

APP NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOHN STANCU

(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

VS.

THE HIGHLAND HILTON
dba HEI Hotels & Resorts

— RESPONDENT(S)

From the U.S. Court of Appeals, 5-th Circuit
Case No. 24-10627

PETITIONER'S APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME
TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

John Stancu

John Stancu

Petitioner

P.O. Box 133171

Dallas, TX 75313

(469)567-3365

The Petitioner files this application asking the Court for extention of time to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The following are the facts relevant to this petition :

1. Petitioner Stancu ("Stancu") is a pro se, forma pauperis litigant.

2. Stancu filed his appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on July 26, 2024.

3. The established method of communication between Stancu and the Fifth Circuit was via U.S. Mail.

4. On February 14, 2025, Stancu received a letter from the Fifth Circuit informing him that his appeal was dismissed. A true and correct copy of said letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

5. The reasons why granting an extention of time are based on facts and thought justified are briefly described below :

(a). The U.S. Constitution. (Seventh Amendment, and Fifth Amendment).

The U.S. District Court from Dallas, Texas and the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, wrongly denied Stancu's Constitutional rights to a jury trial and due process.

(b). The courts named above nullified Stancu's Constitutional rights because he is a pro se litigant, and because they were sure that the U.S. Supreme Court will never review Stancu's petition for a writ of certiorari. This travesty of justice harmed not only Stancu, but millions of other working class Americans who could not afford to hire an attorney.

- (c). For the record, this is the eighth (8th) work-place discrimination case that was wrongly dismissed by the U.S. District Court from Dallas, Texas, and U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The U.S. Supreme Court denied Stancu's petitions for writ of certiorari in all cases - eight of them.
- (d). This travesty of justice has found its way in the mass media and the court of public opinion. For example, in November, 2022, CNN presented a one hour, prime-time documentary titled "The Deep Pockets of Texas". The broadcast concluded by comparing our justice system with a **"Russian style oligarchy"**. The actions of the courts named above are aiding and abetting this oligarchy.

Stancu asks the Court for 60 days extension of time to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari, specifically from May 14, 2025, when Stancu mailed this corrected application requested by this court.

John Stancu

John Stancu
Petitioner Pro Se
P.O Box 133171
Dallas, TX 75313
(202)689-9233

APP No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOHN STANCU

(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

VS.

THE HIGHLAND HILTON
dba HEI Hotels & Resorts

— RESPONDENT(S)

From the U.S. Court of Appeals, 5-th Circuit
Case No. 24-10627

PETITIONER'S AMENDED APPLICATION FOR EXTENTION OF TIME TO FILE
A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

John Stancu

John Stancu

Petitioner

P.O Box 133171

Dallas, TX 75313

(469)567-3365

Petitioner Stancu ("Stancu") files this amended application asking the Court for 60 days extention of time to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The following are the additional facts relevant to this application :

1. Stancu is a **pro se , forma pauperis** petitioner. For a U.S. Supreme Court petitioner without the assistance of an attorney takes much longer time to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari. In addition, a forma pauperis petitioner has to complete and file more documents than a standard petitioner, i.e. Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis, which (again) takes more time.

2. In addition to the above reasons, Stancu is a 70 years old man. For a human being of this age takes a lot more time to do anything, and especially a petition for a writ of certiorari.

3. On top of all of the above, Stancu is under a disabling medical condition, and medical treatments that slows him down even more.

For all the reasons presented above, Stancu asks the Court for 60 days extention of time to file his Petition of Certiorari, specifically from May 28, 2025, when Stancu mailed this amended application, to July 28, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

John Stancu

John Stancu

Petitioner Pro Se
P.O. Box 133171
Dallas, TX 75313
(469)567-3365

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the enclosed application was sent
via U.S. Mail to the lawyer for Respondents on May 28, 2025, at :

Esteban Shardonovsky
700 Milam St., #1400
Houston, TX 77002

John Stancu

John Stancu

EXHIBIT A

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-10627
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 14, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JOHN STANCU,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

THE HIGHLAND HILTON, *doing business as* HEI HOTELS &
RESORTS,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:23-CV-894

Before DENNIS, HO, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff-Appellant John Stancu, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's dismissal of his employment discrimination and retaliation claims against Defendant-Appellee Highland Hilton (HEI). For the following reasons, we AFFIRM.

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

Stancu began working for HEI as a maintenance engineer in Dallas, Texas in October 2022 and was injured when another hotel employee allegedly crashed into him with a laundry cart. Stancu filed suit in April 2023, alleging that HEI violated the Americans with Disabilities Act by discriminating against him when it denied several requests for reasonable accommodations and by retaliating against him. After allowing Stancu the opportunity to amend his initial complaint, the district court granted HEI's Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, finding that he failed to state a claim and that further amendment was futile. Stancu appeals.

On appeal, Stancu argues that the district court's dismissal of his claims violated both the Fifth and Seventh Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Neither of these arguments is meritorious. First, "[d]ismissal of [Stancu's] claims pursuant to a valid 12(b)(6) motion does not violate [his] right to a jury trial under the Seventh Amendment." *Haase v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 748 F.3d 624, 631 n.5 (5th Cir. 2014) (citing *Sparkman v. Am. Bar Ass'n*, 281 F.3d 1278 (5th Cir. 2001)). Second, the district court's dismissal does not violate his Fifth Amendment right to engage in discovery because he has not made a plausible claim that he is entitled to relief. *Lumpkins v. Office of Cmty. Dev.*, 621 F. App'x 264, 270 (5th Cir. 2015).

Importantly, Stancu does not raise any arguments about the merits of the district court's analysis. By failing to brief why the district court's judgment is incorrect, Stancu has effectively abandoned any such arguments. *See Dardar v. Lafourche Realty Co., Inc.*, 985 F.2d 824, 831 (5th Cir. 1993) ("Questions posed for appellate review but inadequately briefed are considered abandoned."); *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987) ("We will not raise and discuss legal issues that [appellant] has failed to assert."). While we "liberally construe briefs of *pro se* litigants and apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding *pro se* than to parties represented by counsel, *pro se* parties must still brief the

issues.” *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995). As such, we AFFIRM the district court’s judgment.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the enclosed application was sent via U.S. Certified Mail to the counsel for Respondents at :

Esteban Shardonofsky
700 Milam St., # 1400
Houston, TX 77002

John Stancu

John Stancu