

# SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

1 First St, NE Washington, DC 20543

June 20, 2025

## APPLICATION TO EXTEND THE TIME TO FILE WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Case number: 24-1515 (First Circuit Court of Appeal)

### Calendar

Month/Days	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Th	Fri	Sat
April			1-FCJ	2	3	4	5
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14 NP	15	16	17	18	19
	20	21	22	23-FCM	24	25	26
	27	28	29	30			
21 days excluding the weekends the court is closed FC- First Circuit Judgement issued and FCM First Circuit Mandate issued NP-Notice of appeal filed							

Month/Days	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Th	Fri	Sat
May					1	2	3
	4	5	6	7	8-SM	9	10
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
21 days excluding May 26, 2025 holiday and weekends the court is closed SM-Stay of mandate filed							

RECEIVED

JUN 26 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Month/Days	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Th	Fri	Sat
June	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	8	9	10- FC	11	12	13	14
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
	29	30					
20 days (June 19, 2025 is holiday and weekends are not included because court is closed)							

Month/Days	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Th	Fri	Sat
July			1	2	3	4	5
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
	27	28	29	30	31		

Even if all days are counted included weekends, holidays, the motion for time extension to prepare and file writ of certiorari is requested within the 10 days minimum requirement, wherefore this request is in compliance with supreme court rule 30

### Story line

On April 1, 2025, United States Court of Appeals for the first Circuit three panel judges; Chief Justice David J Barron, Judge William J. Kayatta Jr. and Judge Gustavo Antonio Gelpi Jr. agreed to issue a summary affirmative judgement without opinion, nor memorandum and order. On or about April 14, 2025, Appellant-Plaintiff file a notice to appeal the court summary judgement. The Clerk of court; Ms. Anastasia Dubrovsky return appellant-plaintiff notice of appeal on April 23, 2025 without acting on it. The United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit then issued a formal mandate on April 23, 2025. On May 8, 2025, appellant file motion to stay of mandate asserting that the court mandate issued on April 23, 2025 conflict with FRAP 41(b). Furthermore per FRAP 41(d) a motion for rehearing may be filed within 45 days for cases involving government entity or official. This case meet such a requirement because Lakeville Municipal Police Department is a government entity, Massachusetts Attorney General the whale in the room meet that requirement, Massachusetts State Police meet that requirement to highlight a few. On or about May 8, 2025, appellant also file a motion for time extension to petition for rehearing with the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. The clerk of court for the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit,

prepared, signed and docketed the court order issued on June 10, 2025 denying appellant motion for stay of mandate.

In accordant with supreme court of united states rule 30, petitioner a non-lawyer hereby request for an extension of sixty days to prepare and file a writ of certiorari . The grounds for extension of time to prepare and file the writ of certiorari is stated as follows;

**Housing/Homeless:**

United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit issue the judgement on April 1, 2025 and on April 11, 2025, the owner of the hostel on 13 school street Everett Massachusetts Petitioner was staying gave two days' notice for Petitioner to leave. Having been on this hostel for over a year Petitioner request for a month to leave which was granted. Petitioner has been living on this hostel for lack of housing. This hostel on 13 School Street Everett Massachusetts was used as Petitioner confinement/prison. (See the exhibit images below); it is difficult to put that into words. Petitioner homelessness and housing insecurity experience in Boston Massachusetts, in Washington DC and in Virginia create a profound negative impact on Petitioner overall wellbeing. Living in the street for a long time means one is defend less, living in one of the most unfavorable conditions, deprive a person right to enjoy life, harm a person dignity, exacerbate social isolation, create embarrassment, shame and societal stigma. Petition is subjected into this homeless cruel conditions because of the applications that were submitted to the court and the court knowingly approved those applications and willfully refuse to accord Petitioner a hearing. For instance Petitioner homelessness in Boston has resulted to arrest by Logan State Police, detained and charge with criminal offenses and issued arrest warrant. Private actors like doordash and others use Petitioner homelessness to target him on public places. Courts judges used Petitioner homelessness to subject him to prolong custodian investigations. Petitioner suffer skin rash (see the images below ), expose to cold weather conditions and fall sick. These conditions compel Petitioner to create a profile with world packers to get out of Boston. Unable to find a host in the lower forty eight Petitioner took the risk to come to the last frontier in Alaska. For the last two month (since United States court of appeals for the first circuit issue the judgement) appellant has been trying to find a place to live. To this date, Petitioner has no housing and is being targeted again in Fairbanks Alaska. The housing insecurity create uncertainty. Computing the number of days from April 1, 2025 including weekends, minus legal holidays (memorial day May 26, 2025, Juneteenth 19, 2025) the nighty days window to file writ of certiorari is July 2, 2025. Because of the housing insecurity Petitioner is kindly requesting for the court permission to grant him sixty days extension to prepared and file the writ of certiorari

**First Circuit Judgement:** Petitioner file notice of appeal on April 14, 2025 and file motion on May 8, 2025 to contest the hasty issuance of the mandate on April 23, 2025. The court denied both petitioner request. Because the first circuit actions are in conflict with the rules of appellate, Petitioner therefore believe and

allege that his fundamental right to court access is infringe upon Without the supreme court supervisory authority to grant petitioner sufficient time to prepare and file writ of certiorari; petitioner right to access the court is foreclose.

**Courts:** Petitioner BRIEF THEME with the first circuit was the COURTS and the writ of certiorari theme will be the COURTS. The courts include; military court, grand jury, First circuit, United States District court for the district of Massachusetts, Eastern Boston District Court, Suffolk Superior Court of Massachusetts, Norfolk Superior Court, Dedham District Court, Massachusetts Commission against discrimination, Fourth circuit, United States District court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria District Court, Harrisonburg District Court, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, FISA court. This quite a long list will require time for research to put together a presentation for the writ of certiorari. Petitioner kindly request the court to grant his permission to prepare and file writ of certiorari.

**Court order:** The last court order was issued on June 10, 2025, therefore petitioner will argue because the extraordinary court order is issued in reference to April 1, 2025 judgement the computation of time to file writ of certiorari should commence on June 11, 2025


**Health:** Petitioner physical appearance is very visible, experience frequent body aches, smile is horrible, loss self-esteem, the body is exhausted

The events leading up to this action has been going on for too long. For example in 2019 Petitioner became very concern what is happen to him on school campuses, on the street, at his home, and at religious houses and reach out to federal and state agencies for background check on himself. One of those agencies is the federal bureau of investigation (FBI). And it appears now that this has been going on well beyond 2019. Because these events has lasted for a very long time the request for an extension of time to prepare and file writ of Certiorari will not prejudice neither of the courts nor any of their clients.

In closing, Petitioner kindly request the court to grant this request for extension of time to prepare, and file writ of certiorari

Aren Tau

Petitioner/Appellant

  
06/20/25

**I currently do not have an address. I live at 535 Glacier, Alaska AK 99701 a hostel that has been used again as a place of confinement.**

7

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

---

No. 24-1515

AREN S. TAU,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TOWN OF LAKEVILLE; RMV; AFFORDABLE TOWING AND AUTO REPAIR INC.;  
ALLY BANK; GRABHUB; BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS; BOSTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; DOORDASH, INC.; CITY OF BOSTON; STEVEN A. LEANUES,  
Lieutenant, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; JARED TAJE,  
Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; EMILIANN  
MELO, Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in her individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Before

Barron, Chief Judge,  
Kayatta and Gelpi, Circuit Judges.

---

## JUDGMENT

Entered: April 1, 2025

Pro se Plaintiff-Appellant Aren S. Tau (Appellant) appeals from the district court's without-prejudice dismissal of his complaint for failure to properly effect service within the time limits imposed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and District of Massachusetts Local Rule 4.1. This court reviews a dismissal for insufficient service of process for abuse of discretion. See Crispin-Taveras v. Municipality of Carolina, 647 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2011).

Following a careful review of relevant portions of the record and of the relevant arguments raised by Appellant in briefing, we conclude that the appeal presents "no substantial question" and that summary affirmance is in order. See 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c) (summary-disposition authority); United States v. Zannino, 895 F.2d 1, 17 (1st Cir. 1990) ("[I]ssues adverted to in a perfunctory manner, unaccompanied by some effort at developed argumentation, are deemed waived."). We arrive at this conclusion substantially for the reasons set out by the district court when it dismissed

(6)

the complaint. See Fleming v. Magnusson, 52 F.3d 309 (1st Cir. 1995) (unpublished per curiam) (pro se litigants generally must comply with Rule 4(m) and other procedural rules). Any remaining pending motions, to the extent not mooted by the foregoing, are denied.

Affirmed. See 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c).

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

cc:

Aren S. Tau

Andrea J. Campbell

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

---

No. 24-1515

AREN S. TAU,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TOWN OF LAKEVILLE; RMV; AFFORDABLE TOWING AND AUTO REPAIR INC.;  
ALLY BANK; GRABHUB; BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS; BOSTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; DOORDASH, INC.; CITY OF BOSTON; STEVEN A. LEANUES,  
Lieutenant, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; JARED TAJE,  
Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; EMILIANN  
MELO, Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in her individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Before

Barron, Chief Judge,  
Kayatta, and Gelpi, Circuit Judges.

---

## ORDER OF COURT

Entered: June 10, 2025

The court entered a judgment of affirmance in this matter on April 1, 2025, and mandate issued on April 23, 2025. Plaintiff-Appellant Aren S. Tau then made post-mandate filings captioned as a "motion for stay of mandate" and a "motion for extension of time." The post-mandate motions are construed, collectively, as a motion to recall the mandate, and that motion is denied. See generally Kashner Davidson Sec. Corp. v. Mscisz, 601 F.3d 19, 22 (1st Cir. 2010) (standard); see also Fed. R. App. P. 40(d)(1) (14-day rehearing deadline for cases not involving United States or its agencies or employees).

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

2

cc:

Aren S. Tau

Andrea J. Campbell



3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

For The

FIRST CIRCUIT

Case number: 24-1515

May 8, 2025

**MOTION FOR STAY OF MANDATE**

On or about April 23, 2025, the First Circuit appellate circuit court entered a mandate to certify the summary dismissal judgement entered on April 1, 2025. This motion will argue that the mandate entered on April 23, 2025 is not enforceable on the following grounds;

- (a). The First Circuit formal mandate entered on April 23, 2025 conflict with appellate FRAP 41(b)
- (b). In Reference to FRAP 40(d) a petition for rehearing may be file by any party within 45 days.

Because the time to file petition for rehearing has not expires the appellate court precipitous/hastily issuance of mandate (41(a)) to certify the first circuit summary dismissal judgement enter on April 1, 2025 conflict with federal rules of appellate circuit court procedures. Wherefore the mandate is not enforceable. There are substantial and extraordinary circumstances that warrant a delay of the first circuit agreed upon mandate assurance.

Per Rule 41(d) Plaintiff-Appellant move to file for a delay insurance of the mandate while Plaintiff-Appellant consider filing a petition for rehearing or File for writ of certiorari

Please take notice that the motion file on May 8, 2025 in reference to 41(d) request for response by May 13, 2025

File electronically

/s/Aren Tau

Plaintiff-Appellant

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

For The  
FIRST CIRCUIT

Case number: 24-1515

May 8, 2025

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

In accordance to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26(b) and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27 appellant-plaintiff hereby request a sixty days time extension for filing the Petition for rehearing .

The grounds for the request is stated as follows;

1. **Extraordinary Circumstances:** court warrants, court secretive confinement orders, court involuntary placement to mention a few actions are not unpredictable but were foreseeable
2. The events in the circuit courts, District Courts, States Courts compounded together require time and preparation to put together for a presentation
3. Plaintiff-Appellant was compelled to flee out of the state
4. Considering the time lapse, duration appellees have engaged in this conduct, the extension of time will not prejudice the United States District Court of Massachusetts nor any of the appellees.

This motion is electronically filed today May 8, 2025 with the Clerk of Court for the United States First Circuit court of appeals. Appellant kindly request the court to grant the additional sixty days until July 20, 2025.

Please take notice this motion filed today May 8, 2025 in reference to FRAP 26(b) request for a response by May 13, 2025

5

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

---

No. 24-1515

AREN S. TAU,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TOWN OF LAKEVILLE; RMV; AFFORDABLE TOWING AND AUTO REPAIR INC.;  
ALLY BANK; GRABHUB; BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS; BOSTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; DOORDASH, INC.; CITY OF BOSTON; STEVEN A. LEANUES,  
Lieutenant, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; JARED TAJE,  
Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; EMILIANN  
MELO, Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in her individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

## MANDATE

Entered: April 23, 2025

In accordance with the judgment of April 1, 2025, and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41(a), this constitutes the formal mandate of this Court.

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

cc:

Andrea J. Campbell

Aren S. Tau

6

File;

/s/Aren Tau

Appellant-Plaintiff

P O BOX 171226

Boston MA. 02117

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

ANASTASIA DUBROVSKY  
CLERK

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY  
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE  
1 COURTHOUSE WAY, SUITE 2500  
BOSTON, MA 02210  
(617) 748-9057

April 23, 2025

Aren S. Tau  
PO Box 171226  
Boston, MA 02117

Re: Tau v. Town of Lakeville, et al  
Appeal No. 24-1515

Dear Aren S. Tau:

On April 14, 2025, this court received your notice of appeal, which appears to be an attempt to appeal from this court to the United States Supreme Court. Please be advised that your only means to seek review by the U.S. Supreme Court is by filing a petition for writ of certiorari. 28 U.S.C. § 1254.

**A petition for writ of certiorari must be filed directly with the U. S. Supreme Court and not with this court.** Sup. Ct. R. 12. If you have any questions about this, you should contact the Clerk's Office of the United States Supreme Court, 1 First St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20543, (202) 479-3000, and they will further advise you.

As a result, I am returning this filing to you without taking action on it. I hope this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely,

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

PT

Encl.

cc:  
Andrea J. Campbell

# **United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit**

Case No. 24-1515

## **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Appellant will appeal the judgement entered on April 1, 2025

Filed

Aren S Tau  
Appellant

(9)

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

---

No. 24-1515

AREN S. TAU,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TOWN OF LAKEVILLE; RMV; AFFORDABLE TOWING AND AUTO REPAIR INC.;  
ALLY BANK; GRABHUB; BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS; BOSTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; DOORDASH, INC.; CITY OF BOSTON; STEVEN A. LEANUES,  
Lieutenant, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; JARED TAJE,  
Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in his individual and official capacity; EMILIANN  
MELO, Officer, Lakeville Police Department, in her individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

## ORDER OF COURT

Entered: August 19, 2024

Plaintiff-Appellant Aren S. Tau has moved for leave to amend his opening brief. This motion is granted, and Tau's amended brief is due no later than September 17, 2024. No further requests for leave to amend or for extension of time shall be granted without a showing of extraordinary circumstances.

Tau also has pending a motion seeking return of property; a motion for a hearing, apparently under United States v. Monsanto, 491 U.S. 600 (1989); and a "Motion on Record of Appeal." Each of these motions is denied.

Tau is encouraged to focus on the preparation of his amended brief. Filing of further motions will not hasten the resolution of this appeal.

By the Court:

Maria R. Hamilton, Clerk

cc:

Aren S. Tau

Andrea J. Campbell

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to supreme court rule 29 Petitioner- Appellant certify a true copy of the motion to for extension of time to prepare, and file a writ of certiorari was mail to the Clerk Office of the supreme court on June 20, 2025 at the address below

Clerk of Court  
Supreme Court of the United States  
1 First St NE,  
Washington DC 20543

The motion for extension of time to prepare and file writ of certiorari was mail through USPS by certified mail


Mailed by Petitioner-Appellant on June 20, 2025

Aren Tau  
Appellant-Plaintiff

535 GLACIER AVE ALK 99701

Date 06/20/25 time 300 PM

Am B Tan  
06/20/2025





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