

APP NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Aisha Wright,
Petitioner,

V.


Union Pacific Railroad,
Respondent,

On Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of
Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court

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

Aisha Wright
P.O. Box 11826
Houston, TX 77293
Aishawright68@gmail.com
903-630-0916

Pro Se, Aisha Wright, for Petitioner



NOW INTO COURT, comes Plaintiff, Petitioner, Pro Se, Aisha Wright, by undersigned counsel, unto this Honorable Supreme Court Justices,

In Accordance with this Court's Rules 13.5. I Petitioner Aisha Wright, Pro Se, respectfully request that the time to file its Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this matter be extended be for 60 days up to and including July 24, 2023, from the date of due date on May 23, 2023, (Appendix) A The Court of Appeals issued its opinion is not designated on January 25, 2023. (Appendix) B denied rehearing en banc on February 23, 2023 because no member of the panel or judge in regular active service requested that the court be polled on rehearing en banc. (Appx) C. The JUDGMENT, this cause was considered on the record of Appeal and brief on March 03, 2023. The Petition for Writ of Certiorari would be due on May 23, 2023. Petitioner is filing this Application more than ten days before that date. This Court would have jurisdiction over the Judgment under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1). The Undersigned Pro Se Petitioner, due to my unforeseen disability condition at times, this case involves and extensive record, complicated legal issues, the tremendous pressure of other equally urgent professional work requiring that awaiting more legal documents needs to be preparation, and Pro Se, of handling another case in The Court of Law, Southern District of Texas Houston Division, Aisha Wright v. Transportation communication Union/IAM, Civil Action No. 4:21-cv-3174, Pro Se, as solo, on my own of needing more time for my Writ Certiorari to be submitted on or by July 24, 2023. **Appendix D is my Notarized Medical Condition** which was submitted in the court of law throughout out my Court Proceedings that was never discussed or used as evidence of retaliation from working in hostile work environment which caused me to be disable. I pray you accept this application within the ten days per the Supreme Court Rules Filing and Rules, Rules and Guidance to Grant the Petitioner extension.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND:

Prior to my last Dismissal of my former attorney of Marjorie Murphy failed to do her Fiduciary duties to represent me properly throughout my court proceedings. As I discovered as Pros, Se and to my new evidence of findings on March 2023 and April 2023 of two Transcripts and 2 hearings with supporting documents in Appendix E, explains how my case was maliciously dismissed in favor of Union Pacific Railroad. I Aisha Wright Bring facts (1) An agreed Protective order was in place without my consent in presence of my attorney, whereas, the Form 9 from the Southern District Court Southern District of Texas Houston Division of the correct form filing, to properly signed in presence of an attorney, (2) The Hearing Conference without my knowledge and not me being there, where the documents show's a **P. Wright** and not Aisha Wright of whom I filed lawsuit, (3). **The Court Docket Text: Cleary states No hearing was held in this case and No Transcript's at the end of the case of being dismissed in 06/01/2020 and 05/31/2022 of being deceit.** Furthermore, **Judge Lynn Hughes from the Defendant Docket #80**, enclosed brought to Law Clerk attention of **Financial Disclosures of Union Pacific Railroad of Shares Stock that the Judge Lynn Hughes owns**, see enclosed documents of his financial Disclosures of his shares of Stocks from Union Pacific Railroad, but cover it up with and **Clarification Order saying This Court Doesn't own stocks when all reality he owns stock**, which is a violation under oath of the Judge Lynn Hughes of being maliciously dishonest for failure to rescue himself, see all documents in **Appendix E**. These allegations of documents raise suspicious from all four Official parties including Judge Lynn Hughes, Marjorie Murphy, Elizabeth Graham, and Jacquelyn V. Clark were **all in collaborations without my consent and not knowing behind closed doors from the District Lower court of Maliciously, Prejudicial of misrepresentation,**

improper of being one sided, self-dealing, conspiracy with cahoots of misrepresentation, deceit to denied my rights to be objective to my case to hear my case which was rightfully denied as being presence, but instead a P. wright was there at both Hearing, My question is who is P Wright? The sole purpose of the Background of Facts to bring all my disclosure of supporting evidence of information that I submitting to the Supreme Court of Justices, I the Petition was never giving a Fair Hearing nor a Trail to prove my case as you can see from the supporting documents. It raises suspicious as well in the documents **of Opinion #71 that the defendant mention in Docket #80**, if it was an opinion why come it's not stated or listed, instead, I discovered the **Opinion #71** is a former attorney Delona Laxton of being terminated/withdraw from the case where the defendant is being a deceit of dishonesty along with the other three official parties of falsely statements of mishandling my case to favor Union Pacific Railroad. This whole case has a lot of malicious intentional misconduct of all Judicial Parties to have my case dismiss wrongfully. I asked that you Grant the Extension for the Writ Certiorari or how you see fit from all this sufficient documents that was presented by me discovering throughout my research of my case as Pro se, solo to have an **Oral argument or remand back to the Lower Court under a new Judge and trail I would be greatly appreciative; I'm asking because if you don't ask you will never know.** I would have never **agreed to any of this unforeseen** of frivolous mishandled of misleading of deceit to go unjust without my consent or presences of my truth in the Court of Law.

Rule 56 The rule 56(c) summary judgment/federal rules of civil procedures in the court may: (1) give an opportunity to properly support or address the fact

2) consider the fact undisputed for purposes of the motion;

3) grant summary judgment if the motion and supporting materials —

including the facts considered undisputed — show that the movant is entitled to it; or (4) issue any other appropriate order.

I pray and humbly submit this Additional Evidence and laying my case at the mercy of the Supreme Court Justices to Grant my Case.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aisha Wright
P.O. Box 11826
Houston, TX 77293
Aishawright68@gmail.com
903-630-0916

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing on this date, May 09, 2023, as required by Supreme Court Rule 13.5, I have served the enclosed Application for Extension Of Time To File Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari to the Union Pacific Railroad Counsel parties below in the U.S. mail properly. The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Jacquelyn V. Clark
Direct: 402-544-3078
Email: jvclark@up.com
[COR LD NTC Retained]
Union Pacific Railroad Company
Stop 1580
1400 Douglas Street
Omaha, NE 68179-0000

Reha Dallon
Direct: 402-544-5016
Email: rdallon@up.com
[COR NTC Retained]
Union Pacific Railroad Company
Mail Stop 1580
1400 Douglas Street
Omaha, NE 68179-0000

Sydney Erica Richards
Direct: 402-544-4468
Email: serichar@up.com
[COR NTC Retained]
Union Pacific Railroad Company
1400 Douglas Street
Omaha, NE 68179-0000

/S/Aisha Wright

APPENDIX A

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

January 25, 2023

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 22-20322
Summary Calendar

AISHA WRIGHT,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:19-CV-203

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Aisha Wright appeals the District Court's order granting summary judgment in favor of her former employer, Union Pacific Railroad, on her employment discrimination claim.

We review that summary judgment ruling *de novo*, applying the same standard as the district court in the first instance. *Davis v. Fort Bend Cty.*, 765

* This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 22-20322

F.3d 480, 484 (5th Cir.2014). We interpret all facts and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmovant. *Ion v. Chevron USA, Inc.*, 731 F.3d 379, 389 (5th Cir.2013). Summary judgment is appropriate only when the record reveals “no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” FED.R.CIV.P. 56(a).

Upon review of the parties’ briefs and the record, we find no reversible error in the district court’s determination that Wright failed to establish that Union Pacific’s legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for her termination was a pretext for discrimination. Wright’s remaining arguments and requests are not properly before this court. We therefore affirm the district court’s order granting summary judgment to Union Pacific. The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

APPENDIX B

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 22-20322

AISHA WRIGHT,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:19-CV-203

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING
AND REHEARING EN BANC

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

The petition for panel rehearing is DENIED. Because no member of the panel or judge in regular active service requested that the court be polled on rehearing en banc (FED. R. APP. P. 35 and 5TH CIR. R. 35), the petition for rehearing en banc is DENIED.

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**