

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RAHUL CHATURVEDI,
Petitioner,

v.

SIDDHARTH SIDDHARTH,
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

Fifteenth day of September, MMXXV



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 23, 2025. The petition is currently due on September 24, 2025. The deadline to file an extension is September 15, 2025, pursuant to S. Ct. R. 30.1, following the final order of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts on June 26, 2025, in *Siddharth Siddharth v. Rahul Chaturvedi*, FAR-29818B.¹ (See Appendix A for the order and docket entries.)

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

The June 26, 2025, order sits at the epicenter of a complex litigation history spanning two decades. In these and related proceedings, the systemic and escalated sustained erosion of constitutionally-protected rights has materially impaired Petitioner's ability to petition timely, thereby raising grave federal questions of due process, equal protection, and access to justice that warrant this Court's review.

This request is related to a previously granted extension application in No. 25A259. Both Respondents—in No. 25A259 and in this application—are Petitioner's former licensees in a system of interstate commerce.

Collectively, the petitions raise federal questions grounded in the Fourteenth Amendment and the Supremacy Clause. Congress intended the Defend Trade Secrets Act ("DTSA"), 18 U.S.C. § 1836 *et seq.*, to

¹ FAR 29818B, 24-P-0427, procedural order and docket entry, June 26, 2025.

occupy the field for trade and business secrets vital to interstate commerce, thereby establishing field preemption. Where a Massachusetts order relating to discovery and trial clashes with enforceable private party rights under DTSA, conflict preemption arises. Additionally, where the at-risk protected trade secrets involve export-controlled technologies, demanding supremacy of federal law becomes crucial in preventing irreparable harm and is in the national interest.

Petitioner is thereby confronted with a constitutionally impermissible choice: risk contempt and *res judicata* consequences in strategically preemptive state litigation, or suffer the loss of trade secrets, proprietary technology, and business identifiers embodied in exculpatory evidence.

Good cause exists for this extension. Petitioner is handling imminent and escalated harm involving four different matters, each with related, intertwined complexities:

(a) Pursuant to the Appeals Court decision in *Bridge Over Corp. et al v. Chaturvedi*, 2024-P-1162, on the merits² and denial of discretionary review in FAR 30465,³ Petitioner will imminently file an extension application, along with an emergency motion to stay the pending trial in the underlying case in Norfolk Superior Court (2182CV00699), where the exculpatory evidence involves at-risk business and trade secrets, expressly governed by the DTSA.

² Final decision in *Bridge Over Corp., et al v. Chaturvedi*, 2024-P-1162, July 10, 2025.

³ FAR 30465, discretionary review denied on September 4, 2025.

Considering that the federal court will not interfere in state court proceedings, the stay application is crucial. (*See infra* (d).)

(b) The escalated harm from events of September 9, 2025, following the grant of extension in 25A259, has compelled the Petitioner to seek emergent extraordinary relief under Mass. G. L. c. 211 § 3 from the Supreme Judicial Court in Massachusetts in *Siddharth v. Chaturvedi* 2489SP000012, Falmouth District Court. Absent relief, Petitioner must file a petition for a writ of certiorari with this Court.

(c) On September 5, 2025, the Appeals Court in *Siddharth v. Chaturvedi*, 2024-P-1166, related to the instant application, denied Petitioner's application to expedite the appeal. Upon adjudication, a petition for a writ of certiorari to this Court may be required.

(d) Petitioner is preparing an imminent complaint for injunctive relief in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. When combined with the materials already in possession of the respondents in No. 25A529 and in this application, new unauthorized disclosures of scientific material from July 29, 2025 have created a heightened risk of a "deemed export" of controlled technologies, in violation of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (ECRA), 50 U.S.C. §§ 4801–4852, and the implementing regulations, including 15 C.F.R. § 734.13.

The overlapping record is extensive and complex, and Petitioner is in the process of retaining counsel. The requested extension will provide sufficient time to prepare a comprehensive, properly supported petition

that presents multiple decisions 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: September 15, 2025

Pro Se Petitioner

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RAHUL CHATURVEDI,
Petitioner,

v.

SIDDHARTH SIDDHARTH,
Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.2, I certify that one original and two copies of the application to extend time to file petition for writ of were hand delivered to the Clerk's Office on this 15th day of September, 2025.

I further certify, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.5(c), that one copy of the same was served on counsel of record for respondent, Anthony Riley, Esq. 40 Grove Street, Suite 190, Wellesley, MA 02482, by United States Postal Service First Class Mail, postage prepaid, on September 15, 2025.

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



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

Dated: September 15, 2025

Pro Se Petitioner

APPENDIX A



Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

RE: No. FAR-29818B

SIDDHARTH SIDDHARTH

vs.

RAHUL CHATURVEDI

NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY

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

ORDER: On March 25, 2025, an order entered that the application was to be filed on or before April 28, 2025, no further enlargement of time should be anticipated. The application was not received.

The motion to file the application late is denied. This matter is dismissed and the case is closed.

Very truly yours,

The Clerk's Office

Dated: June 26, 2025

To:

Anthony Riley, Esquire

Rahul Chaturvedi

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

RAHUL CHATURVEDI,
Petitioner,

v.

SIDDHARTH SIDDHARTH,
Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.2, I certify that one original and two copies of the application to extend time to file petition for writ of were hand delivered to the Clerk's Office on this 15th day of September, 2025.

I further certify, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.5(c), that one copy of the same was served on counsel of record for respondent, Anthony Riley, Esq. 40 Grove Street, Suite 190, Wellesley, MA 02482, by United States Postal Service First Class Mail, postage prepaid, on September 15, 2025.

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

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

Dated: September 15, 2025

Pro Se Petitioner

**SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
for the Commonwealth
Case Docket**

**SIDDHARTH SIDDHARTH vs. RAHUL CHATURVEDI
FAR-29818B**

CASE HEADER

Case Status	FAR applic dismissed
Status Date	06/26/2025
Nature	Corporate/business
Entry Date	12/19/2024
Appeals Ct Number	<u>2023-P-0427</u>
Response Date	
Appellant	Defendant
Applicant	Defendant
Citation	
Case Type	Civil
Full Ct Number	
TC Number	1772CV00144
Lower Court	Barnstable Superior Court
Lower Ct Judge	Diane C. Freniere, J.

INVOLVED PARTY

Siddharth Siddharth
Plaintiff/Appellee

Rahul Chaturvedi
Pro Se Defendant/Appellant

ATTORNEY APPEARANCE

Anthony Riley, Esquire

DOCKET ENTRIES

Entry Date	Paper	Entry Text
12/19/2024		Docket opened.
12/19/2024	#1	MOTION to file FAR application late filed by Rahul Chaturvedi. (Because the rescript has issued, the motion is referred to the quorum. The application shall be filed on or before January 25, 2025).
01/17/2025	#2	MOTION to request modification of order issued on 1/17/2025 filed by Rahul Chaturvedi. (Because the rescript has issued, the motion is referred to the quorum. The application shall be filed on or before March 15, 2025).
03/25/2025	#3	MOTION to file FAR application late filed by Rahul Chaturvedi. (Because the rescript has issued, the motion is referred to the quorum. The application shall be filed on or before April 28, 2025. No further enlargement of time should be anticipated).
04/28/2025	#4	MOTION to file FAR application late filed by Rahul Chaturvedi. (6/16/2025:Because the rescript has issued, the motion is referred to the quorum).
06/26/2025	#5	ORDER: On March 25, 2025, an order entered that the application was to be filed on or before April 28, 2025, no further enlargement of time should be anticipated. The application was not received. The motion to file the application late is denied. This matter is dismissed and the case is closed.

As of 06/26/2025 4:20pm

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