

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SAMUEL LEE SMITH, JR.,

Petitioners,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondents,

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI**

Petitioner SAMUEL LEE SMITH, JR., proceeding pro se, respectfully moves this Court for a sixty-day extension of time within which to file a petition for writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Florida dismissing his appeal.

I. IDENTIFICATION OF JUDGMENT AND JURISDICTIONAL BASIS

Petitioner seeks review of the order entered by the Supreme Court of Florida. The Court entered its own Order dismissing Petitioner's appeal in

Case No. SC2026- 0544. The Supreme Court of Florida dismissed the appeal stating this Court lacks jurisdiction to review an unelaborated decision from a district court of appeal that is issued without opinion or explanation or that merely cites to an authority that is not case pending review in, or reversed or quashed by, this Court dated on April 7th, 2026, and with Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

The Supreme Court order became final. Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari is currently due on 90 days from finality. This Court's jurisdiction would be invoked.

The bases for the petition is the foul conscious intentional undermining of the rule of law violating the Petitioners due process, procedural due process which requires adequate notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard to contest any government action, speedy trial violations, government abuse displaying egregious judicial and law enforcement misconduct, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968 and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341-1346 . The underlying case arose from a false arrest and the Petitioner charged with driving while license suspended/ financial suspension (Fla stat. 322.34(10)(B)1) arising from an incident alleged to have occurred on May 10th, 2025 in which R. Aguero badge 1993, K. Coloma Badge 2465, N. Martinez Badge 2518 and J. Borroto 2418. Hialeah officer R. Aguero acted unlawfully, and factually falsified the arrest affidavit 8 U.S.C. § 1324c. Petitioner filed Motion to return Property on May 14th, 2025, Petitioner filed Motion to Produce on June 6th, 2025, the state never complied obstruction to data Fla Stat. § 815.06. Victoria Ferrer

heard this matter on June 17th, 2025 and ordered the State to produce discovery in 15 days. The state failed to comply. Motion to Impose Sanctions was filed on July 3rd, 2025 for failing to comply with discovery request. Petitioner filed Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice on August 12th, 2025, the Court egregiously ignored the Petitioners Motion and denied the undersigned his opportunity to be heard. The case was then heard before Betsy Alvarez- Zane on October 21st, 2025, at 9:45 am, who violated the rules of procedure for discovery by granting the state with a second opportunity to produce discovery. Judicial double standards and corruption is a breach of judicial duty 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968. On November 28th, 2025, Petitioner filed Second Motion to Impose Severe Sanctions due to unreasonable delays and Speedy Trial violations. On December 15th, 2025 The Motion to Impose Sanctions was heard before Betsy Alvarez-Zane who affirmed under oath the Motion will be heard on December 16th, 2025. The senior official acted impartial and used a bait and switch technique on the 16th of December 2025 dismissing the case ignoring the Petitioners Motion To Impose Sanction and contradicting her statement Fla Stat. § 837.021

A timely appeal was filed in the District Court of Appeal of Florida for the Third District case 3d2026-0093 which was dismissed by the Third District Court. Upon the dismissal of the this matter, Edwin A Scales, III, C.J., Norma S. Lindsey, Alexander S. Bokor and JJ issued the factually falsified order U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968.

II. TIMELINESS OF THIS APPLICATION

This application is filed before the current deadline for filing the petition for writ of certiorari.

III. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR A SIXTY-DAY EXTENSION

A. Legal Standard

Under Supreme Court Rule 13.5, a Justice may extend the time to file a petition for writ of certiorari for a period not exceeding 60 days upon a showing of good cause. USCS Supreme Ct R 13 Applications to extend the time to file a petition for writ of certiorari are not favored. USCS Supreme Ct R 13 Nevertheless, the Rule contemplates that good cause may exist in appropriate circumstances, and the sixty-day extension authority demonstrates that the Court recognizes situations warranting relief from strict filing deadlines.

The application must set out the basis for jurisdiction in this Court, identify the judgment sought to be reviewed, include a copy of the opinion and any order respecting rehearing, and set out specific reasons why an extension of time is justified. USCS Supreme Ct R 13 The application must clearly identify each party for whom an extension is being sought, as any extension granted would apply solely to the party or parties named in the application. USCS Supreme Ct R 13

B. Petitioner's Serious Medical Emergency Constitutes Good Cause

Petitioner is currently experiencing a serious and ongoing medical emergency requiring immediate neurological evaluation and treatment. Petitioner must seek

urgent care from a neurologist due to symptoms that materially impair his ability to prepare legal filings and effectively proceed with legal matters. The nature of petitioner's symptoms is such that he cannot engage in the sustained cognitive work necessary to research, draft, and prepare a petition for writ of certiorari.

This medical emergency is not a matter of convenience or preference for additional time. Rather, it is an acute condition demanding immediate professional attention and potentially ongoing treatment. Petitioner has been advised that further neurological evaluation is required; he may need to refrain from legal work pending diagnosis and treatment, though the duration cannot be predicted with precision at this stage.

Petitioner's medical emergency is fundamentally different from the insufficient reasons that have been rejected in prior extension applications. In one case, a Circuit Justice denied an extension where counsel cited a voluminous record and planned absence as reasons, holding these did not constitute good cause because counsel should have familiarity with the record from prior briefing and planned absences should not affect the orderly administration of deadlines. *Penry v. Tex.*, 515 U.S. 1304 in another case, an extension was denied where the only reason given was counsel's desire for additional time to research constitutional issues. *Kleem v. INS*, 479 U.S. 1308 Unlike those cases involving professional scheduling or desire for more preparation time, petitioner faces an involuntary medical crisis that prevents him from performing legal work altogether.

C. Pro Se Status and Complete Absence of Alternative Means

Petitioner is proceeding pro se and has no counsel to assist him in preparing his petition. As a pro se litigant, petitioner is solely responsible for all aspects of researching, drafting, and filing his petition for writ of certiorari. He has no alternative means to prepare the required documents.

The Supreme Court has recognized that procedural rules are based on the assumption that litigation is normally conducted by lawyers. *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106 While the Court has held that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should not be interpreted to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel, the Court has also recognized that some procedural rules must give way because of unique circumstances. *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106

Unlike represented parties who may rely on counsel to continue legal work during periods of personal difficulty, petitioner has no such alternative. When a pro se litigant is incapacitated by a medical emergency, the inability to prepare filings is absolute. Petitioner cannot delegate this work to counsel because he has none and lacks the financial resources to retain counsel. If the extension is denied, petitioner will be effectively barred from seeking review not because his claims lack merit, but because he is physically unable to perform the necessary legal work due to a medical emergency beyond his control.

D. Good Faith, Diligence, and Commitment to Compliance

Petitioner makes this request in good faith and not for purposes of delay or tactical advantage. He is seeking to preserve his right to seek Supreme Court review while addressing a medical crisis that demands immediate attention. Petitioner has already pursued his claims through the district court and appellate process despite significant procedural obstacles, including denial of in forma pauperis status and dismissal of his appeal for want of prosecution due to inability to pay fees. His request for an extension demonstrates responsible action to ensure that his petition will be prepared with appropriate care rather than rushed to meet a deadline while he is incapacitated.

Petitioner commits to the following:

Filing his petition for writ of certiorari as soon as he is medically able to do so, without waiting for the full sixty-day extension period to expire if his condition permits earlier work.

Providing medical documentation from a medical professional which suggested seeing a treating neurologist and getting more professional evaluation.

Notifying the Court promptly if his medical condition improves sufficiently to permit earlier filing than the extended deadline.

E. The Requested Extension Is Modest and Defined

Petitioner requests a sixty-day extension, which is the maximum period authorized by Supreme Court Rule 13.5. USCS Supreme Ct R 13 This defined

period provides reasonable time for petitioner to undergo neurological evaluation, receive medical guidance, and begin recovery while maintaining orderly administration of the Court's docket. The extension establishes a clear deadline sixty days from the current deadline, promoting certainty in docket management.

If, after sixty days, petitioner's medical condition has not improved sufficiently to permit work on the petition, petitioner may seek an additional extension supported by medical documentation from his treating neurologist. This approach allows the Court to evaluate petitioner's circumstances in stages with concrete medical evidence, rather than requiring speculation about an indefinite future.

F. No Prejudice to Respondents

Granting a sixty-day extension does not materially prejudice respondents. A delay in the filing of a certiorari petition, which itself is discretionary and not a matter of right, does not undermine the finality of the judgments below or impose any substantial burden on the respondents. Moreover, granting the extension serves the orderly administration of justice by allowing petitioner to prepare a complete and thoughtful petition rather than forcing him to choose between meeting a deadline while incapacitated or forfeiting his right to seek review.

When the judicial process becomes the only effective means of resolving a dispute, denial of access raises grave problems for legitimacy. *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant a sixty-day extension of time to file his petition for writ of certiorari, extending the current deadline and for such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ SAMUEL LEE SMITH, JR..

SAMUEL LEE SMITH, JR.,

Petitioner Pro se

16614 SW 99 Court

Miami, Florida 33157

Email gysam7@gmail.com

Supreme Court of Florida

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 2026

Samuel Lee Smith, Jr.,
Petitioner(s)

v.

State of Florida,
Respondent(s)

SC2026-0544
Lower Tribunal No(s):
3D2026-0093;
ALEJZFE, ALEJZEE

Petitioner's Notice to Invoke Discretionary Jurisdiction, seeking review of the order or opinion issued by the Third District Court of Appeal on March 3, 2026, is hereby dismissed. This Court lacks jurisdiction to review an unelaborated decision from a district court of appeal that is issued without opinion or explanation or that merely cites to an authority that is not a case pending review in, or reversed or quashed by, this Court. *See Wheeler v. State*, 296 So. 3d 895 (Fla. 2020); *Wells v. State*, 132 So. 3d 1110 (Fla. 2014); *Jackson v. State*, 926 So. 2d 1262 (Fla. 2006); *Gandy v. State*, 846 So. 2d 1141 (Fla. 2003); *Stallworth v. Moore*, 827 So. 2d 974 (Fla. 2002); *Harrison v. Hyster Co.*, 515 So. 2d 1279 (Fla. 1987); *Dodi Publ'g Co. v. Editorial Am. S.A.*, 385 So. 2d 1369 (Fla. 1980); *Jenkins v. State*, 385 So. 2d 1356 (Fla. 1980).

No motion for rehearing or reinstatement will be entertained by the Court.

A True Copy
Test:

SC2026-0544 4/7/2026

John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court



CASE NO.: SC2026-0544

Page Two

SC2026-0544 4/7/2026

TD

Served:

**HON. BETSY ALVAREZ-ZANE
CRIM APPEALS MIA ATTORNEY GENERAL
3DCA CLERK
MIAMI-DADE CLERK
RICHARD L. POLIN
YOLANDE MARVA SAMERSON
SAMUEL LEE SMITH, JR.**

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SAMUEL LEE SMITH JR — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

state of florida — RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, SAMUEL LEE SMITH JR, do swear or declare that on this date, July 2nd, 2026, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

crimappm19@myfloridalegal.com, jason doyle - jdoyle@floridabar.org,
betsy alvarez-zane - balvarez-zane@jwdll.flcourts.org, cig@eog.myflorida.com
george fuente - gfuente@hialeahfl.gov, jeremy redfern - jeremy.redfern@myflorida.com
Bradley mcgray@myfloridalegal.com, richard i polin - richard.polin@myfloridalegal.com
Yolande Samerson - yolande.samerson@myfloridalegal.com

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

Executed on July 2nd, 2026

NAME
(Signature)
RECEIVED
JUN 30 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**