App No. 24A 1672

In The Supreme Court of the United States

Gary Pisner.,

Applicant,

FILED MAY 0 4 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK SUPREME COURT, U.S.

v.

Attorney Grievance Commission of Maryland

Respondent.

On Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

Gary Pisner, Esq.

Pro Se. Applicant

10561 Assembly

Drive

Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Tel: (703) 597-6447

Email: gpisner@outlook.com

May 4, 2025

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 2025

SEFERE THERLERS

Corporate Disclosure Statement

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, Gary Pisner (Applicant/Appellant) states that it has no parent corporation and that no publicly held company owns 10% or more of Applicant's stock.

To the Honorable Chief Justice John Roberts as Justice for the Maryland Supreme Court

In accordance with this Court's Rules 13.5, 22, 30.2, and 30.3, Applicant Gary Pisner `respectfully requests that the time to file his petition for a writ of certiorari be extended for 60 days, up to and including, Monday August 4. 2025.

Without the extension, Applicant's Petition would be due on June 3, 2025.

The Maryland Supreme Court issued its final order on March 5, 2025, (Exhibit A) in the Per Curiam order AG No. 23 from the Circuit Court of Montgomery County Case Nol C-15-CV-23-004631.

The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. 1257.

Background

This case presents a disciplinary proceeding that lacked even basic due process, such as, but not limited to, notice, notice and access to exculpatory evidence, discovery responses by the Respondent, limited or no discovery responses from Respondent's witnesses, confidentiality bars for two of the witnesses that limited cross examination, and attorney-client privilege for Respondent.

Another anomaly was that, inexplicably, documentation and Respondent's Circuit Court petition were selected and prepared by a popular court appointed attorney who had embezzled Applicant's funds, altered court documents, fabricated documents, pushed perjured testimony by his accountant as the court appointed trustee, where the trust's beneficiary was Gary Pisner who is the Applicant.

Moreover, Pisner had filed two ethics complaints and suits against the trustee and accountant. This created what the Circuit Court referred to as the case's unresolved "snitch" problem.

Another anomaly was that the trustee was not the Complainant, but most of the grievances in Respondent's petition related to the trustee, who had prepared the complaint, so the earlier administrative proceedings had no value.

None of these constitutional and procedural deficiencies and breaches could be addressed by the Circuit Court, because it claimed that it lacked the jurisdiction to hear due process issues and that the jurisdiction to hear due process and other constitutional issues lied solely in the Maryland Supreme Court and when Applicant attempted to petition the Maryland Supreme Court to hear those due process issues the Maryland Supreme Court refused to hear those due process and equal protection issues.

With the Maryland Supreme Court refusing to hear any of the due process and equal protection issues, the Applicant remanded the case to the Federal District Court of Maryland; the Respondent filed a Petition for remand back to the Maryland Supreme court. Its argument was that Constitutional due process and equal protection are not Federal questions and that Pisner had no due process or equal protection rights and that it was a simple disciplinary matter for the state. Pisner appealed the remand to the Fourth Circuit, where it is, but with Pisner's stay request from the Federal District Court of Maryland, denied for less than clear reasons, the Maryland Supreme Court summarily issued its order (Exhibit A) so, because the Federal District Court would not issue a stay and the Maryland Supreme Court

would not permit a continuance at the insistence of Respondent, there are, in effect two tracks with two timelines. Obviously, Applicant's constitutional rights were ignored, and he has already been damaged, whereas the trustee is back at work as a court appointed trustee -much richer.

Reasons For Granting an Extension of Time

The March 5, 2025, order (see Exhibit A) is terse and uninformative; the proceeding in the Federal Fourth Circuit, if resolved, will negate the Maryland case because of its constitutional deficiencies, so filing a Petition for Certiorari might be unnecessary, but the case in the 4th Circuit is in its early stages and the respondent is slowing the review, by requesting meritless extensions. This is why a sixty (60) day extension is necessary. Regrettably, options are limited, given that deadlines are statutory, but the sixty (60) day extension would allow the proceeding to reach a more advanced state, in the Forth Circuit, prior to the need to file a Petition for Certiorari with this court.

Conclusion

The applicant requests that the time to file a writ of certiorari in the above captioned case matter be extended 60 days to and including Monday August 4. 2025...

Dated this 4th day of May.

Respectfully submitted,

Day Rece !

EXHIBIT A

Circuit Court for Montgomery County Case No. C-15-CV-23-004631 Argued: March 3, 2025

IN THE SUPREME COURT

OF MARYLAND

AG No. 23

September Term, 2023

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

 $\mathbf{v}_{\boldsymbol{\cdot}}$

GARY PISNER

Fader, C. J.,

Watts

Booth

Biran

Gould

Eaves

Killough,

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: March 5, 2025

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE

COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

V.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT

OF MARYLAND

GARY PISNER *

September Term, 2023

ORDER

For the reasons to be stated in an opinion to be filed later, it is this 5th day of March 2025, by the Supreme Court of Maryland,

ORDERED that, effective immediately, Respondent Gary Pisner is disbarred from the further practice of law in the State of Maryland; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court shall strike the name of Gary Pisner from the register of attorneys, and the Clerk shall comply with the notice provisions of Rule 19-761(b); and it is further

ORDERED that Gary Pisner shall pay all costs as assessed by the Clerk pursuant to Rule 19-709, including the costs of any transcripts, and judgment for the amount of the costs is entered in favor of the Attorney Grievance Commission and against Gary Pisner.



Gary Pisner, Esq. 10561 Assembly Drive Fairfax, Virginia 22030 Tel: (703) 597-6447

Email: gpisner@outlook.com

Pro Se Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Try Pull

I certify that I have mailed a copy of this Application to the counsel of record, in the Maryland State Court, for the Respondent who is Thomas DeGonia, Esq. on May4, 2025.