

Docket No. 22-6224

In the Supreme Court of the United States

ALI SHAHROKHI
Petitioner

vs.

KIZZY BURROW
Respondent

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY
THE DOCKETING FEE REQUIRED BY RULE 38(A)
AND TO SUBMIT A PETITION IN COMPLIANCE WITH
RULE 33.1 OF THE RULES OF THIS COURT.**

T.MATTHEW PHILLIPS, Esq
4894 W. Lone Mtn. Rd. No. 132
Las Vegas, NV 89130
(323) 314-6996
TMatthewPhillips@aol.com

PARTIES *to the* PROCEEDING

The caption of the case contains the names of all the parties to this petition, Ali Shahrokhi and Kizzy Burrow.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

As per Rule 29.6, Petitioner, Shahrokhi, is a natural person. There is no parent corporation.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

STATE OF NEVADA CASES:

- BURROW v. SHAHROKHI – A PATERNITY PETITION, CUSTODY DISPUTE, CURRENTLY OPEN, CASE NO. D-18-581208-P, (A SEALED CASE).

- BURROW v. SHAHROKHI – A CHILD SUPPORT CASE, CURRENTLY OPEN, CASE No. R-21-218156-R.

STATE OF OREGON CASES:

- BURROW v. SHAHROKHI, a registration of foreign custody order, change of jurisdiction, Case No. 22DR14283

State of Nevada—Appellate Cases:

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, November 6, 2019, GRANTING Petition for a Writ of Mandamus in Part and Denying Petition in Part, Case No. COA-79336, Nevada Court of Appeals.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, June 9, 2020, GRANTING Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 82803, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, January 2, 2020, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. COA-80277, Nevada Court of Appeals.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, February 6, 2020, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. COA-80447, Nevada Court of Appeals.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, July 28, 2020, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. COA-81218, Nevada Court of Appeals.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, September 18, 2020, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. COA-81791, Nevada Court of Appeals.

- SHAHROKHI v. BURROW, May 12, 2022, Appeals affirmed, three combined cases, Case Nos. 81978, 82245, 83726, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, July 30, 2021, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 83164, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, October 13, 2021, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 83558, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, November 16, 2021, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 83772, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. BURROW, October 28, 2021, dismissing appeal for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, Case No. 83726, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, February 2, 2022, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No.83973, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, December 23, 2021, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 83927, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, February 18, 2022, No action was taken on Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 84043.

- SHAHROKHI v. NEVADA COMMISSION on JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE, February 10, 2022, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 84124, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, April 29, 2022, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 84189, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, March 18, 2022, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 84341, Nevada Supreme Court.

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, December 6, 2022, Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No.85655, Nevada Supreme Court.

////

////

- SHAHROKHI v. EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT, Currently Pending, Case No. 85705, Nevada Supreme Court.

Federal Cases:

- SHAHROKHI v. HARTER, et. al., 2:20-cv-01019-APG-VCF, case dismissed under Younger abstention.
- SHAHROKHI v. HARTER, et. al., 2:20-cv-01623-JAD-NJK, case currently STAYED under Younger abstention.
- SHAHROKHI v. TAO, et. al., 2:20-cv-02346-GMN-VCF, case dismissed.
- PHILLIPS, et. al., v. OCHOA, et. al., 2:21-cv-00483-APG-NJK, case dismissed under Younger abstention.
- SHAHROKHI v. HARTER, et. al., 2:21-cv-00557-APG-BNW, erroneous dismissal by the district court stating: The plaintiffs have no case pending before Judge Harter, so they cannot show they have suffered particularized and concrete injury in fact. They thus lack standing to assert these claims. [Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. 330, 339-40 (2016)].
- SHAHROKHI v. THRONE, et. al., 2:22-cv-00001-JAD-VCF, case dismissed under Younger abstention.

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Cases:

- PHILLIPS, et. al., v. VINCENT OCHOA, et. al., 0:2021cv16030, Affirmed,

court stated Younger abstention does not apply to this case, yet affirmed based on issue preclusion.

- ALI SHAHROKHI, et. al., v. USDC-Nevada, 0:2021op71158, Petition for Writ of Mandamus denied, Petitioners have not demonstrated that this case warrants the intervention of this court by means of the extraordinary remedy of mandamus.

- ALI SHAHROKHI v. TAO, 0:2021cv16171, affirmed.

- ALI SHAHROKHI v. DAWN THRONE, et. al., 0:2021cv16171, currently pending before the three-panel court.

- ALI SHAHROKHI v. HARTER, et. al., 0:2022cv15276, currently pending before the court.

* * *

To the Honorable Justice Elena Kagan:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 30, Petitioner, Ali Shahrokhi, (“Shahrokhi”), now makes this application to the Court, *respectfully* for extension of fourteen (14) days to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

On January 23, 2023, this court entered the following order in the docket of Case No. 22-6224: “The motion by the petitioner for leave to proceed in forma pauperis has been denied. The petitioner has been given until February 13, 2023 to pay the docketing fee as required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition that complies with Rule 33.1 of the court's rules”.

The petitioner will comply with the court order. However, petitioner just needs a 14-day extension as there are about 138 pages worth of appendix that need to be re-typed and reformatted to comply with Rule 33.1 of the court, which will require more time to be done properly.

Shahrokhi respectfully thus requests a 14-day extension of time until February 27, 2023, in order to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

Dated: **January 31, 2023**

/s/ T.Matthew Phillips, Esq.
Attorney of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of this application was served via email and U.S. mail to parties listed below in accordance with Supreme Court Rules 22.2 and 29.3: I am an individual over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action. My Business address is Law Office of T. Matthew Phillips, Esq. 4894 W. Lone Mtn. Rd. No. 132 Las Vegas, NV 89130 . My phone number is (323) 314-6996

On **Jan. 31, 2023**, I served the following:

Kizzy Burrow
16408 SW Timberland Dr.
Beaverton, OR 97007

Supreme Court of Nevada
201 South Carson St. Suite 201
Carson City, NV 89702

on an interested party in the above-entitled action by

 X via e-mail transmission,

 personal service on the person below listed,

 X depositing it in the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid,

and addressed to the person below listed,

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: **Jan. 31, 2023**

/s/ T.Matthew Phillips .
Affiant.