respectfully, it's very disturbing that the inferior courts had no original orders with Clerk seal and signature, but manages to have a Clerk sign off on a unwanted

forced remitter. This is a consistent pattern of the DA's office orchestrating conspiracy by force in a civil court when the matter was moot, false, and frivolous to begin with.

GOOD CAUSE AND EXCUSABLE NEGLECT

With veneration, Fernando Shahpouri in Pro Se request **60-day extension** of time to complete Petition For Writ Of Certiorari due to good cause and excusable neglect. The Federal Supreme Court grants such extensions regularly and due to corona there is still much public safety concern. Even Mayor Garcetti just recently caught corona.

With reverence, **Good cause (1)** Fernando Shahpouri must complete extensive business taxes for 2021. With homage, **Good cause (2)** Fernando Shahpouri is required to handle long

hours of regular studying for academic courses and preparing for exams. With esteem, **Good cause (3)** Fernando Shahpouri had to make an **emergency move** do to financial burdens from over \$ **75k thousand** in extensive litigation, damage, and appeal costs. With high regard, **Good cause (4)** Fernando Shahpouri had to move additionally due to neighbor who suffered from **regular recurring corona** after vaccines, which was a threat to Fernando Shahpouri's health. With adulation, **Good cause (5)** Fernando Shahpouri is handling repairs and damages to new location, which are immediate concerns and are important to the well being of Fernando Shahpouri. With admiration, **Good cause (6)** Fernando Shahpouri must handle additional repairs and damages for his 84-year-old father's safety and health. With adoration,

Good cause (7) Fernando Shahpouri is ordering recommended federal law books for Petition For Writ Of Certiorari, which will take time to pay for and receive. With exaltation, **Good cause (8)** Fernando Shahpouri is working on literary and producing work with literary agent for distribution deal and finance, which takes extensive work time and is required for **financial security** purposes and much needed work for his start-up company, which will be closed down if unable to work. With approbation, **Good cause (9)** Fernando Shahpouri is still in the middle of physical rehabilitation for serious injuries, needs to seek further treatment, needs to speak to additional Dr.'s for inflammation injection options, conditions have **worsened**, but still need further treatment due to interruptions by the California Supreme Court and California District

Appellate Court which denied time for extensive regular treatments even though three different physician provided Dr.'s notes and medical records requesting the time on the record.

With commendation, **Excusable neglect (1)**

The appellant made a mistake due to the California Supreme Court's Clerk office, where they obstructed justice by providing misinformation, and intentionally sending appellant to The United States Court Of Appeal For The Ninth Circuit. Which is the incorrect jurisdiction, this error cost the appellant over a month of time, and monetary damages. With accolade, **Excusable Neglect (2)** The appellant made error, the appellant misread the rules of *The Supreme Court Of The United States* due to unfamiliarity and must reformat, rewrite

sections, as well as write new section to complete the Petition for Writ Of Certiorari. With acclaim, **Excusable Neglect (3)** The appellant made error with confusion and believed the due date was 150 days “Order List 589 U.S.” on Thursday March 19th, 2020” only finding late that is was rescinded to 90 days. This through off the appellant’s scheduled working calendar, and causing loss of time.

INFORMATION ON INJURIES

With adulation, such facts on injuries are serious, as failure to continue treatments will lead to permanent damages or loss of an ability to run and walk for Fernando Shahpouri. Fernando Shahpouri’s hip shifted out of place, his knees have damages, his feet have damages and swelling, and his spinal cord is out of alignment.

With praise, various injections are strongly recommended, continued treatment is required, and interruptions are costly and damaging.

Insurance can stop coverage at any time do to length of treatments which causes additional costs. Such continuous interruptions have caused treatment time to largely extend. Respectfully, Pro Se litigants should be paid by the state to defend themselves for such extensive work and time.

DEADLINE AND EXTENSION DATES

With homage, Petition For Writ Of Certiorari is due on **December 21st**. And requested **60-day** extension date is February 19th, 2022.

With veneration, **It's requested** that the

rescinded order “Order List 594: U.S.” on Monday July 19th, **be modified** to hold the **original order guidelines** for “Order List 589 U.S.” on Thursday March 19th, 2020’s **regulations and time** for submitting Petition For Writ Of Certiorari.

With esteem, this is to include cases, which were heavily impacted by Corona and still being impacted by corona due to location. Los Angeles and California was the most heavily impacted areas in the United States and still makes effort to fight the wide spread corona virus. Mayor Garcetti just recently caught corona, Fernando Shahpouri’s neighbor has reoccurring corona after vaccines, and Fernando Shahpouri’s entire case was impacted by corona creating major violations of Due Process and jurisdictional issues during

Emergency Orders and litigation process.

With laudation, request (1) is to have modification dates for extension deadlines to be on April 20th, 2022.

With obeisance, request (2) is that if modification request (1) is denied that the date be set on the minimum 60-day extension deadline, which is for February 19th, 2022.