

Raul Mendez
2712 N Goldeneye Way
Meridian, Idaho 83646
Telephone: (208) 871-7237
raulmendez02@yahoo.com
Pro Se

23A519

RECEIVED
DEC 04 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

RAUL MENDEZ,

Petitioner,

V.

Ada Community Libraries Board, et al.

Respondents.

Supreme Court No.
9th Circuit No. 22-35151
Case No. 1:20-cv-00589-DCN

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 04 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT
OF CERTIORARI PER RULE 13 (5) AND
MOTION REQUESTING RULES,
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN
FORMA PAUPERIS PER RULE 21**

Pro Se Petitioner Raul Mendez, respectfully requests a 60 day extension to file the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The attached Order denying rehearing was filed on October 10, 2023. The 90 day deadline to file the petition is on 1/8/2024. Mendez requests a 60 day extension from 1/8/2024 but he will diligently work to file the petition before then. In addition, Mendez would like a copy of the IFP application and pertinent rules.

Mendez has good cause to request an extension since he is a pro se party and needs additional time to conduct research in support of his Petition for writ of Certiorari. Mendez would briefly summarize why he has good cause as follow:

1) The Idaho Law Library is open business hours from 8-5 and closed on the weekends. It is extremely difficult for pro se non-attorneys to access the only place in all of Idaho that has legal resources available to the public.

RECEIVED
DEC -7 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

- 2) Mendez case involve civil rights. Mendez is aware that it has become routine practice at the Judicial Branch of government to dismiss civil rights cases from the lower courts to the Supreme Court. Mendez questions if it has become a problem involving separations of power when Congress has vested those rights and the courts are denying them.
- 3) The Ninth Circuit panel erred in holding that the district court properly dismissed Mendez First Amendment claim because it was not decided at the district level.
- 4) Neither of the District Court or Ninth Circuit addressed the right to vote issue on the complaint.
- 5) A pro se complaint cannot be deemed a Taxpayer claim within the meaning of the law because a Taxpayer claim is representative of a group of people.
- 6) The Ninth Circuit panel erred when holding just like the district court that an Equal Protection Claim requires proof of discrimination because of race/protected class.

CONCLUSION

Mendez understands that review by the Supreme Court is discretionary and Mendez is aware that the Supreme Court very rarely hears pro se cases. Mendez does not see any harm in granting an extension to file the petition given that it's unlikely that the court will grant certiorari.

DATED: December 4, 2023


Raul Mendez