

App. No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term 2022

**Lauren Andersen,
*Applicant/Petitioner,***

v.

**British Airways (“BA”) PLC, et al.,
*Respondents.***

**Application for an Extension of Time
Within Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the US Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit**

**PETITIONER'S APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME
TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Lauren Andersen
1710 East Franklin Street, #1159
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Applicant/Petitioner

RECEIVED

FEB - 8 2023

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

APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Pursuant to Rule 13.5 of the Rules of this Court, Applicant Lauren Andersen hereby requests a 60-day extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari up to and including April 28, 2023.

JUDGMENT FOR WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT

The judgment for which review is sought is *Andersen v. British Airways et al.*, Second Circuit docket no. 22-850 (“*Andersen v. BA*”, 22-cv-1594, EDNY, formerly 22-cv-1045, SDNY) (attached as Exhibit 1). The US Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit denied Applicant’s motion for rehearing on November 28, 2022 (attached as Exhibit 2). The mandate was issued December 5, 2022.

JURISDICTION

This Court will have jurisdiction over any timely filed petition for certiorari in this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1). Under Rules 13.1, 13.3, and 30.1 of the Rules of this Court, a petition for a writ of certiorari was due to be filed on or before February 27, 2023. In accordance with Rule 13.5, this application is being filed more than 10 days in advance of the filing date for the petition for a writ of certiorari.

REASONS JUSTIFYING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of the US Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit in this case, up to and including April 28, 2023.

1. I am seeking an attorney to represent me in this matter. In 11 years of this and related litigation, I have been represented for less than a fifth of that time, and both of my attorneys committed malpractice. So, unsurprisingly, it is difficult for me to trust attorneys. However, it has become obvious to me that *pro se* litigants are not taken as seriously by the courts as they should be, despite the courts' various pronouncements about equality. It would be impractical for me to get a law degree at 60 years of age. Therefore, the only sensible course of action is for me to continue to seek legal representation.

2. I have endured extreme harassment, intimidation, threats, oppression, gamesmanship, coercion, information chilling, and resulting injury, by the Defendants and their conspirators, in retaliation for my criticism of them in my pleadings and in administrative complaints. The harassment has affected almost every area of my life, from my healthcare, to my children, to my business, to my finances, to my home, to my transport. I am moving out of New York State to escape the harassment, but this is a time-consuming process of pulling up family roots which go back to the 1800s.

3. I continued to seek representation in the six years since the departure of my second attorney, although it has become painfully apparent after contacting dozens of them that I have been obstructed in this endeavor. For example, the chief of Brooklyn Bar Association's lawyer referral service told me that their lawyers do not take any cases involving mental healthcare, which is a farcically discriminatory policy – especially given that one in five of US adults suffers from mental illness each

year (source: National Alliance on Mental Illness, *nami.org*). The City Bar Association rejected my case for a lawyer referral without explanation, which explains why this organization is among my defendants. These rejections clearly have nothing to do with the quality of my case. (I have not made this application to Circuit Justice Sonia Sotomayor because she has been given a medal by my defendant the City Bar Association, which is a conflict of interest.¹)

4. The various forms of harassment have exacerbated my health problems, which include depression, PTSD, sleep disruption, and gastrointestinal distress. These are well documented (see *Andersen v. BA*, Amended Complaint, ¶¶53, 216, 223, 392-393). The symptoms worsen when I am under stress. For the court to place unnecessary time pressure on me to finish this petition early, thereby aggravating my illness, would be discriminatory.

DATED: February 1, 2023
Chapel Hill, NC

Respectfully submitted,



Lauren R. Andersen
Applicant/Petitioner, *pro se*
1710 East Franklin Street, #1159
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

phone: 516-934-1985
myhumanrights2@gmail.com

¹ <https://www.nycbar.org/media-listing/media/detail/city-bar-presents-association-medal-to-us-supreme-court-justice-sonia-sotomayor-and-unveils-her-portrait>

EXHIBIT 1

E.D.N.Y. – C. Islip
22-cv-1594
Brown, J.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 12th day of October, two thousand twenty-two.

Present:

Pierre N. Leval,
Denny Chin,
Eunice C. Lee,
Circuit Judges.

Lauren Andersen,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

22-850

British Airways (BA) PLC, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appellant, pro se, moves for reconsideration of her motion for an extension of time to file her brief, to transfer her appeal to either the Third, Fourth, or Eleventh Circuits, and to intervene as “co-plaintiff” on behalf of Andersen Caledonia Ltd. Appellant’s parents, Shirley R. Andersen and Harold W. Andersen, and Appellant’s son, Cameron W. Lintott, move to intervene in the appeal.

Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the transfer motion is DENIED. Even if this Court were authorized to transfer the case to another circuit, Appellant has not demonstrated that venue would be appropriate in those jurisdictions and that a transfer would serve the interests of justice or judicial economy. See 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a); cf. *AT&T v. FCC*, 519 F.2d 322, 325 (2d Cir. 1975) (finding “inherent power to order” the transfer of a petition for review of an administrative decision, over which both it and another circuit had jurisdiction and venue, where the other circuit had before it a related order, “in the interest of justice and sound judicial administration”).

It is further ORDERED that the appeal is DISMISSED because it “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see Pillay v. INS*, 45 F.3d 14, 16–17 (2d Cir. 1995) (per curiam) (holding that this Court has “inherent authority” to dismiss a frivolous appeal). It is further ORDERED that the remaining motions are DENIED as moot.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court


Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

The seal of the United States Second Circuit Court of Appeals is circular. It features the words "UNITED STATES" at the top, "SECOND CIRCUIT" in the center, and "COURT OF APPEALS" at the bottom. There are small stars on either side of the central text.

EXHIBIT 2

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT**

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 28th day of November, two thousand twenty-two.

Lauren Andersen,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

British Airways (BA) PLC, Mr. Anthony Battista, Esq., et
al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

ORDER

Docket No: 22-850

Appellant, Lauren Andersen, filed a motion for panel reconsideration, or, in the alternative, for reconsideration *en banc*. The panel that determined the appeal has considered the request for reconsideration, and the active members of the Court have considered the request for reconsideration *en banc*.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is denied.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk


Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this date, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, I have served the enclosed Application For Extension Of Time To File Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above document in the U.S. mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid.

DATED: February 1, 2023
Chapel Hill, NC

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lauren R. Andersen", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lauren R. Andersen
Applicant/Petitioner, *pro se*
1710 East Franklin Street, #1159
Chapel Hill, NC 27514