

App No. _____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

Ryan P. Givey,
Applicant

v.

Alicia A. Givey,
Respondent

On Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of
Certiorari to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court



10M12280233

United States Supreme Court

Recipient:

Clerks Office

Sender:

Leroy anton weaver

Processed:

1/16/2026 11:52:55 AM | 267



Ryan P. Givey, APPLICANT
610.348.5720
Rpg2609@aol.com
428 Hannum Ave.,
West Chester, Pa 19380

Date: January 15, 2026



To the Honorable Samuel Alito, as Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, including Appeals from the Pennsylvania Supreme Court for Pennsylvania Supreme Court Case No. 362 MAL 2025:

In accordance with this Court's rules 13.5, Applicant Ryan Givey respectfully requests that the time to file his petition for a writ of certiorari be extended for 60 days, up to and including April 3, 2026. The Supreme Court of the United States denied APPLICANT permission to file In Forma Pauperis and gave APPLICANT until February 2, 2026 to pay the docketing fee and file his petition in booklet format. Absent an extension of time, the petition would be due on February 2, 2026. The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a). APPLICANT contacted the Attorney RESPONDENT claims is representing her in this case and did not receive a reply.

BACKGROUND

This case was initiated by Respondent solely based on the fact that Applicant filed a court case (US Supreme Court, Givey v DOJ, 23-7063) claiming he is an attacked whistleblower and demanding Biden's DOJ to take a criminal complaint, which they refused to do. The trial court only has emergency jurisdiction to issue an emergency custody order in the event of abuse, mistreatment or an imminent threat of physical harm to the children. With no allegations of abuse or mistreatment, Respondent simply testified, "If he keeps filing these cases, that makes me very wary that he is going to have another psychotic break.", falsely claiming that

APPLICANT had a psychotic break 11 years ago, while APPLICANT maintains that he was illegally drugged that night and wants a criminal investigation into the events that occurred. In an order that clearly violated Pennsylvania Law and the United States Constitution, the trial court removed Applicant's custody rights and ordered him to undergo a psychological evaluation, with a doctor chosen by RESPONDENT.

Citizens have a constitutional right under the First Amendment of the United States constitution to raise their children and a right to free speech. There is no law in Pennsylvania or legal precedent in any court that supports the trial judge's order to remove APPLICANT'S custody rights and order APPLICANT to undergo a psychological evaluation.

The questions at hand are of national importance, because it would allow courts to remove the custody rights of parents for any fabricated reason brought before the court, for events that have not actually happened, contrary to existing Pennsylvania law and legal precedent and the United States Constitution. This case also has important implications concerning the psychologist/ psychiatrist patient privilege and the authority of courts to order parents to undergo psychological evaluations.

COMPLICATIONS ENCOUNTERED WITH THIS CASE

DECEMBER 11, 2024

The Supreme Court of the United States denied APPLICANT and his family

witness protection on June 17, 2024.

After Trump won the presidential election in November 2024 APPLICANT stated he will be refiling his federal lawsuits demanding the DOJ take a criminal complaint once Trump takes office. Then on December 11, 2025 RESPONDENT filed an emergency petition for special relief requesting emergency custody of their children. RESPONDENT was denied emergency custody at that time and requested a two-hour emergency hearing that was scheduled on Jan. 28, 2025 in courtroom 14, before Judge Analisa Sondergaard (APPENDIX A). This was done at 3:50 pm according to the time stamp.

Sometime between 3:50 pm and 4:30 pm on Dec. 11, 2025 the Court transferred the case to Judge Allison Bell Royer and rescheduled the case in Courtroom 7 on Jan. 3, 2025 at 9:30 am for a full day hearing (APPENDIX B). A scheduling conflict would not change the judge or change a two-hour hearing to a full day hearing, where RESPONDENT testified all morning and PETITIONER testified and was cross-examined in the afternoon. A typical emergency custody hearing only lasts 30-60 minutes. If the judges were switched to alter the conditions of the hearing or influence the outcome of the hearing, it would be a federal crime.

So, on Dec. 11, 2024 RESPONDENT filed an emergency custody petition that was denied, court staff then improperly transferred judges on the case, changed it from a 2-hour hearing to a full day hearing and rescheduled the hearing from January 28, 2025 to January 3, 2025, before Trump took office.

~~RESPONDENT'S PETITION~~ ~~JUDGE ROYER'S CONFLICT OF INTEREST~~ ~~INTEREST GROUP~~

APPLICANT was threatened before the hearing on Jan. 3, 2025 that if he did not commit perjury and testify that he is mentally ill and no longer believes in the criminal allegations then he would never see his children again.

Tom Hogan was Chester County District Attorney from 2012-2020. Tom Hogan as Chester County District Attorney is Judge Royer's political ally and endorsed her campaign for Chester County judge (APPENDIX C) so the switching of judges in the case was not harmless.

Judge Royer stated that she read APPLICANT's response to RESPONDENT's Petition for Special relief, including his allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan's District Attorney's office (Jan. 3, 2025, Transcripts p. 3).

During the hearing on January 3, 2025, Judge Royer overruled APPLICANT's objections and ordered him to testify about the details of his criminal complaints. It is worth noting that if APPLICANT is compelled to testify about his criminal complaints or reveal that information during a psychological evaluation that is made public, the information could endanger more witnesses and lead to more evidence being destroyed.

APPLICANT has filed state and federal lawsuits claiming to be an attacked whistleblower who local, county, state and federal law enforcement has refused to take a criminal complaint from for over a decade and demanding a criminal investigation. The Chester County District Attorney's office refused to take a

APPLICANT from 2012-2020. Tom Hogan was the

Chester County District Attorney from 2012-2020, years in which the District

Attorney's office refused to take a criminal complaint from APPLICANT. During the emergency hearing on Jan. 3, 2025, RESPONDENT's lawyer had RESPONDENT read out loud APPLICANT's allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan's office during direct testimony (Transcripts, Jan. 3, 2025, p. 26-27)

Judge Royer's relationship with Tom Hogan would have led her to have a preconceived opinion about Tom Hogan and his District Attorney's office, which creates a clear bias concerning APPLICANT's allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan's office. Judge Royer failed to disclose her relationship with Tom Hogan at the emergency hearing, which presents a clear conflict of interest.

Despite the evidence presented to the contrary, Judge Royer dismissed APPLICANT's allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan's District Attorney's office and called his allegations "delusions" and a "conspiracy theory", suspended his custody rights to his children and ordered APPLICANT to undergo a psychological evaluation. Judge Royer specifically ordered APPLICANT, in her May 15, 2025 order (APPENDIX D), to provide Dr. Gransee, a doctor chosen by RESPONDENT to perform a psychological evaluation, with copies of Exhibits M-3 and M-4, which is his lawsuit (US Supreme Court, Givey v DOJ, 23-7063) to have Dr. Gransee assess APPLICANT's allegations, including allegations of misconduct concerning Tom Hogan's office. Judge Royer wishes to make Dr. Gransee's report public stating an "independent medical examiner will not be subject to the confidentiality

with Father." (153 EDA 2025, Opinion Sur Rule 1925 (a), p.51).

With no history or allegations of violence against APPLICANT, Judge Royer was presented with two doctor notes stating APPLICANT was not a danger to himself or others and able to care for his children but Judge Royer responded, “we did consider them; we simply found that they did not answer the question as to whether either provider was aware of Father’s conspiracy theories.” (Opinion Sur Rule 1925 (a), p.52). So, in an emergency hearing that requires proof of abuse or mistreatment of the children for the Court to have emergency jurisdiction, according to her own words, the main concern of Judge Royer was ordering a psychological evaluation to have a doctor chosen by RESPONDENT evaluate APPLICANT’s conspiracy theories or rather his allegations of misconduct against her political ally, Tom Hogan’s District Attorney’s Office, and potentially have him diagnose APPLICANT and then make that report public.

Pursuant 207 Pa. Code § 15-4 “A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge’s impartiality might be questioned”.

Judge Royer’s relationship with Tom Hogan presented a clear conflict of interest in this case that deprived APPLICANT of an impartial tribunal.

EVIDENCE OF MISCONDUCT AT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE

APPLICANT presented evidence to Judge Royer in his Response to RESPONDENT’s Petition for Special Relief to support his allegations of misconduct, including allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan’s District Attorney’s office.

on or about 2010 through 2012 APPLICANT received around a dozen violation

letters and multiple citations for alleged trash violations (APPENDIX E, APPENDIX F), allegedly committed by APPLICANT's tenants, that did not comply with Pennsylvania's nuisance laws and none of the violations or citations were substantiated in Court. The officer falsely alleged sending a violation letter. A landlord cannot legally be charged with a crime committed by their tenants but the Borough was using these violations to add points to a landlord's rental license that can be used to revoke the building's rental license.

The code enforcement officer was even opening APPLICANT's tenants' trash cans and inspecting the garbage inside the trash bags to look for violations. APPLICANT followed a code enforcement officer on several occasions during her morning enforcement schedule to discover she was targeting specific properties with enforcement actions while ignoring the same conditions at other properties and even appeared to have a list of properties she was targeting.

A code enforcement officer then alleged APPLICANT's property violated fire code regulations (APPENDIX G) (which could result immediate revocation of a rental license and possible incarceration for non-compliance) and demanded APPLICANT install an alarm system, hard-wired and interconnected through the walls, requiring each alarm to also be hard-wired to an electrical outlet and in retaliation for APPLICANT appealing to the Mayor, Borough Manager and his Supervisor over the illegal enforcement actions taken against him, the officer sent

addition, APPLICANT claims of code violations, where APPLICANT submit an NFPA test that requires the alarm system to be connected and monitored by an

alarm company 24 hours a day (APPENDIX H) and cited a section of the International Fire Code pertaining to new construction not existing 100 year-old single family homes.

APPLICANT was clearly being targeted since the home had been a rental property for years and always previously passed rental inspections. The Borough code and International Fire Code pertain to all properties in the Borough, not just rental properties and the Borough did not provide notices to every home owner in the Borough demanding they install a similar fire alarm system.

APPLICANT did have a Fire Alarm company service his two apartment buildings and the owner of the company argued with the Borough on APPLICANT's behalf and after a lengthy argument over several days the Borough withdrew all of the fire code requirements stated in their violation letters.

The owner of the fire alarm company told APPLICANT that the Borough then threatened his business if he ever helped APPLICANT again and he deleted his email account, where he had argued back and forth with the Borough.

APPLICANT owned two multi-unit apartment buildings and heard of two occasions where the Borough revoked a multi-family property's rental license and then rezoned the building as a single-family dwelling (greatly diminishing the value of the property). In another instance APPLICANT heard of, the Borough levied \$70,000 in fines against a property owner and the government officials appeared in

contact with a friend who agreed to pay the fine in exchange for the title of property and being transferred into his name. APPLICANT had evidence that a Borough Code

Enforcement officer presented false and misleading testimony during his trial and the Borough had the court reporter change the court transcripts of a trial.

APPLICANT reported the Borough officials to the Pa Department of Labor and Industry who licenses fire inspectors with the State, since enforcement officers cannot enforce fire codes in the state without a license. After being told by the intake officer that if this conduct was substantiated it would result in the revocation of their state licenses, then The Pa Department of Labor and Industry refused to investigate (APPENDIX I).

The local police, county district attorney and State Attorney General repeatedly refused to take a criminal complaint from APPLICANT. On October 31, 2012 Tom Hogan's Chief of Staff intervened when a Chester County detective requested a detective to be assigned to APPLICANT's case to investigate potential crimes and refused to assign a detective claiming no criminal laws were violated (APPENDIX J). The bar association would hang up on APPLICANT refusing to refer a lawyer and the law firms he contacted were not interested in supporting a lawsuit because they were all making money defending against these citations.

JANUARY 9, 2025

On January 9, 2025 APPLICANT entered the Chester County Courthouse and was detained by court security on false allegations. As APPLICANT stood quiet and calm, the security repeatedly screamed into his walkie "Calm down sir! I'm asking

you to calm down!" A cop from the sheriff's department came and claimed that there was a complaint from the court reporter's office in APPLICANT's name and

that APPLICANT had created a disturbance and was demanding transcripts at the court reporter's office.

After APPLICANT was released he emailed Rachel Rodkey, the secretary from the court reporter's office, who replied that she spoke with the corporal and stated APPLICANT was polite and respectful and told him that she is unaware of any complaint originating from the court reporter's office (APPENDIX K). She said the corporal then claimed that the complaint originated from somewhere else. The following day APPLICANT had to return to the courthouse and spoke to the corporal who then claimed it was a misunderstanding and that APPLICANT should not have been detained.

JANUARY 13, 2025

Four days later on January 13, 2025, the trial judge's Law Clerk emailed APPLICANT's attorney stating "Your client, [APPLICANT], filed the attached pro se Notice of Appeal last Thursday, 1/9/25. Would you please advise the Court as to whether you will be prosecuting this appeal for him. I don't see that he has filed a notice of self-representation." (APPENDIX L) This prompted APPLICANT's attorney, who had represented him for ten years, to demand that he sign a pro se agreement and submit it to the Chester County Court. APPLICANT then hired another attorney and paid her over seven thousand dollars and then she demanded he sign a pro se agreement. When APPLICANT refused to sign the pro se

agreement, he filed a Notice to Withdrawal as his attorney. APPLICANT confirmed with the Superior Court prothonotary that he can represent himself in his appeal

and continue to have an attorney of record in his Chester County custody case and signing the pro se agreement would leave APPLICANT without legal representation in his Chester County custody case.

1318 EDA 2025, APPEAL IN PA SUPERIOR COURT

According to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's Rules governing per curiam decisions "5. A per curiam order shall indicate if a Justice did not participate in the consideration or decision of the matter."¹ After Judge Royer made the claim that her orders are unappealable, contrary to all legal precedent cited, the Superior Court Order 1318 EDA 2025 (APPENDIX M) also claimed that Judge Royer's orders are not appealable in an illegal, Sua Sponte, anonymous, per curiam ruling, that violated the Pa Supreme Court's rules governing per curiam rulings by not identifying which justices did not participate in the decision and the order was also not signed or attested to by the prothonotary, which is required for a valid court order.

DIFFICULTY OBTAINING LEGAL COUNSEL

Sidney Powell is a lawyer who is admitted to practice at the US Supreme Court and wrote a book where she claims to have exposed corruption at the Department of Justice. When APPLICANT calls her phone number listed on her law firm's website and the Texas State Bar website it says that her number is disconnected. An error appears when APPLICANT attempts to complete the form on her website to request

¹ <https://www.pacourts.us/Storage/media/pdfs/20221215/200130-supremeiopupdate1222.pdf>

hired a process server to deliver his petition and request for services. The process server claimed that Sidney Powell does not have an office located at the address listed on her website. The process server also claimed that Sidney Powell did not have office located at the address listed on the Texas State Bar website but said that Sidney Powell has a mailbox there that she checks about once a month. The process server left the request for services with the mail clerk at the mail room. The following day Applicant receives a fake email from a proton mail account from someone claiming to be Sidney Powell's executive assistant and declining services. (APPENDIX N) Sidney Powell's law firm uses the @federalappeals.com domain for emails and not a proton mail domain. This email was clearly fake.

RESPONDENT'S LEGAL REPRESENTATION

On December 10, 2025 PETITIONER requested RESPONDENT to notify him of the attorney representing her, who is representing her for her response to APPLICANT's petition for writ of certiorari before the United States Supreme Court (APPENDIX O). From Attorney McDonald's website it does not appear she is admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. APPLICANT emailed Attorney McDonald to get clarification if she is representing RESPONDENT before the Supreme Court of the United States and did not receive a reply.

PRINTING THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI

APPLICANT's mail has been interfered with for years and he fears that an effort will be made to prevent APPLICANT from printing his Petition for Writ of Certiorari and having the Petition delivered to the Supreme Court of the United States.

REASONS FOR GRANTING AN EXTENTION OF TIME

Due to circumstances outside of APPLICANT's control such as the printing and delivery of the Petition of Writ of Certiorari and due to the interference Applicant has encountered in this case, Applicant requests additional time to complete the printing and delivery of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests that the time to file a writ of certiorari in the above-captioned matter be extended 60 days up to and including April 3, 2026.

Respectfully Submitted,



Ryan P. Givey, APPLICANT
610.348.5720
Rpg2609@aol.com
428 Hannum Ave.,
West Chester, Pa 19380

Date: 1/15/26

No. 25-6035

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Ryan P. Givey,
Petitioner

v.


Alicia A. Givey,
Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I mailed a copy, through United States Post Office certified mail, of the Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of Certiorari on the counsel identified below, pursuant Rules of this Court. All parties required to be served have been served.

Shannon McDonald,
Attorney for Alicia A. Givey

18 W. Market St.
West Chester, Pa 19382



Ryan P. Givey
610-348-5720
428 Hannum Ave.
West Chester, Pa 19380
rpg2609@aol.com

1/15/26
Date

Certified Mail Tracking No:

9589 0710 5270 1889 0311 75

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