

Application No. _____

Case No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

In re: brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER / v. US BANKRUPTCY COURT

brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER – Petitioners-Appellants

Two cases consolidated from public record for a Writ of Certiorari

Original Case Order Denying Request – USCANC - No. 20-35905, DC No. 3:20-mc-00903

Original Case Order Denying Request – USCANC - No. 20-35979, DC No. 3:20-cv-01403-MO

October Term 2021

**Application for Extension of Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari with this
United States Supreme Court from The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

***To: Justice Elena Kagan for the Ninth Circuit
in the Supreme Court of the United States,***

Petitioner-Appellant: brent evan webster is dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER: sui juris, respectfully request a **60-day extention of time** to file his Petitions for **Writ of Certiorari**. This new filing is in response to the letter Dated March 29, 2022 addressed to: **Brent Evan Webster** from the **SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF THE CLERK WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001** from Scott S. Harris, Clerk by Jacob Levitan.

Webster appreciates the courts request for clarification, specifically concerning **Rule 12.4** on the number of applications necessary to review the issues at hand, specifically when two or more judgments are sought to be reviewed from the same court and involve identical or closely related questions, then a single petition covering all the judgments suffices.

Also, **Rule 13.5** good cause, a Justice may extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari for a period not exceeding 60 days, and reasons why an extension of time is justified.

Webster will lay the foundation for the reasons these **ten cases** should be consolidated into **four separate Writ of Certiorari's** as grouped, and **reviewed separately** as proposed.

1. **Ten separate orders** come from the **Ninth Circuit** from a **Portland Bankruptcy Case** - namely **brent evan webster** doing business as his corporate fiction, **BRENT EVAN WEBSTER**, case number **19-34090-pcm7**, he converted to a **chapter 13** to set a **legal-trap** for **claimed respondents**, then filed a **conversion** to a **chapter 14** to protect the **farm** from **fraudulent debt collectors** trying to **steal webster's family properties**.
2. This court has jurisdiction and venue to hear these cases based on **subject matter** (**851. FALSE CLAIMS—18 U.S.C. § 152(4)**), **territory** (**State of Oregon under US Constitution, Bill of Rights**), and as **Natural Person** (**Specially as one of the people**).
3. **It was webster's mis-understanding** that this court was still observing the ongoing **public health concerns relating to COVID-19 order** which he believed the **150-day time limit** to file was still in effect from **Order on THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2020**. But, **upon further investigation** he discovered an **Order on MONDAY, JULY 19, 2021** after the other Court orders about **COVID-19** were **rescinded**, that's when on **March 22, 2022** webster filed for **extention of time** on the **ten cases** he is **presenting**.
4. **Webster contends** that his **claims of "Force Majeure"** are **factual** and **over-ride** any presumed **"DEBT"** the **Respondents have falsely claimed** in his **bankruptcy**, which he **believes he proved beyond any reasonable doubts** in his **filings**. The ongoing **public health concerns relating to COVID-19** **substantiates webster's claim** of a **"Force Majeure"** and he ask that **this court also substantiate his claim**.
5. **Considering the world circumstances** that are **literally guaranteeing the destruction of our societies including the supply chains**, now **bankrupting millions of families** in this country **which will never be the same**. The **"New Normal"**, is **uncertainty**, so webster kindly asks that this court please be flexible with him, as he **does not have the budget or staff to assist him in the finer points of court procedure**, but he is **confident** that he can **grasps the intent of the LAW, as the founders crafted them**.
6. **Webster has only presented special appearance filings**, which the **courts and respondents have never refuted the claim of common law as a matter of right**. **Webster is a man on the land**, and has **confronted those who's intentions are to steal the family farm**, where he lives, farms, and maintains the **EFU zoned land**.

7. Webster kindly ask this most important court on the land, to grant his "Force Majeure" and/or send this case back to the lower courts, to honestly look at the False Claims Respondents have fabricated, per websters filings and testimony in the public record, and prosecute if webster is correct to the full extent of the LAW.

The final judgment, **ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING AND PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC**, also **REQUESTS FOR PUBLICATION OF THE MEMORANDUM DISPOSITION** was denied by Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Circuit Judges: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS entered by MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS on **December 23, 2021** and **January 12, 2022**.

The date for which the Petitions for Writ of Certiorari expire are on **March 23, 2022** and **April 12, 2022**. This application is filed for the second time at the request of the clerk and was originally postal marked on **March 22, 2022** and received on **March 29, 2022**, therefore this request is timely and the extention of time to filing writ of certiorari should granted.

Attached is copies of the final denials by the court under Rule 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c).

Re-Executed on: April, 12, 2022

Attorney in Fact: brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER April 12, 2022
brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER

Certificate of Service

I certify that a copy of the **Application for Extension of Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** was served, either by US mail, Fax, or e-mail, on person or corporation involved below within 3-business days of this filing.

Eric Oss | Court Support Supervisor

United States District Court for the District of Oregon

ORDml ProSe Filing <prosefilings@ord.uscourts.gov>

brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER April 12, 2022

brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 16 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: BRENT EVAN WEBSTER,

No. 20-35905

BRENT EVAN WEBSTER,

D.C. No. 3:20-mc-00903

Petitioner-Appellant.

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Michael W. Mosman, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 14, 2021**

Before: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Brent Evan Webster appeals pro se from the district court's order imposing a prefiling review restriction on Webster's filings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

In his opening brief, Webster fails to address how the district court erred by imposing the prefiling review restriction on frivolous or repetitive filings. As a result, Webster has waived his challenge to the district court's order. *See Smith v.*

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).*

Marsh, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999) (“[O]n appeal, arguments not raised by a party in its opening brief are deemed waived.”); *Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We will not manufacture arguments for an appellant, and a bare assertion does not preserve a claim . . .”).

We do not consider matters raised for the first time on appeal. *See Mano-Y & M, Ltd. v. Field (In re Mortg. Store, Inc.)*, 773 F.3d 990, 998 (9th Cir. 2014); *Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

DEC 23 2021

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: BRENT EVAN WEBSTER,

BRENT EVAN WEBSTER,

Petitioner-Appellant.

No. 20-35905

D.C. No. 3:20-mc-00903
District of Oregon,
Portland

ORDER

Before: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

The panel has voted to deny the petition for panel rehearing.

The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter en banc. *See Fed. R. App. P. 35.*

Webster's petition for panel rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 10) are denied. To the extent Webster requests publication of the memorandum disposition, the request is denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION**FILED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 16 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

BRENT EVAN WEBSTER,

No. 20-35979

Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:20-cv-01403-MO

v.

MEMORANDUM*

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Michael W. Mosman, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 14, 2021**

Before: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Brent Evan Webster appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his appeal from the bankruptcy court's order denying his motion for conversion to chapter 12. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

In his opening brief, Webster fails to address how the district court erred by dismissing his appeal for lack of jurisdiction. As a result, Webster has waived his challenge to the district court's order. *See Smith v. Marsh*, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999) (“[O]n appeal, arguments not raised by a party in its opening brief are deemed waived.”); *Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We will not manufacture arguments for an appellant, and a bare assertion does not preserve a claim . . .”).

We do not consider matters raised for the first time on appeal. *See Mano-Y & M, Ltd. v. Field (In re Mortg. Store, Inc.)*, 773 F.3d 990, 998 (9th Cir. 2014); *Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 12 2022

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

BRENT EVAN WEBSTER,

Appellant,

v.

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT,

Appellee.

No. 20-35979

D.C. No. 3:20-cv-01403-MO
District of Oregon,
Portland

ORDER

Before: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

The panel has voted to deny the petition for panel rehearing.

The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter en banc. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 35.

Webster's petition for panel rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 10) are denied. To the extent Webster requests publication of the memorandum disposition, the request is denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

Application No. _____

Case No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

In re: **brent evan webster** dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER / v. US BANKRUPTCY COURT

brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER – Petitioners-Appellants

Original Case Order Denying Request – USCANC - No. 20-35905

Original Case Order Denying Request – USCANC - No. 20-35979

STANDING AND MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

Petitioner qualifies for leave to file writ of certiorari and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Appropriate box Marked:

☒ Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in the following court(s): Oregon Supreme Court, District Court, 9th. Circuit Court, and US Supreme Court.

☐ Petitioner has not previously been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in any other court.

DECLARATION IN SUPPORT FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

brent evan webster is doing business as: BRENT EVAN WEBSTER, so this petitioner insists that a special appearance be observed as to conduct a court of constitutional due process in the above-entitled case/s. In support to proceed in forma pauperis, webster states because of the perpetual legal abuse in Oregon and lifelong neck and back injuries, he has not had a steady income after 1989.

Estimated average income per month from limited handyman work randomly acquired during the past 24 months after related expenses is less than \$500.00 per month.

Income source Approx.	Average monthly amount during the past 24 months		Amount expected next month	
	You	Spouse	You	Spouse
Self-employment average income	\$ <u>500.00</u>	\$ <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>500.00</u>	\$ <u>N/A</u>
Public-assistance food allowance	\$ <u>245.00</u>	\$ <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>245.00</u>	\$ <u>N/A</u>
Total monthly income:	\$ <u>745.00</u>	\$ <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>745.00</u>	\$ <u>N/A</u>

Re-Executed on: April 12, 2022

Attorney in Fact: brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER April 12, 2022

brent evan webster dba BRENT EVAN WEBSTER

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

March 29, 2022

Brent Evan Webster
8701 SE Cottrell Rd.
Boring, OR 97009

RE: USCA9 Nos. 20-35784, 20-35785, 20-35787, 20-35788, 20-35800, 20-35905, 20-35798, 20-35799, 20-35979, 21-35740

Webster v. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. (&c)

Dear Mr. Webster:

Ten different applications for an extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-referenced case(s) were postmarked March 22, 2022 and received March 29, 2022. The applications are returned for the following reason(s):

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

The application(s) must set forth with specificity the reasons why the granting of an extension of time is thought justified. Rule 13.5.

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

Please be advised that you should file only as many applications for extension of time as petitions you intend to file. For example, if you intend to file one petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of multiple judgments under Rule 12.4, you should file one application for extension of time to file that petition. Ten separate applications are only necessary if you intend to file ten separate petitions.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By:

Jacob Levitan
(202) 479-3392

Enclosures