

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

Nancy Thias, Petitioner

v.

Alinea Apartments, Respondent

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.**

Nancy Thias

7507 Byron Place #1

Clayton, Missouri 63105

314-926-4280

[nancythias7@gmail.com](mailto:nancythias7@gmail.com)

June 6, 2025

To the Honorable Brett Kavanaugh Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Petitioner respectfully requests a 30-day extension of time.

On May 15, 2025, a tornado struck Clayton, Missouri where the petitioner resides. The tornado was an unexpected and unavoidable event. The petitioner's location of residence was affected with power outages and damage to trees and safety issues which have delay efforts to file a petition.

Dated 6-9-2025



**Supreme Court of Missouri**

**en banc**

**SC10112**

**Nancy Thias, Appellant,**  
**v.**

**Alinea Apartments, Respondent.**

☐ **Sustained**

☒ **Overruled**

☐ **Denied**

☐ **Taken with Case**

☐ **Sustained Until**

☐ **Other**

**Order issued: Appellant's motion to file application for transfer out of time overruled**

*Mary R. Russell*

By: Chief Justice

May 15, 2025

**Date**



## In the Missouri Court of Appeals Eastern District

NANCY THIAS

Appellant,

vs.

ALINEA APARTMENTS,

Respondent.

No. ED113136

### ORDER

Appellant filed her brief which failed to comply with Rule 84.04. This court issued an order directing Appellant to file an amended brief complying with Rule 84. Appellant was warned: Rule 84 brief requirements are mandatory; pro se litigants are held to the same standards as attorneys and failure to adequately comply with such briefing rules governing the contents of appellate briefs would result in dismissal of the appeal.

Appellant filed her amended brief on March 24, 2025. Despite referral to the template provided in Rule 84.04(d), Appellant's amended brief remains deficient and non-compliant. The points relied on and arguments lack sufficient clarity in pinpointing within the record a specific claim of legal error in a specific action taken by the trial court which could justify reversal. Where this court must guess or infer what Appellant's legal claims are and comb the record on its own to address them, this court is placed in the untenable position of acting as Appellant's advocate. Steele v. Schnuck Markets, Inc., 485 S.W.3d 823, 824 (Mo. App. E.D. 2016). This we cannot do.

On the court's own motion, the appeal is dismissed for failure to file a brief conforming to the Supreme Court Rules.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 28, 2025

cc: Nancy Thias  
ecc: Randall Reinker  
Matthew Martin

*McLanck 45996*  
Thomas C. Clark II, Chief Judge



**NOTICE OF ENTRY**  
(SUPREME COURT RULE 74.03)

In The Eastern Dist Court of Appeals Court, Eastern Appellate Court, Missouri  
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE, 815 OLIVE STREET, ROOM 304, SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101

**NANCY THIAS, APP V ALINEA APARTMENTS, RES**

**CASE NO : ED113136**

To: NANCY THIAS  
7507 BYRON PLACE #1  
CLAYTON MO 63105

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that the court duly entered the following:

<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Description</u>
--------------------	--------------------

28-Mar-2025

**Court Order Issued**

Appellant filed her brief which failed to comply with Rule 84.04. This court issued an order directing Appellant to file an amended brief complying with Rule 84. Appellant was warned: Rule 84 brief requirements are mandatory; pro se litigants are held to the same standards as attorneys and failure to adequately comply with such briefing rules governing the contents of appellate briefs would result in dismissal of the appeal. Appellant filed her amended brief on March 24, 2025. Despite referral to the template provided in Rule 84.04(d), Appellant's amended brief remains deficient and non-compliant. The points relied on and arguments lack sufficient clarity in pinpointing within the record a specific claim of legal error in a specific action taken by the trial court which could justify reversal.

Where this court must guess or infer what Appellant's legal claims are and comb the record on its own to address them, this court is placed in the untenable position of acting as Appellant's advocate. Steele v. Schnuck Markets, Inc., 485 S.W.3d 823, 824 (Mo. App. E.D. 2016). This we cannot do. On the court's own motion, the appeal is dismissed for failure to file a brief conforming to the Supreme Court Rules.

---

Clerk of Court

CC: ALINEA APARTMENTS  
NANCY THIAS  
ECC: MATTHEW PHILIP MARTIN  
RANDALL JOHN REINKER

Date Printed : 28-Mar-2025



**CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MISSOURI  
POST OFFICE BOX 150  
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI**

BETSY  
LEDGERWOOD  
CLERK

**65102**

TELEPHONE

(573) 751-4144

May 15, 2025

Nancy Thias  
7507 Byron Place  
Clayton, Missouri 63105

In Re: Nancy Thias, Appellant, vs. Alinea Apartments, Respondent. (ED113136) (St. Louis County Circuit Court No. 24SL-CC01930).  
Missouri Supreme Court No. SC101112

Nancy Thias:

This letter acknowledges your motion to file application for transfer out of time was denied on May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025. A receipt for the \$70 filing fee is enclosed. Your application for transfer is also returned to you with this letter.

Please note docket number **SC101112** has been assigned to this case. This same number should appear on all correspondence and documents relating to this proceeding.

To view your case on the Internet, use the Case.Net link on the Missouri Judiciary Homepage at <http://www.Courts.mo.gov>. Other useful information may be found by using the Supreme Court link on the same homepage.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Betsy Ledgerwood".

BETSY LEDGERWOOD