

MAILED

JUL 24 2025
Jason Elyse

In The United States Supreme Court

Jason Elyse
Appellant

Case No: 302023-1322
Lower Tribunal: FJO-825/B

v.
STATE OF FLORIDA,
Appellee,

Application For Extension Of Time

COMES NOW the petitioner, Jason Elyse, pro se, pursuant to Rules of the United States Supreme Court, Rule 22 and Rule 30 moves this Honorable Court for an extension of time in which to submit his Petition for Writ of Certiorari and in support of this motion would show the following:

Jurisdiction

The Basis for Jurisdiction in the United States Supreme Court is found in 28 USC § 1651. See *Hahn v United States*, 524 US 236, 118 S Ct 1969, 141 L Ed 2d 242. Further, The United States Supreme Court's Rules expressly provide for extensions of time in which to file a petition for writ of certiorari, thus, this Court has Jurisdiction to entertain the application/motion for an extension of time.

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Reasons for Extensions Of Time

Petitioner, Jason Elyse, moves this Court for an extension of time in which to submit his Petition for Writ of Certiorari due to several factors that are outside of his control.

1. Appellant has filed a Brief on Jurisdiction with Florida Supreme Court on July 21, 2025 which addresses additional claims that needs to be exhausted to be presented to this Honorable Court and motion will not be ruled on for minimum 30 days
2. Appellant is housed at a level 7 institution and has limited

access to the law library due to his housing and job assignment. Further, appellant will need the assistance of a certified law clerk and will be only allowed to visit the law library at pre-determined times based on the submission of an inmate request and placement on a callout. The need of law clerk assistance is necessary to ensure that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari is properly presented with all the necessary facts, which will include typing and copy services.

3. Appellant has no way of contacting opposing counsel in regards to any objections to this request for an extension of time, however, appellant submits that this motion is filed in good faith and in no way is done to delay the proceeding, and as such would not prejudice the State of Florida in any manner.

Wherefore, based on the foregoing Appellant would request that this Court grant appellant an additional Sixty (60) days, in which to submit his Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully Submitted

/s/ Jason Elisse ^{no Reprieve}
Jason Elisse, pro se

DL# E61920

Union Correctional Institution

P.O. Box 1000

Railford, Florida 32083-1000

Certificate of Service

Pursuant to authority of *Houston v Lack* 487, US 266, 108 S Ct 2379, 2382, 101 L Ed 2d 245 (1988), prisoner mailbox rule, I have placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing "Application for Extension of Time" into the hands of Union Correctional Institution Officers for placement into the U.S. Mail for ultimate delivery to Clerk of Court, United States Supreme Court, 1 First St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20543-0001; Office of the Attorney General, PL-01, The Capitol, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050.

I CERTIFY under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed on July 25, 2025.

Respectfully Submitted

Jason Elyse ^{pro se}

Jason Elyse, pro se
DL # E61920

Union Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 1000
Raiford, Florida 32083-1000

Third District Court of Appeal

State of Florida

Opinion filed May 7, 2025.
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

No. 3D23-1322
Lower Tribunal No. F20-8251B

Jason Elysse,
Appellant,

vs.

The State of Florida,
Appellee.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Milton Hirsch, Judge.

Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Nicholas A. Lynch, Assistant Public Defender, for appellant.

James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and Kayla Heather McNab, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee.

Before EMAS, SCALES and GOODEN, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Jason Elysse appeals his convictions and sentences for attempted cocaine trafficking, conspiracy to traffic cocaine, and conspiracy to launder money. Elysse argues that the trial court abused its discretion¹ by: (i) denying, without first conducting an in camera hearing, Elysse's sworn motion to compel the disclosure of the confidential informant who acted as the intermediary for the underlying reverse sting operation conducted by the Hialeah Police Department; (ii) denying Elysse's eleventh-hour, de facto motion for a trial continuance to substitute a private attorney as his counsel; and (iii) overruling Elysse's authentication objection and admitting into evidence a cellphone video depicting bundles of cash and Elysse's voice stating his readiness to do a drug buy. Finding no abuse of discretion, we affirm Elysse's convictions and sentences. See State v. Zamora, 534 So. 2d 864, 868 (Fla. 3d DCA 1988) ("To invoke an in camera hearing, a defendant must file a sworn motion or affidavit alleging facts concerning the informant's

¹ Thomas v. State, 28 So. 3d 240, 243 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010) ("A trial court's orders regarding discovery of confidential informants are generally reviewed for an abuse of discretion."); Francois v. State, 137 So. 3d 1186, 1188-89 (Fla. 3d DCA 2014) ("A trial court is vested with broad discretion when ruling on a motion for a continuance. This discretion extends to motions requesting a continuance for the purpose of allowing substitution of new counsel.") citation omitted); Lamb v. State, 246 So. 3d 400, 408 (Fla. 4th DCA 2018) ("A trial court's conclusion regarding authentication is reviewed for an abuse of discretion.").

involvement which, if true, would support the possibility of a specific asserted defense.” (quoting State v. Acosta, 439 So. 2d 1024, 1027 n.2 (Fla. 3d DCA 1983)); Francois, 137 So. 3d at 1189 (“When the defendant requests a continuance on the eve of trial or in the middle of trial, as in this case, to allow time to retain counsel and for counsel to prepare, the trial court must balance the countervailing interests of the effective administration of the courts with the defendant’s right to private counsel of his choice. . . . [T]he evaluation of the facts and circumstances of each case must be left primarily to the informed judgment of the trial court.”) (citations omitted); City of Miami v. Kho, 290 So. 3d 942, 944-45 (Fla. 3d DCA 2019) (“A trial judge may admit a photograph under the silent witness method [of authentication] after considering the following factors: ‘(1) evidence establishing the time and date of the photographic evidence; (2) any evidence of editing or tampering; (3) the operating condition and capability of the equipment producing the photographic evidence as it relates to the accuracy and reliability of the photographic product; (4) the procedure employed as it relates to the preparation, testing, operation, and security of the equipment used to produce the photographic product, including the security of the product itself; and (5) testimony identifying the relevant participants depicted in the

photographic evidence.” (quoting Wagner v. State, 707 So. 2d 827, 831 (Fla. 1st DCA 1998))).

Affirmed.