

No. _____

**Robert Joyce,
Petitioner,**

v.

**Consolidated Edison Company of New York Inc.,
Respondent,**

Petitioner's Application for an Extension of Time

**Robert Joyce
547 Westfield Drive
Valley Cottage, New York, 10989
917 576-9289
rj41926@gmail.com**

Robert Joyce
v. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
USAP2 No: 24-931
No: 25-5359

Petitioner's application for an extension of time

Petitioner Robert Joyce's motion for leave to proceed in *forma pauperis* was denied by the Court on October 14, 2025, and is attached hereto. The Court allowed Petitioner until November 4, 2025, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance within Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

Petitioner then proceeded to submit an application for an extension of time in order to comply with the Court's October 14, 2025, order. Petitioner's application for an extension of time was postmarked on November 3, 2025, and received on November 12, 2025.

Petitioner's application for an extension of time was returned unfiled because the application did not specify the amount of additional time Petitioner required in order to submit a petition that would comply with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court (attached hereto).

Petitioner requests an additional 60 days from whatever date the Court deems acceptable and appropriate in order for Petitioner to comply with Rule 33.1. An extension of time is needed by the Petitioner because it is timely and expensive for the petition and appendix, and the 40 copies of each, to comply with the requirements of Rule 33.1.

Furthermore, my wife was involved in a severe automobile accident on October 20, 2025, which required surgery to treat her injuries while being hospitalized for 11 days and it has been the sole responsibility of Petitioner to run the household and take care of the children.

The Petitioner has never asked for an extension of time to file a document and an extension of time would cause no harm to Consolidated Edison who is the respondent in this case.

Petitioner pleads to the Court that his petition for writ of certiorari can not be considered malicious because Petitioner was simply trying to survive a motion to dismiss and the questions Petitioner presented would resolve the issue of why the lower courts never acknowledged or addressed the credible allegations of Con Edison engaging in fraud to deprive Petitioner of his employment.

Petitioner also believes that the petition can not be considered frivolous because his employment, his livelihood, were taken from him due to the illegal and fraudulent behavior committed by the defendant.

Thank you.

Robert Joyce
 November 25, 2025
547 Westfield Drive
Valley Cottage, N.Y., 10989
rj41926@gmail.com
(917) 576-9289

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

November 12, 2025

Robert Joyce
547 Westfield Drive
Valley Cottage, NY 10989

RE: Joyce v. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
USAP2 No. 24-931
No: 25-5359

Dear Mr. Joyce:

The application for an extension of time to comply with the Court's October 14, 2025 order was postmarked on November 3, 2025 and received on November 12, 2025. The application is returned unfiled for the following reason(s):

The application must specify the amount of additional time requested.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:

Emily Walker
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

October 14, 2025

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

Mr. Robert Joyce
547 Westfield Drive
Valley Cottage, NY 10989


Re: Robert Joyce
v. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
No. 25-5359

Dear Mr. Joyce:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until November 4, 2025, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott S. Harris", written in a cursive style.

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

**Robert Joyce,
Petitioner,**

v.

**Consolidated Edison Company of New York,
Respondent,**

I, Robert Joyce, do swear and declare that on November, 25, 2025, a copy of Petitioner's application for an extension of time was sent to Consolidated Edison the respondent in this proceeding. A copy was mailed to Consolidated Edison's lawyer.

Paul Limmiatis
4 Irving Place, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10003

Robert Joyce
 11/25/2025
547 Westfield Drive
Valley Cottage, N.Y., 10989
rj41926@gmail.com
(917) 576-9289

