

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Applicant,

IFTIKAR AHMED,

v.

Respondent.

OAK MANAGEMENT CORPORATION,

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Connecticut Supreme Court

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

GREGORY DUBINSKY
Counsel of Record
VINCENT LEVY
HOLWELL SHUSTER
& GOLDBERG LLP
425 Lexington Avenue
14th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(646) 837-8551
gdubinsky@hsgllp.com

Counsel for Applicant

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

To: Associate Justice Sonia Sotomayor, Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

Under this Court's Rules 13.5 and 22, Applicant Iftikar Ahmed respectfully requests an extension of thirty (30) days to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this case. His petition will challenge the decision of the Connecticut Supreme Court in *Ahmed v. Oak Management Corporation*, 348 Conn. 152 (2023), a copy of which is attached to this application. In support of this application, Applicant states the following:

1. By a divided 4-3 vote, the Connecticut Supreme Court issued its opinion on October 17, 2023. Without an extension, the petition for a writ of certiorari would be due on January 15, 2024. With the requested extension, the petition would be due on February 14, 2024. This Court's jurisdiction will be based on 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

2. This case presents a significant and important question for review. This case turns on whether an arbitrator may apply the fugitive disentitlement doctrine to entirely bar one party in an arbitration from having an opportunity to be heard. The arbitrator violated "[t]he principle that each party is entitled to an opportunity to be heard," a right that is "so fundamental to our conception of fairness that it is a rare case in which it is transgressed. When it is violated, vacatur is consistently the result." 302 A.3d 850, 901 (2023) (Alexander, J., dissenting).

3. This Court has previously granted certiorari to reverse an inappropriate application of the fugitive disentitlement doctrine. *See Degen v. United States*, 517 U.S. 820 (1996). The scrutiny of this Court is warranted in such cases because the right to be heard is a core underlying principle of justice that implicates serious due process concerns. *Id.* at 829.

4. The stakes are raised even higher in arbitration. Because review on substantive matters is severely limited, parties in an arbitral proceeding must be confident that core procedural rules will be followed. Recognizing this need, Congress delegated to the judiciary the statutory authority pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act to police abuses when an arbitrator is “guilty of misconduct . . . in refusing to hear evidence pertinent and material to the controversy.” 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(3).

5. This application for a 30-day extension seeks to accommodate Applicant’s legitimate needs. In light of the importance of the issues that will be presented in this case and other obligations of counsel which have prevented full attention to this matter, counsel submit that a thirty (30) day extension is necessary and appropriate in order to effectively prepare the petition for certiorari on Mr. Ahmed’s behalf.

6. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the due date for his petition for a writ of certiorari be extended to February 14, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregory Dubinsky

Gregory Dubinsky

Counsel of Record

Vincent Levy

HOLWELL SHUSTER

& GOLDBERG

425 Lexington Avenue

14th Floor

New York, NY 10017

(646) 837-8551

gdubinsky@hsgllp.com

Dated: January 5, 2024