

Martha Carrascal
Plaintiff,
v.
American Airlines Inc.,
Defendant

Application for Extension
of Time to File a Petition
for Sixty Days

Case No: 23 1746

Date: January 25, 2024

To Whom it may concern,


I am writing to request an extension of time for sixty days (60) in order to submit my Petition for Writ of Certiorari; due to my precarious economic situation and high costs of Paralegal Services to type my handwritten documents, following the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I will appreciate your understanding.

Respectfully,

Martha A. Carrascal

Martha A. Carrascal
P. O. Box 15628
Alexandria, VA 22309
cell. 703. 919. 0581



FILED: November 2, 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1746
(1:22-cv-00825-LMB-JFA)

MARTHA CARRASCAL

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.

Defendant - Appellee

J U D G M E N T

In accordance with the decision of this court, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 41.

/s/ NWAMAKA ANOWI, CLERK

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1746

MARTHA CARRASCAL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:22-cv-00825-LMB-JFA)

Submitted: October 31, 2023

Decided: November 2, 2023

Before HARRIS and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Martha Carrascal, Appellant Pro Se. Daniel E. Farrington, Lauren Genvert Goetzl, FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Martha Carrascal appeals the district court's order dismissing her employment discrimination action as a sanction for failing to comply with her discovery obligations pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A)(v). After reviewing the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Carrascal's action. *See Mey v. Phillips*, 71 F.4th 203, 217 (4th Cir. 2023) (stating standard). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Carrascal v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00825-LMB-JFA (E.D. Va. June 15, 2023). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED