

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FREDRICK GOINGS - PETITIONER

-VS-

CAROLYN T. GROSBOLL - RESPONDENT

APPLICATION TO EXTEND THE TIME TO FILE A
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

FREDRICK GOINGS, M36022
PO BOX 112
STATEVILLE CORRECTIONAL CENTER
JOLIET, IL 60434

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FREDRICK GOINGS-PETITIONER

—VS—

CAROLYN T. GROSBOLL-RESPONDENT

APPLICATION TO EXTEND THE TIME TO FILE A
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Now Comes Petitioner, Fredrick Goings, a Prisoner in the Illinois Department of Corrections, Proceeding Pro-se at this time, pursuant to S.Ct. Rule 13, S.Ct. Rule 30, and 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a), having simultaneously tendered to be filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, hereby request unto this Honorable Supreme Court that he be given an extension of time in which to file his Petition For Writ of Certiorari. In support of states as follows:

BASIS FOR COURTS JURISDICTION

The Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a), S.Ct. Rule 13 and S.Ct. Rule 30.

THE JUDGEMENT SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED

FREDRICK GOINGS V. CAROLYN TAFT GRSBOLL,
M.D. 014003. ENTERED November 21, 2017.

ARGUMENT

1. On February 12, 2009 after a Jury trial Petitioner was convicted of two counts of First Degree Murder. (720 ILCS 5/9-1).

2. On October 30, 2015 the Illinois Appellate Court First District, Sixth Division affirmed the judgement of the trial Court, where the following arguments by Appellate Counsel in summary were rejected: (a) Crimescene Photographic evidence and evidence as to the victims surviving family member, along with the States Commentary referring to such evidence was irrelevant and inflammatory and operated to deprive Fredrick Goings of a fair trial; (b) the deceased testimony from a prior unrelated hearing from 2007 was improperly admitted in the 2013 murder trial;

(c) Cellphone surveillance evidence and other cellphone records were admitted in violation of Fredrick Goings Constitutional rights; and (d) Petitioner's trial judge was biased.

3. On May 25, 2016 the Illinois Supreme Courts ruling which denied Petition For Leave To Appeal in People of the State of Illinois v. Fredrick Goings, 120308, was filed.

4. On November 29, 2016 Petitioner's Motion For Leave To File a Motion For Reconsideration of the order denying Petition For Leave To Appeal was denied.

5. On September 18, 2017 Petitioner's motion for leave to file a petition for an original writ of mandamus was timely filed in the Illinois Supreme Court.

6. In the mandamus petitioner was seeking a Court Order to Compel Respondent Carolyn Taft Grosboll, the Clerk of the Illinois Supreme Court to provide petitioner with official Court orders evidencing that his Petition For Leave To Appeal (PLA) and Motion For Leave To File his Motion For Reconsideration of the Court Order that denied his PLA was in fact denied.

7. On November 21, 2017 Petitioner's motion for leave to file a petition for an original writ of mandamus was denied.

8. Petitioner has already been advised by the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court that without actual copies of the orders from the lower courts being appended to his pleadings his Writ of Certiorari petition will be non-compliant for filing.

9. Petitioner has even attempted to obtain copies of the necessary orders pursuant to a Freedom of Information Request. All to no avail.

10. Petitioner even requested the Illinois Attorney General, Public Access Bureau to review his Freedom of Information request to the Illinois Supreme Court, however, that office was unable to assist.

11. Petitioner is currently in prison with limited access to the prison law library.

12. Additionally, Petitioner's ability to review case law and statutes is impaired because there is a significant backlog on receiving copies of cases and shephard's citations from the prison law library.

13. Petitioner needs at least 60 days beyond the time in which he has to file his petition for Writ of Certiorari in order to adequately research and write his petition for Writ of Certiorari.

14. At the present time Petitioner is proceeding pro-se as an unrepresented party in this matter, and he has no prior experience filing a Petition For a Writ of Certiorari before the United States Supreme Court.

15. Petitioner contends that his Petition For Writ of Certiorari will be meritorious and is not frivolous.

16. Petitioner contends that without an extension he will be unable to reach the merits of his Petition For Writ of Certiorari and thus he will ultimately be unable to exhaust his remedies and direct appeal.

17. Petitioner contends that prejudice will result against him if the Court will not grant an extension of time, and that no prejudice will result against respondent.

18. Petitioner contends that good cause has been asserted and that his Application to extend the time to file a Petition For Writ of Certiorari is not being filed for the purpose of causing unreasonable delay but is being filed because it is necessary under the circumstances.

19. Petitioner contends that his reasons for requesting an extension are compelling.

20. Without an extension of time the Petition For Writ of Certiorari has to be filed by February 21, 2018, which Petitioner contends is not sufficient time.

21. This Honorable Court should also take into Consideration that Petitioner simultaneously has Pending two separate federal lawsuits which stem from Treatment and Conditions while he has been in the Custody of the Illinois Department of Corrections.

22. Those two federal lawsuits Collectively has more than 60 different defendants and involves at least 21 different factually and legally Complex Claims.

23. Petitioner is unrepresented in the two federal lawsuits and therefore has to divide his law library and research time amongst all his pending matters.

24. At best Petitioner can expect to gain access to the prison law library once a month, and under normal circumstances the actual time Petitioner will be allowed to utilize the prison law library per visit is roughly-merely an hour.

25. Currently Petitioner is unable to receive Copies of case law and statutes on the same day he visits the law library.

26. Furthermore, it routinely takes several weeks, sometimes months to receive copies of case law, statutes and Shepard's request from the prison law library.

27. Also, Stateville law library where Petitioner is currently confined do not allow prisoners to use loaner cases; Petitioner is required to purchase the copies of cases and statutes at a rate of 10¢ per page, which results as a burden to him as the funds needed for the purchases are often unavailable.

28. The Honorable United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois has already recognized Petitioner's financial condition by allowing him to proceed In Forma Pauperis ("IFP") in the two federal lawsuits.'

29. Additionally, Petitioner's ability to research and review case law often is delayed because of missing pages in reporters and digest.

30. Without the assistance of counsel, these limitations on Petitioner's ability to present the issues to the Court are very real considerations that Petitioner would like for the Court to carefully weigh when it decides on Petitioner's Pro-se motion for Extension of Time.

'16-CV-00833-NJR-DGW
'16-CV-00489-SMY-RJD

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant him an extension of time to file his Petition For Writ of Certiorari, and extend the deadline at least 60 days, up to and including April 21, 2018, and grant any other relief it deems just and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

 2-1-18

Fredrick Goings, M36022

P.O. Box 112

STATEVILLE CORRECTIONAL CENTER
Joliet, IL 60434

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: February 1, _____, 2018


Fredrick Goings, M36022