

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

RONALD GEDDIS,

Applicant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Eleventh Circuit**

**APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Katherine Earle Yanes
Florida Bar No. 0159727
Kynes, Markman & Felman, P.A.
P.O. Box 3396
Tampa, Florida 33601
Telephone: (813) 229-1118
Facsimile: (813) 221-6750
kyanes@kmf-law.com
*Counsel for Petitioner
Ronald Geddis*

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

To the Honorable Clarence Thomas, Circuit Justice for the Eleventh Circuit:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c) and Supreme Court Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.3, Applicant Ronald Geddis respectfully requests that he be granted an extension of time of 30 days, to and including May 8, 2026, within which to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

The judgment sought to be reviewed was entered by the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals on January 8, 2026, and is attached. The case below was Eleventh Circuit Case No. 25-11721-F. Pursuant to Rule 13.1 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States, the current deadline for filing the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari is April 8, 2026. This motion is filed within the time allowed by Rule 13.

The jurisdiction of this Court would be invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1).

REASONS FOR EXTENSION

Good cause exists for the requested extension because it is necessary to allow counsel adequate time to prepare a petition for a certiorari that will be of assistance to the Court. Mr. Geddis is incarcerated, and due to the nature of his charges he lacks access to electronic communications. As a result, all communications with him to discuss this matter must be by legal mail or prearranged attorney-client calls, which significantly slows down Mr. Geddis's ability to communicate with his counsel regarding this matter, as well as counsel's ability to communicate with him. Undersigned counsel was recently informed that Mr. Geddis will be retaining her for

the purpose of preparing the petition. It is anticipated that the process of retaining her will be accomplished this week. Counsel has other upcoming unrelated deadlines during the time period in which the petition is currently due. Additionally, undersigned counsel has prearranged travel plans during this time period.

Accordingly, this extension is requested in order to allow counsel to prepare a petition for a writ of certiorari that thoroughly and effectively presents the issues in this case. This request is not for purposes of delay. No party will be prejudiced by the requested extension.

**STATEMENT REGARDING NOTIFICATION
AND POSITION OF RESPONDENT**

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.4, undersigned counsel has notified counsel for Respondent the United States of America, Holly L. Gershow, Deputy Chief, Appellate Division, United States Attorney's Office for the Middle District of Florida, of this motion. Counsel for the United States has graciously authorized the undersigned that the United States does not oppose the requested extension.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Geddis respectfully requests that this Court grant an extension of time of thirty (30) days, to and including May 8, 2026, within which to file the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Katherine Earle Yanes

Katherine Earle Yanes

Florida Bar No. 0159727

Kynes, Markman & Felman, P.A.

P.O. Box 3396

Tampa, Florida 33601

Telephone: (813) 229-1118

Facsimile: (813) 221-6750

kyanes@kmf-law.com

Counsel for Petitioner

Ronald Geddis

Dated: March 26, 2026

APPENDIX

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-11721

RONALD GEDDIS,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 8:22-cv-01407-MSS-AEP

ORDER:

Ronald Geddis moves this Court for a certificate of appealability (“COA”) to appeal from the district court’s order denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. Geddis’s motion for a COA is DENIED because he has not made a substantial showing of the denial of his

2

Order of the Court

25-11721

constitutional rights. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

/s/ Andrew L. Brasher

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE