

CAPITAL CASE

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

**CHADWICK WILLACY,**

*Petitioner,*

**v.**

**SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,**

*Respondent.*

---

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
FLORIDA SUPREME COURT

---

**APPLICATION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION**

---

**DEATH WARRANT SIGNED**  
**Execution Scheduled: April 21, 2026, at 6:00 PM ET**

---

To the Honorable Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of  
the United States:

The State of Florida has scheduled the execution of Petitioner Chadwick  
Willacy for Tuesday, April 21, 2026, at 6:00 PM ET. Pursuant to the Supreme Court  
Rule 23 and 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f), Mr. Willacy respectfully requests a stay of execution

pending the disposition of his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari accompanying this application.

### **STANDARDS FOR A STAY OF EXECUTION**

The standards for granting a stay of execution are well established. *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 895 (1983). There ““must be a reasonable probability that four members of the Court would consider the underlying issue sufficiently meritorious for the grant of certiorari or the notation of probable jurisdiction; there must be a significant possibility of reversal of the lower court’s decision; and there must be a likelihood that irreparable harm will result if that decision is not stayed.”” *Id.* (quoting *White v. Florida*, 458 U.S. 1301, 1302 (1982) (Powell, J., in chambers)).

### **PETITIONER SHOULD BE GRANTED A STAY OF EXECUTION**

The question raised in Mr. Willacy’s Petition for a Writ of Certiorari is sufficiently meritorious for a grant of a Writ of Certiorari. The underlying issue presents a significant, compelling question of constitutional law and a stay is necessary to avoid Mr. Willacy being executed in violation of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution before that question is resolved. *Madison v. Alabama*, 139 S. Ct. 718 (2019); *Panetti v. Quarterman*, 551 U.S. 930 (2007); *Ford v. Wainwright*, 477 U.S. 399 (1986).

It is indisputable that Mr. Willacy will be irreparably harmed if his execution is allowed to go forward. The balance of equities weighs heavily in favor of a stay. Florida’s interest in the timely enforcement of judgments handed down by its courts must be weighed against Mr. Willacy’s continued compelling interest in his life. *See*

*Ohio Adult Parole Auth. v. Woodard*, 523 U.S. 272, 289 (1998) (“[I]t is incorrect . . . to say that a prisoner has been deprived of all interest in his life before his execution.”) (O’Connor, J., plurality opinion). Florida has a minimal interest in finality and efficient enforcement of judgments, while Mr. Willacy has a right and significant interest in ensuring that his execution comports with the Constitution. In addition, the irreversible nature of the death penalty supports granting a stay. “[A] death sentence cannot begin to be carried out by the State while substantial legal issues remain outstanding.” *Barefoot*, 463 U.S. at 888. Mr. Willacy submits that there is a significant possibility of the lower court’s reversal, should this Court grant the request for a stay and review of the underlying petition. This Court’s intervention is urgently needed to prevent Mr. Willacy’s imminent execution despite the protections from the death penalty provided by the Eighth Amendment.

### **CONCLUSION**

“The fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard “at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.” *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965). Mr. Willacy’s meritorious issue cannot possibly be heard in a meaningful manner with just days left until his execution. The important constitutional issue presented by Mr. Willacy’s case requires a full appellate review that is not truncated by his imminent execution.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Willacy respectfully requests that this Court grant his application for a stay of execution scheduled for April 21, 2026, to address the compelling constitutional question in his case on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Melody J. Jacquay  
MELODY JACQUAY-ACOSTA  
Florida Bar No. 1010248  
Assistant CCRC-M

/s/ Joshua Chaykin  
JOSHUA P. CHAYKIN  
Florida Bar. No. 1019578  
Assistant CCRC-M

/s/ Ann Marie Mirialakis  
ANN MARIE MIRIALAKIS\*  
Florida Bar No. 658308  
Assistant CCRC-M

*Counsel of Record for Petitioner*  
*\*Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court*

Dated: April 17, 2026