

22A500

App No _____

FILED
DEC 15 2022
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Lori Saxon,
Petitioner

vs.

Ameritas Life Insurance Corporation,
Respondent

)
) Case No. _____
)
) DCCA. No. 20-CV-127
)
)
)
)
)

**PETITIONER'S APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE A
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Lori Saxon
Petitioner
Po Se
Best Address to use for filing
331 Plymouth Rd
West Palm Beach, FL 33405
loriannsaxon@gmail.com
703-625-4343

DC Residence
937 N St NW
Washington, DC 20001

RECEIVED
DEC 21 2022
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

To the Honorable Chief Judge John G. Roberts for the DC Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, from Case 20-CV-127.

Pursuant to Rule 13.5 of the Rules of this Court, Pro Se Applicant/Petitioner, Lori Saxon hereby respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time within which to file a writ of certiorari. Petitioner's application is being mailed to the Clerk of this court 11 days before the Writ would be due on December 26, 2022.

Review is sought from DC Court of Appeals Case 20-cv-127 September 27, 2022 Order Denying En Banc and Rehearing (exhibit 1) and August 24, 2022 Memorandum Opinion and Judgment (exhibit 2).

Per The Supreme Court *Sause v Bauer* 6/28/18, 585 U.S. _____ (2018) protects Pro Se Litigants under the 1st & 4th Amendments.

1. The circumstances are extraordinary in that :

- a. The petitioner is unrepresented.
- b. The petitioner has had difficulty finding a printing source that is affordable to print, copy and bind the multiple-40 copies needed to file a correct petition. Petitioner must attempt to locate an affordable alternative of local printers. It would put an unnecessary burden and hardship on Petitioner to pay that fee just to seek a writ of review without submitting to an application to file in *forma pauperis*.
- c. Petitioner was mistakenly under the impression that by being unrepresented and pro se, that she would not have to present 40 bound and professionally printed copies to the court of the writ of certiorari and or could e-file.
- d. Petitioner has had to become familiar with the various rules to comply.
- e. Petitioner has made good faith efforts to comply with the rules but does not have formal legal training on various rules and procedures.
- f. Pleadings filed by unrepresented litigants shall not be held to the same standard as lawyers and/or attorneys at law (distinct definitions); and whose motions,

g. pleadings and all papers may only be judged by their substance and not their form. *See: Haines v. Kerner; Platsky v. CIA; Anastasoff v. United States* (emphasis in bold):

Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519-421. Unrepresented litigants are **held to less stringent pleading standards** than admitted or licensed bar attorneys. **Regardless of the deficiencies** in their pleadings, unrepresented **litigants are entitled to the opportunity to submit evidence** in support of their claims.

Platsky v. C.I.A., 953 f.2d. 25. **Court errs** if court dismisses the unrepresented litigant **without instruction of how pleadings are deficient** and how to repair pleadings.

Anastasoff v. United States, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000). Litigants' [substantive] constitutional [guaranteed] rights [not confused with privileges] are violated when courts depart from precedent where parties are similarly situated.

Pro Se Petitioner believes she will prevail in the Supreme Court if just given a chance and an extension of time to file.

There has been a blatant disregard and conflict with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the lower courts and many legal errors in Applicant-/Petitioner's case. The lower Court's decision appears not just erroneous but outlandishly so.

The lower Court's decision is so far outside the norm of judicial decision making that it requires further review from this court.

Applicant, Petitioner has suffered irreparable harm and the Order/ Judgment violates petitioner's constitutional rights.

Applicant,/ Petitioner has suffered a miscarriage of justice and a denial of her due process rights.

Pro Se appellant has had her 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8, 9th, 10th and 14th Amendment Constitutional rights violated by all courts.42 USC 1983.

An extension will not cause prejudice to Respondents,

For the foregoing reasons, applicant/petitioner respectfully requests and prays that this court grant an extension of 60 days within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this case.

I, Lori Saxon, pro se applicant-petitioner, declare under penalty under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

An Original and 2 copies is being mailed to the Clerk of the Supreme Court via First Class USPS Mail date stamped 12/15/22.

Respectfully Submitted,



Lori Saxon

December 15, 2022

Preferred address for filing and correspondence
331 Plymouth Rd.
West Palm Beach, FL 33405
loriannsaxon@gmail.com
703-625-4343

~~DC Residence~~
937 N St NW
Washington, DC 20001
703-625-4343
loriannsaxon@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lori Saxon hereby certify that on this 15th day of December, 2022, a copy of the foregoing application was mailed USPS mail to the following respondents::

Mary C. Zinzer DC Bar 430091
Jason T. Kutcher DC Bar 1011988
S. Mohsin Reza DC Bar 985270
Troutman Sanders LLP

401 9th St NW Ste 1000
Washington, DC 20004

Respectfully Submitted,



Lori Saxon

December 15, 2022

Preferred address for filing and correspondence
331 Plymouth Rd.
West Palm Beach, FL 33405
703-625-4343
loriannsaxon@gmail.com