

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

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JONATHAN EUGENE BRUNSON, PETITIONER

VS.

GEORGE SOLOMON, RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, 4TH CIRCUIT  
(NO. 20-1037)

MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

PETITIONER, JONATHAN E. BRUNSON, PRO SE, HEREBY RESPECTFULLY MOVES THIS HONORABLE COURT FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULES 10 AND 13 (5). A TIMELY PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS DENIED BY THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS APPROXIMATELY WITHIN THE PAST 30 DAYS. IN SUPPORT OF THIS MOTION, PETITIONER SHOWS THE FOLLOWING.

ON 4-19-22, PETITIONER TRANSFERRED INTO MAURY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, NORTH CAROLINA AT WHICH TIME THE RECEIVING OFFICER AND WARDEN CONFISCATED MY LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND FILES, INCLUDING THE DECISIONS OF THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED BY THIS COURT. IN RESPONSE, ON 4-27-22 PETITIONER FILED A GRIEVANCE AND MADE NUMEROUS WRITTEN REQUEST TO ACCESS THESE DOCUMENTS, BUT TO NO AVAIL.

PETITIONER HAS ALSO REQUESTED REPLACEMENT COPIES FROM THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS.

PETITIONER HAS NOT RECEIVED ANY ONE RESPONSE AS OF THE DATE OF THIS MOTION.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS THE 12<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MAY 2022.



JONATHAN E. BRUNSON

MANRY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

2568 MOORE ROUSE ROAD

HOOKERTON, NORTH CAROLINA 28538.

DECLARATION

I, JONATHAN E. BRUNSON, DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME IS TRUE AND CORRECT. EXECUTED ON MAY 12, 2022.



JONATHAN E. BRUNSON

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

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JONATHAN EVGENE BRUNSON, PETITIONER


VS.

GEORGE SOLOMON, RESPONDENT

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, JONATHAN E. BRUNSON, DO DECLARE THAT ON 5-12-22, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 I HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UPON THE FOLLOWING BY PLACING A COPY OF THE SAME IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, AND ADDRESSED AS FOLLOWS: N.C. DEPT. OF JUSTICE, P.O. BOX 629, RALEIGH, N.C. 27602-0629.

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.  
EXECUTED ON 5-12-22.

  
JONATHAN E. BRUNSON

MAURY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
2568 MOORE ROUSE ROAD  
HOOKERTON, N.C. 28538

NOTICE OF ADDRESS CHANGE

NEW ADDRESS:

MANRY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

2568 MOORE ROUSE ROAD

HOOKERTON, NORTH CAROLINA 28538

J. E. B.  
JONATHAN E. BRUNSON

FILED: April 5, 2022

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-7300  
(5:14-hc-02009-FL)

---

JONATHAN EUGENE BRUNSON

Petitioner - Appellant

v.

GEORGE SOLOMON

Respondent - Appellee

---

O R D E R

---

The court denies the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc. No judge requested a poll under Fed. R. App. P. 35 on the petition for rehearing en banc.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Agee, Judge Rushing, and Senior Judge Shedd.

For the Court

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

**UNPUBLISHED****UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 21-7300**

---

JONATHAN EUGENE BRUNSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GEORGE SOLOMON,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:14-hc-02009-FL)

---

Submitted: February 17, 2022

---

Decided: February 23, 2022

---

Before AGEE and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jonathan Eugene Brunson, Appellant Pro Se. Jonathan Porter Babb, Sr., Special Deputy Attorney General, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Jonathan Eugene Brunson seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motions for relief from the district court's prior order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). *See generally United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 & n.7 (4th Cir. 2015). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists could find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 759, 773-74 (2017). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Brunson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*DISMISSED*