

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Mr. Clifford Dion Jackson  
AS7108 1-A3-32L  
Folsom State Prison  
P.o. Box 715071  
Represa, Ca 95671

In Pro Per:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Clifford Dion Jackson,  
Petitioner,

VS.

Neil McDowell, (WARDEN)  
Respondent.

Case No: 22-55607  
D.C. No: 2:16-CV-03422-VBF-GJS

MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME  
TO FILE WRIT OF CERTIORARI


Comes now, the petitioner Clifford Dion Jackson, In Pro Per brings the instant motion for an enlargement of time to file a writ of certiorari, enclosed with this motion is petitioners extraordinary circumstances to grant this motion. In the last year and a half, petitioner has had multiple surgeries to both of his hands that have disabled petitioner from using his hands. Both of petitioners hands have been casted and splinted for month's at a time back to back as you can see from the Medical Records. (See Exhibit-A)

Petitioner request a 60 day extension of time to prepare and file his writ of certiorari. (Rule 13)

RECEIVED  
DEC 28 2023  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

1 This motion is based on the denial of petitioners 60(b)(6)  
2 motion and Rhine v. Weber Stay that was over looked at Dixon v. Baker  
3 (2017) in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.  
4 Case No. 22-55607.

5 Dated: 12-11-2023



Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Clifford Dion Jackson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

SEP 14 2023

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

CLIFFORD D. JACKSON,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

NEIL MCDOWELL, Warden,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 22-55607

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-03422-VBF-GJS  
Central District of California,  
Los Angeles

ORDER

Before: GRABER and WARDLAW, Circuit Judges.

This appeal is from the denial of appellant's Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) motion. The request for a certificate of appealability is denied because appellant has not shown "that (1) jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court abused its discretion in denying the Rule 60(b) motion and, (2) jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the underlying section [2254 petition] states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right." *United States v. Winkles*, 795 F.3d 1134, 1143 (9th Cir. 2015); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Lynch v. Blodgett*, 999 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1993) (order).

Any pending motions are denied as moot.

**DENIED.**

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

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Clifford Dion Jackson — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS.

Neil McDowell (WARDEN) — RESPONDENT(S)

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Clifford Dion Jackson, do swear or declare that on this date, \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION *FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE WRIT of HABEAS CORPUS* 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 documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

1 First Street NE, WASHINGTON, DC 20543 UNITED STATE SUPREME COURT

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12-11, 2023

  
(Signature)