

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. TBD

MOHAN A. HARIHAR,

Applicant,

v.

US BANK, et al


Respondents.

**APPLICATION TO THE HON. STEPHEN BREYER, FOR AN EXTENSION OF
TIME WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

Petitioner hereby respectfully moves as a pro se litigant, pursuant to Rule 13(5) of the Rules of this Court, for an extension of time of 60 days, to and including August 11, 2018 (Saturday), for the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit dated January 17, 2018 (Exhibit 1), on which a timely petition for rehearing and for rehearing en banc was denied on March 14, 2018 (Exhibit 2). The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

1. The date within which a petition for writ of certiorari would be due, if not extended, is June 12, 2018.

2. On May 18, 2018, the Petitioner received a letter from the Clerk of the First Circuit Appeals Court signifying the recusal of Circuit Judge David Barron, a presiding judge in the referenced Appeal No. 17-1381. Judge Barron's recusal impacts eight (8) issued orders, including the Judgment order. Petitioner was given



a timeline of June 8, 2018 to file a response and request relief. A response was timely filed with Court on June 4, 2018 (Exhibit 3). In this filed response, the Petitioner raises a number of unresolved issues, including (but not limited to): (1) Jurisdiction, (2) Criminal claims and (3) matters perceived to impact National Security.

3. Petitioner had previously filed for an Emergency Stay order with the First Circuit on April 6, 2018, citing his intention to file a Petition for Certiorari and the list of unresolved issues (including jurisdiction) that first, must be addressed. The motion was denied, without valid cause. Now, with Judge Barron's recusal (collectively, the third recusal associated with this litigation) Petitioner's response again shows cause to question (at minimum) the validity of the judgment itself. The response includes a motion requesting an Emergency STAY/Injunction that temporarily suspends the timeline for filing his petition until ALL issues have been resolved. However, considering the approaching deadline to file, the history of this litigation and the gravity of issues involved, it is unclear whether the First Circuit will issue a timely ruling.

4. The case presents substantial issues of law, among which include (but are not limited to:

(1) whether jurisdiction issues were properly addressed by the First Circuit (and District) Court; (2) whether under Article III Section 3 of the US Constitution, a Circuit (or District) Court judge continued to rule after losing jurisdiction; (3) whether Rule 60(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (Unopposed claims)

was properly addressed by the Court(s); (4) whether, under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), a Circuit judge(s) who has presided in the referenced appeal, failed to recuse following jurisdiction (and other referenced) issues; (5) whether, under 18 U.S.C. § 1832 Circuit Judges failed to properly address evidenced Economic Espionage claims and matters believed to impact National Security; (6) whether under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 Circuit Judges failed to exercise judicial discretion by wrongfully denying or unnecessarily delaying without valid cause - repeated requests for the Court to assist with the Appointment of Counsel; and (7) whether Circuit judges (and previously the District Court) took appropriate action following the recusal of US District Court Judge – Allison Dale Burroughs. Additional questions of law warranting this Court's attention can be found by referencing the June 4, 2018 response (Exhibit 3).

5. Petitioner requires the additional requested time to enable the First Circuit to timely address and resolve all existing legal issues. Upon doing so, and if it is even still necessary to file a petition with this Court, Petitioner is expected to have retained experienced legal counsel to research the legal issues and to prepare an appropriate petition for consideration by this Court.

6. For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner hereby requests that an extension of time to and including August 11, 2018, be granted within which Petitioner may file a petition for a writ of certiorari.


7. Please be advised, based on the Petitioner's interpretation of the Federal Law, and considering a portion of his evidenced claims pertain to: (1)

Criminal misconduct involving judicial officers; (2) Economic Espionage and (3) matters believed to impact National Security, copies of this Motion are delivered to the President, DOJ and members of Congress. A copy will also be made available to the Public out of continued concerns for the Petitioner's safety and well-being.

8. If your Honor has any questions regarding any portion of this Motion, or requires additional information, Petitioner is happy to provide upon request.

The Petitioner is grateful for this Court's consideration of his request.

Respectfully submitted,



Mohan a. Harihar
Petitioner – Pro Se
7124 Avalon Drive
Acton, MA 01720
617.921.2526
Mo.harihar@gmail.com

June 6, 2018