

No: _____

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

William F. Kaetz

Petitioner

v.

United States of America

Judge Renée Marie Bumb

Defendants

Application for an Extension of Time
to file Petitions for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit for Appeal Case:
23-2114.

Application for an Extension of Time

This matter comes before this Court upon Petitioner William Kaetz's application for an extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit for appeal case: 23-2114, under S. Ct. Rule 21, 22 and 33.2. This application is certified that it is submitted in good faith and not for delay. This application is for the following reasons:

Mr. Kaetz is a carpenter, not an attorney. He has six cases he will be petitioning to the Supreme Court. Two appeal cases, 24-1605 and 24-1646 were due, one on 24th and one on the 26th of December 2024. He combined the two cases into one petition, it was sent back deficient. The cases need to be separated into separate petitions for each case. This court gave him 60 days to correct the filings¹. Mr. Kaetz, other than his real job, worked on the correction of the first two cases and has run out of time and money to do the petitions for the four other cases, appeal nos. 23-

¹ See attached Court letter of January 27, 2025

2114, 23-2322, 23-2802, 23-2803, that is due on March 9, 2025. It is a lot more work and money than he realized.

The cases are related to each other under a constitutional challenge to the federal Department of Education and student loan bankruptcy statute 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(8). This questions whether the United States government's power over education is constitutional, whether Congress had constitutional authority to legislate over education, whether the Higher Education Act including the student loan bankruptcy statute 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(8) is constitutional and whether there is a separation of power offense in student loan bankruptcy matters. William Kaetz claims they are unconstitutional and there is a separation of powers offense. He sued everyone that disagrees with him and who avoided the issue, and who created the issue, including federal judges and other federal actors that appear to retaliate in their own way against his exercise of his right to petition his claim. The cases are different in their own way but do relate to each other.

Is federal power over education constitutional?

The U.S. Constitution does not explicitly grant the federal government power over education. The word "education" does not even appear in the document. Historically, education was seen as a state and local matter, rooted in the 10th Amendment, which reserves powers not delegated to the federal government to the states or the people. This is why education systems—like funding, curricula, and standards—have traditionally varied widely across states.

That said, the federal government has carved out a role through broader

constitutional hooks. The General Welfare Clause (Article I, Section 8) lets Congress tax and spend for the "general welfare," which has justified federal education funding, like grants or student loans. The 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause has also been used to enforce civil rights in schools, as seen in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). And the Commerce Clause has occasionally stretched to cover education-related issues tied to interstate economic activity.

Critics argue this is overreach. They say education isn't a delegated power, so it should stay with the states. Supporters counter that federal involvement ensures equity and national standards—think No Child Left Behind or the Department of Education, established in 1979 under Carter. But that department's existence doesn't settle the debate; it's just Congress acting, not proof of constitutional bedrock.

Legally, this Court has not struck down federal education programs as unconstitutional, but it's never fully clarified the limits either. Cases like *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez* (1973) suggest education isn't a federal "fundamental right," leaving room for state primacy. Yet federal influence keeps growing through money and mandates.

So, is it constitutional? So far it depends on who's reading the text. Strict originalists say no—nothing in 1787 gave Washington that power. Pragmatists say yes—modern needs and loose clauses like General Welfare make it work. The reality? It's a gray area, fought out in politics more than courtrooms.

This is a legal question for this Court to answer, not politicians. The new presidential administration wants to return education powers to the states and eliminate

the federal Department of Education. This Court will need to answer the Constitutional Question whether federal power over education is constitutional. Mr. Kaetz is asking this Court the Constitutional Question eight times, in his last two petitions filed, and these six new petitions that are going to be filed.

Mr. Kaetz's first two cases being corrected, 24-1604 and 24-1646, the petitions for a writ of certiorari are being printed and should be filed early, Mr. Kaetz asks for an additional 60 days to file the other four, within a due date of May 8th, 2025, so that he can earn more money to pay for the costs and have more time to build the 180 petitions for writ of certiorari booklets. It is a lot more work and money than he realized, and the case are particularly important, they prove his innocence and correct an injustice.

I, William F. Kaetz, swear under penalty of perjury all statements herein are true. This application is submitted in good faith and not for delay.

Respectfully.

Date: 2/27/2025

By: William F. Kaetz

William F. Kaetz, Petitioner
437 Abbott Rd.
Paramus N.J. 07652
201-753-1063
kaetzbill@gmail.com

No: _____

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

William F. Kaetz

Plaintiff

v.

United States of America (23-2114)
(23-2322) (23-2802) (23-2803);

Judge Renée Marie Bumb (23-2802)
(23-2803); Judge Juan R. Sánchez (23-
2322); John M. Vazquez (23-2803);
Judge Clarence Thomas (23-2802);
Judge Clair C. Cecchi (23-2802); Judge
Kevin McNulty (23-2802); Judge Juan
R. Sánchez (23-2802); Judge Christine
P. O’hearn (23-2802); Judge J.
Nicholas Ranjan (23-2802); Judge
Mark R. Hornak (23-2802); Judge
Joseph F. Saporito, Jr. (23-2802);
Judge Matthew W. Brann (23-2802);
Judge Michael A. Chagares (23-2802);
Judge Michael A. Shipp (23-2802);
Joseph McCormick (23-2803); Nick
Capaccio (23-2803); Carrie Borona (23-
2803); Ivettelis Perez (23-2803);

Defendants

Declaration of Timely Filing
to file Petitions for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit for Appeal Cases:
23-2114, 23-2322, 23-2802, 23-2803

Declaration of Timely Filing

I, William F. Kaetz, pro se petitioner, certify the following:

1. On February 27, 2025, I filed applications for extensions of time to file petitions for writs of certiorari in Third Circuit cases 23-2114, 23-2322, 23-2802, and 23-2803 with the U.S. Supreme Court via United States Postal Service Priority Mail (tracking number 9405 5301 0935 5107 6945 12), pursuant to Rules 21 and 22. I requested deadlines of May 8, 2025, for cases 23-2322, 23-2802, and 23-2803, and June 2, 2025, for case 23-2114. Three copies of the applications were served on the Office of the Solicitor General, 950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001, via USPS Priority Mail, per Rule 29.2.

2. As of May 8, 2025, the Court has not responded to the extension applications. Pursuant to the Clerk's guidance, I am filing a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above cases by the requested extended deadline of May 8, 2025, for cases 23-2114, 23-2322, 23-2802, and 23-2803.

3. On May 8, 2025, I am filing a single petition for a writ of certiorari addressing Third Circuit cases 23-2114, 23-2322, 23-2802, and 23-2803, as they involve related legal issues. The petition is prepared in accordance with Rules 14 and 33.2. I respectfully request consolidation of these cases under Rule 27.3, if deemed appropriate by the Court, the lower court has consolidated the cases in their orders.

I certify 3 copies of this Declaration of Timely Filing will be served along with the 3 copies of the Petition to the Solicitor General via USPS Priority Mail per Rule 29.2.

Date: 5/8/2023

By: 

William F. Kaetz, Petitioner
437 Abbott Rd.
Paramus N.J. 07652
201-753-1063
kaetzbill@gmail.com



Cut on dotted line.

Instructions

1. Please use a laser or laser-quality printer.
2. Adhere shipping label to package with tape or glue - DO NOT TAPE OVER BARCODE. Be sure all edges are secure. Self-adhesive label is recommended.
3. Place label so that it does not wrap around the edge of the package.
4. Each shipping label number is unique and can be used only once - DO NOT PHOTOCOPY.
5. Please use this shipping label on the "ship date" selected when you requested the label.
6. If a mailing receipt is required, present the article and Online e-Label Record at a Post Office for postmark.

9405 5301 0935 5107 6945 12

Print Date: 2025-02-27

Ship Date: 2025-02-27

PRIORITY MAIL® \$9.05

Extra Services: \$0.00

Fees: \$0.00

Total: \$9.05

From: WILLIAM KAETZ
437 ABBOTT RD
PARAMUS NJ 07652-2103

To: SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
JUDGE ALITO
1 1ST ST NE
WASHINGTON DC 20543-0001

* Commercial Pricing PRIORITY MAIL® rates apply. There is no fee for USPS Tracking® service on PRIORITY MAIL® service with use of this electronic rate shipping label. Refunds for unused postage paid labels can be requested online 30 days from the print date.



*Thank you for shipping with the United States Postal Service!
Check the status of your shipment on the USPS Tracking® page at usps.com*