

ORIGINAL


No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WAYNE ENGLISH,
Petitioner,

V.

PARCEL EXPRESS, INC.,
Respondent.




**APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court:

1. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.5, petitioner Wayne English respectfully requests a 30-day extension of time, until Monday, November 27, 2023, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari. The Texas Supreme Court denied the Petition for Review on July 28, 2023. A copy of the opinion is attached. The Texas Supreme Court denied petitioner's rehearing petition on July 28, 2023. A copy of the order is attached. This Court's jurisdiction would be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

2. Absent an extension, a petition for a writ of certiorari would be due on October 26, 2023. This application is being filed more than 10 days in advance of that date, and no prior application has been made in this case.



3. This case concerns whether the Texas Court's through nefarious means, has deny a Texas resident, a Federal constituent and a U. S. citizen a right to trial, a right to produce evidence and documents, and a right to a fair and impartial hearing because the Petitioner did not have any legal representation and was not a license practicing attorney.

4. This case will show that the Texas Court's ignored Texas Statutory law, Federal law, Constitutional Law, and specific prior decision by the Texas Supreme Court in their efforts to deny Petitioner a fair trial and to sanction Petitioner with fines and legal harassment, while blocking his ability to appeal or present his case. Petitioner will provide evidence that the Texas Courts violated statutory law and procedures as follows: 1) requiring an appellate bond five times the statutory limit; 2) refusing to provide documents and court records under a freedom of information request; 3) charging fines, sanctions, and attorney fees to non-attorney litigants without any basis in law or equity; 4) misplacing, losing, or the disappearance of court documents, evidence, and pleadings both hand delivered and mailed; 5) the court docket failing to list or identify only the Petitioner's filings while showing all of Respondent's documents filed by opposing counsel; 6) denying Petitioner hearings on Motions filed to dismiss, summary judgment, and for sanctions; 7) misplacing, losing, or the disappearance of appellate court documents both hand delivered and mailed; and 8) for ruling that Petitioner had no evidence while interpreting and disputing the government documents and business records the Petitioner attached to his pleadings.

5. This is an important case. The Texas Courts are denying procedural due process to litigants based on whether they are represented by counsel. While in


court, the Petitioner observed all other parties without representation not only suffering constant defeat but continued sanctions and fines and rulings that ordered their payment of attorney fees. In trying to appeal, Petitioner was charged an excessive appellate bond of five times the statutory limit, the misplacement and disappearance of court documents whether sent by mail or hand delivered, and court records sent to the appellate court only showing the Respondent's documents filed by their attorney while "losing" or "misplacing" pleadings and evidence submitted by Petitioner. Petitioner had to consistently file documents two or three times, file motions to place previously filed documents in the record for appellate review, and the court and clerks providing no reasonable explanation to why Petitioner filings disappear. The action by the Texas judiciary means the appeal rights of litigants without counsel in civil cases are different based on their status because they appear pro se. This prevents the filing of meritorious claims by litigants because their pockets are bare or their funds are limited.

7. Petitioner respectfully requests an extension of time to file a petition for certiorari. At the certiorari stage, petitioner is recovering from covid and his efforts are limited to research and complete his pleadings. A 30-day extension would allow Petitioner sufficient time to fully examine the court's decision, the consequences of this appeal, to research and analyze the issues presented, and prepare the petition for filing.

Wherefore, petitioner, Wayne English, respectfully requests that an order be entered extending the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to Monday, November 27, 2023 and any other relief the Court considers appropriate.

October 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,


Wayne English, pro se
4849 Bluecap Court
Mesquite, Texas 75181
214-460-4975, fax 972-222-4285
waynemenglish@aol.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing instrument was forwarded to all attorneys of record by email, mail, or fax on October ~~10~~¹⁵, 2023.

By:



WAYNE ENGLISH

FILE COPY

RE: Case No. 23-0255 DATE: 6/2/2023
COA #: 05-20-00961-CV TC#: CC-20-00291-D
STYLE: ENGLISH v. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC.

Today the Supreme Court of Texas denied the petition
for review in the above-referenced case.

MR. WAYNE M. ENGLISH
4849 BLUECAP COURT
MESQUITE, TX 75181
* DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL *

FILE COPY

RE: Case No. 23-0255 DATE: 7/28/2023
COA #: 05-20-00961-CV TC#: CC-20-00291-D
STYLE: ENGLISH v. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC.

Today the Supreme Court of Texas denied the motion for
rehearing of the above-referenced petition for review.

MR. WAYNE M. ENGLISH
* DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL *

5