

June 9, 2025

Scott S. Harris, Clerk Supreme Court of the United States
One First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543
sharris@supremecourt.gov

**Re: Drone v Duff et al., No.3:17-cv-00332-JAGVAED, Motion to Extend Time to File
A Petition for Writ of Certiorari**

Dear Mr. Harris:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 30.4, Respondents respectfully move for an extension of the time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari in the above captioned matter. This request is supported by good cause and is not sought for purposes of delay. A 60-day extension, until August 30, 2025 is needed to get a handle on personal and medical issues and allow ample time to provide a petition to the Court.

I would like to appeal a 4th Circuit Court decision regarding an employment issue. I cannot afford an attorney to assist me with this matter, and I will be attempting to file this paperwork myself. However, I have undergone serious personal and medical issues since February 2025 and have been unable to secure counsel to assist me in this matter. This extension will allow me time to recover and perhaps secure legal representation as this matter is outside of my bandwidth and I will have to do much research to file the necessary paperwork. If the Court could assist me in this matter it would be greatly appreciated.

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request an extension of the deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari, with a new deadline of August 30, 2025.

I am also requesting that the fee for filing be waived. Also, I don't know if I can request attorney representation and a waiver of the fees. If this is available to me, I would request this assistance.

Any assistance or guidance your office can give me would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Perteacher Drone
pd2drone@gmail.com
(804)675-0989



FILED: March 31, 2025

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1935
(3:17-cv-00332-JAG)

PERTEACHER DRONE

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

JAMES DUFF, Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts; REBECCA BEACH SMITH, Chief Judge, in her official capacity as United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia; MARY ANNE VOGEL, then Chief United States Probation Officer, in her official capacity as Chief Probation Officer for the Eastern District of Virginia; MARY K. FARASHAHI, then Acting Chief Probation Officer, in her official capacity as Chief Probation Officer; VELMA K. BENNS, In his individual capacity as Supervisory Probation Officer; DANIEL GUERTLER, in his individual and official capacity as Supervisory Probation Officer; DEBORAH CRAMER, in her official capacity as Employment Dispute Resolution Coordinator

Defendants - Appellees

J U D G M E N T

In accordance with the decision of this court, this appeal is dismissed.

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. 24-1935

PERTEACHER DRONE,**Plaintiff - Appellant,****v.**

JAMES DUFF, Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts; REBECCA BEACH SMITH, Chief Judge, in her official capacity as United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia; MARY ANNE VOGEL, then Chief United States Probation Officer, in her official capacity as Chief Probation Officer for the Eastern District of Virginia; MARY K. FARASHAHI, then Acting Chief Probation Officer, in her official capacity as Chief Probation Officer; VELMA K. BENNS, In his individual capacity as Supervisory Probation Officer; DANIEL GUERTLER, in his individual and official capacity as Supervisory Probation Officer; DEBORAH CRAMER, in her official capacity as Employment Dispute Resolution Coordinator,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr., Senior District Judge. (3:17-cv-00332-JAG)

Submitted: March 27, 2025**Decided: March 31, 2025**

Before THACKER and BERNER, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

PER CURIAM:

Perteacher Drone seeks to appeal the district court's granting Defendant's motion to dismiss Drone's wrongful termination claims. We dismiss the appeal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party in a civil case, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than 60 days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). "[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." *Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court entered its order on December 29, 2017, and the appeal period expired on February 27, 2018. Drone filed the notice of appeal on August 29, 2024. Because Drone failed to file a timely notice of appeal and failed to obtain permission to extend or reopen the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We also deny Drone's motion for appointment of counsel.

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.

DISMISSED

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