

No.

25A259

ORIGINAL

In the Supreme Court of the United States

FILED

AUG 29 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RAHUL CHATURVEDI,  
Petitioner,

v.

ARVIND KUMAR JAY JAISWAL,  
Respondent.

ON APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT, JUSTICE KETANJI BROWN JACKSON, PRESIDING

Rahul Chaturvedi  
775 E. Falmouth Hwy #351  
East Falmouth, MA 02536  
(857) 574-9009  
rahulchaturvedi.md@gmail.com

*Pro Se Petitioner*

Twenty-ninth day of August, MMXXV

RECEIVED

SEP - 3 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Pursuant to S. Ct. R. 13.5 and 22, Petitioner Rahul Chaturvedi respectfully requests that the time to file his petition for writ of certiorari in this matter be extended for sixty (60) days up to and including November 7, 2025. The petition is currently due on September 8, 2025, pursuant to S. Ct. R. 30.1, following the final judgment of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts on June 9, 2025, in *Jaiswal v. Chaturvedi*, FAR-30225.<sup>1</sup> (See Appendix A for the order). This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

This request is related to a contemporaneously filed extension application, along with an emergency motion to stay the execution of the judgment in a companion matter (*Siddharth v. Chaturvedi*, FAR-29818B). Both Respondents are Petitioner's former licensees. They have used forum-shopped state-court proceedings not only to evade defaulted payment liabilities but also to coerce the unprotected disclosure of the Petitioner's trade secrets and proprietary technology identifiers, as embodied in the comprehensive licensing agreements.

Respondent's tactics in the underlying trial court proceedings placed Petitioner in an untenable position. Petitioner was forced to choose between forfeiting intellectual property or facing contempt and adverse judgments—despite his repeated efforts to obtain enforceable private-party protections, codified in the Defend Trade Secrets Act (“DTSA”), 18 U.S.C. § 1836 *et seq.*, before disclosing the protected information.

---

<sup>1</sup> FAR 30225, discretionary review denied May 12, 2025. Rehearing denied June 9, 2025.

The state-court judgments, rendered amid significant procedural and substantive due process concerns and disputes over the equal application of federal and state statutes, have created a *res judicata* bar to Petitioner's forthcoming federal action for relief against former licensees, including Respondent.

Collectively, the petitions will raise the same federal questions, particularly the scope of protection afforded by the federal interests in safeguarding trade secrets under DTSA. State courts have denied requests for seal, impoundment, and protective orders, creating a direct conflict with federal law and raising substantial due process and Supremacy Clause concerns.

Good cause exists for this extension. Petitioner is simultaneously managing two intertwined trial-court actions and two appellate proceedings in which decisions have already been entered. If the Supreme Judicial Court denies discretionary review, those matters will likewise need to be presented to this Court.

Recent events have further complicated the already overwhelming complexity of these proceedings.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, in a separate trial court action involving Respondent Siddharth, the denial of impoundment and the protection of third-party identifiers have compelled the Petitioner to seek extraordinary relief under Mass. G.L. c. 211, § 3,

---

<sup>2</sup> The unauthorized circulation of a confidential overview by a foreign national agent of Respondent beginning on July 29, 2025, and continuing thereafter, when combined with materials already in the possession of both Respondents, may constitute a "deemed export" of controlled technologies contained in the licensing agreements under the Export Administration Regulations. Petitioner may need to seek injunctive relief in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in light of the failure of Respondents and their agent to respond to hold notices.

before the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. If that relief is denied, Petitioner will seek a writ of certiorari in this Court.

The overlapping record is extensive and complex, and Petitioner is in the process of retaining counsel. The requested extension will allow sufficient time to prepare a comprehensive, properly supported petition in which multiple judgments may be presented for review under a single writ of certiorari, consistent with S. Ct. R. 12.4.

Respectfully submitted,



/s/Rahul Chaturvedi

Rahul Chaturvedi

775 E. Falmouth Hwy #351

East Falmouth, MA 02536

(857) 574-9009

rahulchaturvedi.md@gmail.com

Dated: August 29, 2025

*Pro Se Petitioner*

## **APPENDIX A**



Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

RE: No. FAR-30225

ARVIND KUMAR JAY JAISWAL

vs.

RAHUL CHATURVEDI & another

NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY

Please take note that the the following entry was made on the docket.

Motion to reconsider and allow the filing of FAR application filed by Rahul Chaturvedi. (5/20/2025: Because the rescript has issued, the motion is referred to the quorum, which will consider the motion and the application). (6/9/2025: The motion is denied. This matter is closed).

Very truly yours,

The Clerk's Office

Dated: June 9, 2025

To:

David B. Mack, Esquire

Stephanie Parker, Esquire

Amanda F Hobson, Esquire

Rahul Chaturvedi



24200 SW FWY STE 402-259  
ROSENBERG, TX 77471-5985  
+1 (202) 866-8558  
print@uscpc.us  
www.USCPC.us

*Expert Legal Printer,  
For the People,  
By the People.*

U.S. Supreme Court Printing Services

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

---

## In the Supreme Court of the United States

---

RAHUL CHATURVEDI,  
Petitioner,

v.

ARVIND KUMAR JAY JAISWAL,  
Respondent.

---

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

---

Pursuant to S. Ct. R. 29.2, I certify that 1 original, and 2 copies of the application to extend time to file petition for writ of certiorari, along with any required filing fee, are hand delivered to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court on this 29th day of August, 2025.

Lastly, I certify pursuant to S. Ct. R. 29.5(c), 1 cop of the of the application to application to extend time to file petition for writ of certiorari are served upon the counsel of record for respondent, David B. Mack, for Arvind Kumar Jay Jaiswal, petitioners, at 10 Burlington Mall Road Suite 301 Burlington, MA 01803, on this 29th day of August, 2025 through the United States Postal Service via First Class Mail postage prepaid.

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

Executed on August 29, 2025

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Rahul Chaturvedi", is written over a horizontal line.

Rahul Chaturvedi





24200 SW FWY STE 402-259  
ROSENBERG, TX 77471-5985  
+1 (202) 866-8558  
print@uscpc.us  
www.USCPC.us

*Expert Legal Printer,  
For the People,  
By the People.*

U.S. Supreme Court Printing Services

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

---

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

---

RAHUL CHATURVEDI,  
Petitioner,

v.

ARVIND KUMAR JAY JAISWAL,  
Respondent.

---

Dear Clerk,

Our client requested my firm to send the court via the United States Postal Service the application to extend time, as an additional measure to ensure that the submission is on time, after hand delivery at the court. If the hand-delivered documents have been received, please disregard this copy.

Very truly yours,

---

Huang Tiange  
*President*  
United States Commercial Printing Company  
24200 Southwest Fwy, Ste 402-259  
Rosenberg, TX 77471-5985  
huangtiange@uscpc.us  
(202) 866-8558