

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

ROBERT WALKER,

Applicants,

v.

THE FLORIDA BAR, JONATHAN D. GERBER, JEFFREY T KUNTZ, SPENCER D LEVINE
BRETT MICHAEL WARONICKI, BARBARA W BRONIS JANET CARNEY CROOM,
MELAINIE G. MAY, FLORIDA FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS (4DCA),

HINDEN, MCLEAN & ARBEITER, P.A *ET AL.*,

Respondents.

**SECOND (2ND) APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
WITHIN WHICH TO FILE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
BEFORE JUDGMENT TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

ROBERT L. WALKER
4001 S.W. Melbourne Street
Port Saint Lucie, FL 34953
(772)400-7544

Applicant

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

1. Applicant Robert Walker was a Plaintiff in the district court and Appellant before the court of appeals.

Respondents THE FLORIDA BAR, JONATHAN D. GERBER, MELAINE G. MAY, JEFFREY T KUNTZ, SPENCER D LEVINE, BRETT MICHAEL WARONICKI, BARBARA W BRONIS, JANET CARNEY CROOM, FLORIDA FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS (4DCA), HINDEN, MCLEAN & ARBEITER, P.A, were defendants in the district court and appellees before the court of appeals.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.62 Applicants Robert Walker, is an individual and is not a Corporation, No Corporate disclosure statement are required.

APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

TO THE HONORABLE CLARENCE THOMAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT:

Pursuant to this Court's Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.3, applicant Robert Walker respectfully request a 47-day extension of time— to and including December 3, 2025—within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. On the 22nd of September 2025, the Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal and an Application for an Extension of time. On the 16th after Twenty (22) days of filing for an Application, Clerk Rashonda Garner sent a Letter for Clarification as to a Certification, *attached as Exhibit "A-B"*. The Petitioner has Since Clarified the Clerks Notice Dated the 1st of October 2025 and Postmarked the 10th of

October 2025 and Refiled the Application as to the USDCA Order Denying En Banc on the 25th of August 2025, **attached as Exhibit "C"**, from an Order issued on the 18th of June 2025 and the Clarification Order issued while under Appeal on the 1st of October 2025, **attached as Exhibit "D"**. In an Unprecedented and Questionable Opinion, USDCA Judges ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU abused its' discretion with judicial over reach and prematurely Issued an Order and Denied and Order of an EN Banc of The 11th Cir. R. 12-1, The 11th Cir. R. 26-1, The 11th Cir. R. 31-2, and The 11th Cir R. 42-3(e); that Conflicts with U.S. Constitution, Article III, Section 2 and Article I, Section 10 Clause provisions, citing *Hale vs. Hinkel* 201 U.S. 43, 74-75, (1906). the Opinions in err issued on the 25th of August 2025 in an opinion reported In re Walker, No. 25-11231 (attached as Exhibit B) , the 18th of June 2025 in an opinion reported In re Walker, No. 25-11231 (attached as Exhibit C) and the 13th of January 2025 in an opinion reported In re Walker, No. 24-13585, in which those opinions conflicting in nature have created violations in Due Process Rights with judicial overreach as to not "safeguarding not only ongoing, proceedings, but potential future proceedings," Klay, 376 F.3d at 1099, as well as to "protect or effectuate" their prior orders and judgments, *Wesch v. Folsom*, 6 F.3d 1465, 1470 (11th Cir. 1993); see *United States v. N.Y. Tel. Co.*, 434 U.S. 159, 172, 98 S. Ct. 364, 372 (1977)

1. The Eleventh USDCA Judges ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU, presiding over directly related claims briefing before the Court, made in passing related to current, and raised briefly with supporting arguments or authorities that are currently "still" pending Appellate review under the same panel ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), The Hon. Magistrate Ryon M McCabe of the USDC of Florida Southern Division under Magistrate Jurisdiction in addition The Hon. Madam Magistrate Shenik M Maynard of the USDC

of Florida Southern Division also have jurisdiction over appeals inextricably intertwined with related matters.

2. USDCA for the Eleventh Circuit, are Federal courts, are courts of limited jurisdiction, deriving their power solely from Article III of the Constitution and from the legislative acts of Congress,” and “are bound to assure themselves of jurisdiction even if the parties fail to raise the issue.” *Harris v. United States*, 149 F.3d 1304, 1308 (11th Cir. 1998). Madam Judges ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU issued Opinioned Orders Conflicting with the FARP, The U.S. Constitution and The USDCA 11th Circuit Rules of Civil Procedures that unlawfully and constitutionally violate The United States Constitution in its relations to Due Process and the Equal Protection Clause. The Appellant will be arguing as to “The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals panel Judges ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU, violated the Oath of Office, the U.S. Constitution and abuse its discretion with judicial overreach when it issued those Orders on the 18th of June 2025 and the 25^h of August 2025, that Conflicts with a Precious Order issued on the 13th of January 2025.

3. The Courts Opinions cause conflict deeming issues not briefed on appeal, violating the *Rooker-Feldman Doctrine*. and 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution persons right to due process as matters are still before the Court, tolling with issues that are brief and still pending before the court in separate mattes in which the Applicant placed the court on notice on the 18th of September 2025 as to a Notice of Appeal. On the 25th of August 2025 prior to the Courts Opinion the issues before the court where denied a related case of consolidation as to jurisdiction of related issues.

4. The Eleventh Circuit tolling panel of ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU Orders conflict with the law and U.S. Constitution have rendered several Controversial opinion and a Judgment that nullified previous judgments, with significance delay that has successfully prejudice the Applicants with Constitutional violations implications as the tolling issues which have been briefed on appeal currently being heard by several jurisdiction, making the Court's order not only an abuse of discretion with judicial overreach, but a violation of the Equal Protection Clause and the 14th amendment of Due Process but not limited to.


5. The Applicants requested to have the matters reheard under En Banc which was Denied as the matters are still tolling under the same panel ROSEMBAUM, LAGOA and ABUDU in "All" Applicants tolling Appeals. Unless extended, the deadline to file a petition for a writ of certiorari is November 24, 2025. This application is timely. See Sup. Ct. R. 30.2. And this Court's jurisdiction will be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

6. "For good cause, a Justice may extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari for a period not exceeding 60 days." Sup. Ct. R. 13.5. Additional time is necessary to allow Applicants to prepare and file a Two (2) Related but separate petitions on this exceptionally important and complex question of constitutional law. Applicants also have significant Applicants also have significant "Health" and "Legal Litigations" obligations during the period in which the petition would otherwise need to be prepared, including Nineteen (19) Reply Brief(s) on the Merits due on or before the 22nd of October 2025 and Three(3) Reply Petition due on or before 11th of November 2025 in Robert Walker v. Victoria Ruiz, Mercedes F, Kelly, Albertelli Law, Zachary Scott Foster et al., No. 25-12010(11th Cir.) and includes One

(1) of the party Respondents as Counsel for Mercedes F. Kelly in this matter. In addition, the Applicants have pending Tolling Brief Responses with several Party Respondents due on the 11th of November 2025 in, Walker v. Victoria Ruiz, Mercedes F, Kelly, Albertelli Law, Zachary Scott Foster etal., No. 25-15201; 25:10999;(USDCA 11th Circuit), Moreover, applicants are not aware of any party that would be prejudiced by a 47-day extension. Accordingly, good cause exists for this application, and applicants respectfully request a 47-day extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari, to and including December 3, 2025. Citing: *RES-GA Cobblestone, LLC v. Blake Construction and Development, LLC* , 718 F.3d 1308, 1314 (11th Cir. 2013) ("As a general rule, the filing of a notice of appeal divests district courts of jurisdiction over those aspects of the case that are the subject of the appeal."). As on the 1st of October 2025, the USDCA Eleventh(11th Circuit), filed an additional order in direct relations to matters under appeal that is under the jurisdiction of this Court by Application and Certification. *See Exhibit "E"*.

Dated: 22nd of September, 2025
Refiled 17th of October 2025

Respectfully submitted,



Mr. Robert Walker

s/s Robert Walker, all rights reserved
4001 SW Melbourne Street
Port Saint Lucie, FL 34953
(772)400-7544

Pro-Se Applicant

EXHIBIT "C"

2

Order of the Court

25-10521

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 2:24-cv-14222-KMM

No. 25-11213

ROBERT WALKER,
individually and on behalf of himself,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BRETT MICHAEL WARONICKI,
in his individual capacity,
JANET CARNEY CROOM,
in her individual capacity,
BARBARA W. BRONIS,
in her individual capacity,
HONORABLE JEFFREY T. KUNTZ,
in his individual capacity,
HONORABLE SPENCER D LEVINE,
in his individual capacity, et al.,

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 2:24-cv-14222-KMM

Before ROSENBAUM and ABUDU, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Appellant's motion for reconsideration of our June 18, 2025, order, as construed from his "Petition for Panel Rehearing and Petition for Rehearing *En Banc*," is DENIED.

Appellant's "Motion for Leave to Supplement the Record . . . or in the Alternative Motion to Vacate the Clerk[s] Notice of Deficiency . . . and Motion to Extend the Additional Briefing Date" are DENIED.

EXHIBIT "D"

25-10521

Order of the Court

3

D.C. Docket No. 2:24-cv-14222-KMM

No. 25-11213

ROBERT WALKER,
individually and on behalf of himself,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BRETT MICHAEL WARONICKI,
in his individual capacity,
JANET CARNEY CROOM,
in her individual capacity,
BARBARA W. BRONIS,
in her individual capacity,
HONORABLE JEFFREY T. KUNTZ,
in his individual capacity,
HONORABLE SPENCER D LEVINE,
in his individual capacity, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

4

Order of the Court

25-10521

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 2:24-cv-14353-KMM

ORDER:

Appellee the United States of America's "Motion to Consolidate Appeals," requesting that appeals 25-10521 and 25-10999 be consolidated, is GRANTED. Appeals 25-10521 and 25-10999 are hereby CONSOLIDATED as to briefing and merits review. Appellant's consolidated initial brief is due within sixty (60) days of the date of this Order. The consolidated initial brief will replace the brief docketed in 25-10521.

Appellant's motion to consolidate appeals 25-10521, 25-10999, and 25-11213 is DENIED IN PART as to appeal 25-11213 and is DENIED AS MOOT as to appeals 25-10521 and 25-10999. Appellant's initial brief in 25-11213 is due within sixty (60) days of the date of this Order.

/s/ Nancy G. Abudu
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

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