No	
In The	
Supreme Court of the United States	
Sohail M. Abdulla,	
Petitioner	
V.	
Southern Bank,	
Respondent.	
Petitioner's Application For Extension of Time	
To File a Petition For A Writ of Certiorari	
Sohail M. Abdulla	
647 Vincent Ave., NE	
Aiken, SC 29801	
To the Honorable Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of	the Supreme Court of the
United States and Circuit Justice for the Eleventh Circuit	

Petitioner, Sohail M. Abdulla, respectfully applies to this Court for an order extending the time in which to file his petition for writ of certiorari (The U.S. Court of

OCT 1 2 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUBBEME COURT, U.S.

Appels for the Eleventh Circuit Case No. 22-12037, issued its ruling denying Petitioner on July 19, 2023.) from October 17, 2023, until November 16, 2023, a period of thirty (30) days. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1257. In support of this Application, Petitioner states as follows:

1. The Petitioner is a pro se and is experiencing difficulties in putting together his Petition to meet the Court's standards and file his Petition by the deadline.

2. The Petitioner is also having personal difficulties, including an ailing mother, which are constraining his time to finalize the Petition.

Wherefore, for good cause shown, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court extend the current October 17, 2023 deadline until November 16, 2023.

Respectfully Submitted this 8 day of October 2023.

Petitioner: Sohail M. Abdulla

647 Vincent Avenue, NE

Aiken, SC 29801

(202) 603-5958

smabox@live.com

In the United States Court of Appeals For the Flowenth Aircrit

Mor th	e Kleventh Ui	rcuit
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No. 22-12037	
		
SOHAIL M. ABDULLA,		
		Plaintiff-Appellant,
versus		
SOUTHERN BANK,		
		Defendant-Appellee,
SARDIS BANKSHARES, II	NC.,	
		Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia

Order of the Court

22-12037

D.C. Docket No. 1:21-cv-00099-JRH-BKE

Before WILSON, JORDAN, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

2

Appellant's motion to recall the mandate and for leave to file his "Motion for Reconsideration" as an untimely petition for rehearing, as construed from his "Motion Reinstate and to Stay Mandate," is DENIED.