

No. _____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

PAUL SILADI,

Petitioner,

v.


DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS
TRUSTEE FOR WAMU MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH
CERTIFICATE SERIES 2005-AR6

Respondent

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

To the Honorable Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice
Of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit
Justice for the Second Circuit.

Paul Siladi
66 Augusta Drive
Milford, CT 06461
(203) 219-2160



To the Honorable Sonia Sotomayor, as Circuit Justice for the Second Circuit:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 13.5, the applicant, Paul Siladi, respectfully requests a sixty-day extension of the time in which to petition this Court for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut for the Petition of Certification which was denied on May 17, 2022, Mr. Siladi, pro se is filing for an extension of time to search for an attorney who has practiced successfully before the U. S. Supreme Court to represent him in this action.

On the other hand, if the 75 year old Petitioner is unsuccessful in obtaining legal counsel in this matter he will need the additional time requested to prepare his petition for a writ of certiorari. Without an extension the petition for writ of certiorari is due on August 16, 2022. Applicant files this application more than 10 days before that date in compliance with Supreme Court Rule 13.5. The sixty day extension requested by the Applicant would Extend the due date to October 15, 2022. This Court will have jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1257

BACKGROUND

The Case was commenced by the Respondent Deutsche Bank National Trust Company as Trustee for WAMU Mortgage Pass- Through Certificate Series 2005-AR6 (DBNTC) alleging to be the holder of the subject Mortgage and Note. However, a material issue ignored by the CT Superior Court is that DBNTC did not actually have standing to initiate a foreclosure action according to the Pooling and Servicing Agreement creating the Trust of which

DBNTC claims to be the Trustee. That Trust clearly vests the rights to initiate and pursue foreclosure to another entity; the servicer. JPMorgan Chase Bank, NA who DBNTC claimed to have the rights to assign the subject Mortgage to them has admitted in U.S. District Court otherwise. Petitioner will provide supporting documents and citations in his Writ of Certiorari as to the CHASE admission. Over one year before DBNTC commence this action the Note associated with this action was discharged in a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy prohibiting DBNTC or any other entity from enforcing the subject Note.

Petitioner timely filed Special Defenses to the original Complaint challenging DBNTC's standing to pursue this foreclosure action. Nearly two years after commencement DBNTC, having never been required to respond to the Special Defenses of the petitioner by the CT Superior Court, filed a Motion for Summary Judgment over the Objections of the Petitioner. On a Motion by the Petitioner the Superior Court ordered Discovery to proceed. However, when he attempted to pursue discovery DBNTC Motioned the Court and was granted Protection Orders prohibiting Petitioner from questioning DBNTC as to the acquisition of the subject Mortgage and Note and how it had standing to initiate and pursue the foreclosure according to the Pooling and Servicing Agreement which created the Trust.

Despite the fact that a trial had not been held and many material issues had not been addressed by the Court; in December, 2016 the CT Superior Court granted Summary Judgment and soon after in March, 2017 foreclosed on the Petitioner's home. All the triable issues raised by the Petitioner were ignored and a trial was never held.

The CT Superior Court in granting Summary Judgment and Strict Foreclosure without conducting a trial or even an evidentiary hearing at which

the Petitioner could, as provided for in the 5th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and as construed by the U.S. Supreme Court, ASSERT his due process rights to:

1. Be heard in a meaningful time and manner.
2. Present evidence including the right to call expert witnesses.
3. Cross examine adverse witnesses and affiants.
4. Receive written findings of fact for tribunal decisions.

These proceedings stripped the petitioner of his rights guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. In particular as to the denial of a trial and the Superior Court's granting protective orders denying his right to pursue discovery and cross examine witnesses and affiants.

The Petitioner filed three Appeals as a result of the due process abuses of the Superior Court. The three rulings by the Appellate Court will be challenged by the Petitioner in his forthcoming Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

REASONS FOR GRANTING EXTENSION OF TIME

1. Since the decision by the Connecticut Supreme Court was issued on May 17, 2022 two weeks ago, the Applicant has been educating himself as to the procedures involved in preparing a petition for writ of certiorari. Applicant is in the process of finding an attorney with suitable experience who is willing to assist him in this case. Additional time is necessary to find an attorney or in the worst case scenario for petitioner to study the record and the legal issues involved in this case and prepare a petition for writ of certiorari on his own.

2. There is a reasonable prospect that this Court will grant the petition. The blatant disregard by the Connecticut Judicial System of the

petitioners due process right as guaranteed by the 5th and 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in this matter is so egregious that if presented to the Court properly it is certainly possible that this Court may grant the petition.


JURISDICTION

This Court's jurisdiction would be invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1257

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that this Court grant him a 60-day extension of time, to and including September 15, 2022, within which to file a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Paul Siladi', written over a horizontal line.

Paul Siladi, Pro Se
66 Augusta Drive
Milford, CT 06461
203 219-2160

FINAL DECISION CONNECTICUT SUPREME COURT ATTACHED