

App No. _____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

ROBYN ABRAHAM

Applicant,

v.

ABBY LEIGH, AS EXECUTRIX OF MITCH LEIGH ESTATE, ET AL.

Respondents.

UNOPPOSED APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
to File Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court
of Appeals for Second Circuit

Robyn (aka 'Robin') Abraham, Esq.
Attorney Pro Se
Florida, New York, DC Attorney
Counsel of Record
9440 Santa Monica
Blvd. Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Tel: (310) 887-1400
Email: robyna@hbglobal.tv
raa8@georgetown.edu

Counsel for Applicant

January 28, 2026

Corporate Disclosure Statement

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, Applicant Robyn Abraham states that she is an individual, and has no parent corporation and that no publicly held company owns 10% or more of Applicant's corporate business stock.

UNOPPOSED APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

To the Honorable Clarence Thomas, as Associate Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

In accordance with this Court's Rules 13.5, 22, 30.2, and 30.3, Applicant Robyn Abraham respectfully requests that the time to file her petition for a writ of certiorari be extended for 60 days, up to and including Monday April 13, 2026. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals issued its opinion on May 14, 2025 (Exhibit A) and Denied Rehearing en Bane on November 12, 2025 (Exhibit B). Absent an extension of time, the petition would be due on February 10, 2026. The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. 1254(1). This Application is Unopposed.

Background

This Arnold and Porter filed \$250Million international breach of contract case in which Two (2) of the Three (3) multimillionaire serial Defendants settled in Applicant's favor presents an important HOBBS ACT question on the issue of whether a Democrat Appointed New York Federal Court Judge may Target a Republican litigant and Order the Republican Litigant's Partial Settlement Funds Paid to Democrat Washington DC Lobbyist Wiss Partners ("Wiss"); a Democrat Washington DC Political Lobbyist which acted as Lobbyist for and met with the New York Court as

US Democrat Lobbyist for Respondent, Defendants and Opposing Counsel in this case. Wiss Never Represented Applicant Nor Was Retained as Applicant's Attorney. Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Never Applied for Admission to the Case. Wiss Never was Admitted to the Case.

As reflected by court record in this case, while Committing Perjury that Wiss was Applicant's Attorney and Fraudulently Demanding Applicant's Partial Settlement Funds in This Case in which Wiss Never Was Admitted To the Cases, and with Applicant Present in the Court's Chambers, Democrat Lobbyist Wiss also Separately Met with the Court on behalf of Washington DC Lobbyist Wiss Partners' Client Venezuela Dictator Nicolas Maduro.

Without filing for admission to the above referenced New York Federal Cases, at all material times hereto, Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Lobbied the Court on behalf of Respondent and Lobbied the Court on behalf of Defendants and Lobbied the Court on behalf of Opposing Counsel. Democrat Lobbyist Wiss also Lobbied the Court on behalf of Venezuela Dictator Maduro in unrelated NYSD Maduro PDVSA cases.

Following a series of the Court's ex parte communications with DC Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners and Opposing Counsel on behalf of Multimillionaire Respondent and Multimillionaire Defendants in this Case, and separately with the Court on behalf of DC Democrat Lobbyist Wiss

Partners' reported \$6Million unrelated Lobbying Representation of Venezuela Dictator Maduro and Dictator Maduro's PDVSA interests, Wiss Partners repeatedly engaged in ex parte communications with the Court. The Court Sealed, Struck and Deleted More than 3, 000 pages of Wiss Partners' ex parte communications and resulting Sealed Court Orders issued on behalf of Wiss Partners, Respondent and Defendants. The Court Deleted, Sealed and Struck ALL Applicant's fully favorable London Schillings and Arnold and Porter conducted depositions and discovery.

Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners, upon Wiss physically ambushing Applicant in Open New York Federal Court on October 7, 2019, while fraudulently claiming to be Applicant's attorney for the express purpose of Demanding Applicant's Settlement Funds, Wiss Represented Respondent, Defendants and Opposing Counsel Without filing for Admission to the Case, Without Being Admitted to the case, Without possessing any client signed Retainer Agreement and Without being listed on the applicable New York Federal Court Dockets.

This case also presents the important HOBBS Act issues of whether a Democrat Appointed New York Federal Court Judge may Target a Republican litigant and in addition to Ordering the Republican Litigant's Partial Settlement Funds Paid to Democrat Washington DC Lobbyist Wiss Partners ("Wiss") which Democrat Lobbyist Firm Never Was Admitted to

the Case, May Issue and Cause to Be Issued Wiss Partners’ Threatened and Facilitated Series of Factually and Legally Devoid LAWFARE Orders Threatened and Issued in Retaliation of Republican Applicant’s Refusal to Continue Paying Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners’ documented blackmail and extortion.

The Court record reflects that while the Court repeatedly received written, docketed and court record notice that Wiss Never was Admitted to the Case and Wiss Never Represented Applicant and Wiss Never Was Authorized to Represent Applicant, the Court authorized and condoned Democrat Lobbyist Wiss’s legal representation of Respondent’s, Opposing Counsels’ and Defendants’ interests and facilitated Wiss’s escalating threats and Retaliation against Applicant and her Mother Joyce Abraham which retaliation directly resulted from Applicant’s refusal to continue paying Wiss Partners’ documented blackmail and larceny by extortion.

As reflected in court records below, on behalf of Respondent, the Defendants and Opposing Counsel, Dictator Maduro’s Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners, after physically ambushing Applicant in open Court, committing perjury and extorting Applicant’s Partial Settlement Funds, Wiss demanded additional “Protection” aka “Peace” Monies from Beverly Hills California based business executive Applicant and threatened Applicant and her Mother, that unless Applicant continued to pay Wiss

Partners' extortionary 'Peace Money', as the result of Democrat Lobbyist Wiss's 'Special Relationship' with the New York courts, Wiss would facilitate all retaliatory court orders on behalf of Respondent, Defendants and Opposing Counsel in this case and in other unrelated cases against Applicant and Applicant's Mother 'to Destroy, Bankrupt and Leave Homeless Applicant and her Mother Joyce Abraham, personally, physically, professionally and financially regardless of facts and law'.

Pursuant to Wiss Partners' and Opposing Counsels' New York retaliatory threats against Applicant and Applicant's American Mother Joyce Olshen Abraham, exactly one day after Applicant temporarily left her Mother's Florida home on December 19, 2022, American citizen Joyce Olshen Abraham was SWATTED/kidnapped from her Florida home, involuntarily hospitalized, drugged, intentionally denied her necessary diabetes and other lifesaving medications and DNR Executed resulting in Opposing Counsels' and Wiss Partners' threatened and facilitated premeditated felony murder of Applicant's Mother Joyce Abraham.

Additionally and pursuant to Wiss Partners' and Opposing Counsels' retaliatory threats against Applicant for successfully closing this \$250 Million business transaction and refusal to dismiss this case and Applicant's refusal to continue paying Wiss Partners' documented extortion, pursuant to more than 3, 000 pages of ex parte communications between and among the

Court, Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners and Opposing Counsel, the Court also issued Wiss Partners' Series of Retaliatory Orders threatened by Wiss Partners and facilitated national Court Orders against Applicant, including calling and emailing a California Superior Court Judge in an unrelated California real estate case to facilitate Applicant's unrelated California eviction from her Beverly Hills fully paid approximate 10 year rental, ordering the Washington DC Bar Grievance Dismissal of Applicant's Fully Documented Bar Grievance against Marcia Wiss for blackmail and extortion and recommending Bar Complaints against Applicant's Flawless Bar Records. The Court also issued the series of retaliatory factually and legally devoid Court Orders threatened and facilitated by Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners on behalf of Respondent and her Counsel Against Applicant.

Per Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners' and Opposing Counsels' retaliatory threats on behalf of Respondent and Defendants in this case, contrary to law and facts, After the Court Sealed, Struck and Deleted More Than 3, 000 pages of Applicant's Fully Favorable Arnold and Porter and Schillings London Law Firm Evidence that Applicant Successfully Closed this \$250Million International Business Transaction, the Court Issued All Orders Against Applicant and in Favor of Respondent.

Applicant's Fully Favorable Arnold and Porter Filed \$250M Case

On behalf of highly accomplished studio trained Applicant Robyn Abraham, Arnold and Porter filed this \$250Million international breach of contract case against Respondent and serial multimillionaire Defendants following Applicant's successful structuring, negotiating and closing of Applicant's, Respondent's and Serial Defendants' Exclusive Contract of the British and proposed Broadway revival of the Tony Award winning Broadway and West End musical, "Man of La Mancha".

In her capacity as a highly accomplished Disney trained business executive (JD/MBA) with stellar track record of repeatedly and successfully closing multimillion dollar entertainment and media transactions, Applicant successfully negotiated, structured and closed this Exclusive Business Transaction for the London West End and Proposed Broadway Revival of the "Man of La Mancha" musical of which Majority Rights Holder Respondent Exclusively Contracted Applicant's Professional Business Services. Applicant Never Was Engaged as Respondent's Nor Defendants' Attorney. There was No American legal work in this British business matter.

Respondent and Defendants, while enjoying the benefits of Applicant's stellar British commercial work product without complying

with the Terms of the Exclusive Contract and while intentionally stiffing Applicant and refusing to compensate her for British professional services rendered pursuant to Exclusive Contract, Respondent and Defendants, in furtherance of their documented US and international practice of soliciting professional services and then stiffing and suing contract providers, Respondent and Defendants breached and stiffed Applicant. Respondent countersued Applicant for successfully closing this \$250Million Exclusive ‘Man of La Mancha’ Contract while falsely claiming without evidence that Applicant was Respondent’s legal counsel.

New York court record confirms that Two (2) of the Three (3) Serial Defendants Settled in Favor of Applicant. Former Defendant Alan Honig provided a Filed and Docketed Declaration that Respondent Committed Fraud against Applicant in this Case by Contracting the Same “Man of La Mancha” Rights to Another Business Executive without Notice to Applicant. Respondent also filed a frivolous counterclaim against Applicant falsely alleging that Applicant was Respondent’s attorney ‘breached her fiduciary duty’ against Respondent by successfully closing this \$250Million transaction in which Applicant Never Acted as Respondent’s attorney and There Was No American legal work. The British Business Work was Represented by Applicant’s British Elite London Schillings Law Firm.

In furtherance of these HOBBS Act New York and Florida cases,

Respondent, Defendants and Opposing Counsel enlisted Venezuela Dictator Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners and several New York and Florida “Trojan Horse” attorneys¹ who threatened and filed retaliatory, false and frivolous lawsuits against Applicant and her Mother Joyce Olshan Abraham. Respondent, Defendants and Opposing Counsel also threatened and filed a series of false and retaliatory Bar Complaints against Applicant’s flawless Bar Records in every jurisdiction.

Reasons for Granting an Extension of Time

Respondent, Respondent’s and Venezuela Dictator’s Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners and Respondent’s Attorneys have threatened and filed and/or caused to be filed Ten (10) of now Twenty-Two (22) Unprovoked Factually Devoid Scorched Earth Retaliatory False Frivolous SLAPP LAWFARE cases against Applicant and Applicant’s Late Mother Joyce Olshan Abraham in New York and in Florida.

Respondent, Respondent’s and Venezuela Dictator’s Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners and Respondent’s Attorneys including Trojan Horse foreign national attorney Colleen Kerwick aka Colleen NiChairmhaic (“Kerwick”), the latter of whom admittedly Targeted Appellant on behalf of Respondent and Defendants - threatened and filed and/or caused to be filed

¹ Trojan Horse attorneys are attorneys who Target a Litigant on behalf of Opposing Counsel, file a Notice of Appearance to purportedly represent the Target and instead file pleadings on behalf of Opposing Counsel and Against the Target with the specific purpose of Sabotaging the Target’s case. In Florida, ‘Trojan Horse Attorneys’ are conservatively estimated to be a multimillion dollar unregulated industry.

Five (5) False and Retaliatory New York, Florida and Washington DC Bar Complaints against Applicant’s Flawless Bar Records in New York, Florida and Washington DC.

Respondent, Democrat Lobbyist Wiss Partners and their Akerman and Cozen O’Conner counsel, including serial predatory Trojan Horse attorney and foreign national Colleen Kerwick aka Colleen NiChairmhaic (“Kerwick”) who admittedly Targeted Applicant on Respondent and Defendants’ behalf Vowed to ‘Sue Applicant and Her Mother Joyce Abraham into Bankruptcy, Homelessness and Death’. Applicant had no prior knowledge of, nor relationship with serial foreign national attorney predator Colleen Kerwick Ni Chairmhaic.

On behalf of Respondent, Respondent’s counsel and Respondent’s Wiss Partners’ lobbyist who threatened Applicant’s Mother, Wiss and Kerwick threatened to file and facilitated the filing of Two New York LAWFARE cases, including *Abraham v Eliashiv* (New York Superior Court Case 654070/2022) a New York case fraudulently filed in Applicant’s name without authorization by Kerwick’s criminal accomplice, serially New York Bar grieved attorney Joshua Douglass.

Pursuant to and in furtherance of Respondent’s, Wiss Partners’ and Opposing Counsels’ threats to ‘Sue Applicant and Her Mother Into Bankruptcy, Homelessness and Death’, on behalf of Respondent,

Respondent's Lobbyist Wiss Partners and Counsel, Florida attorney Scott A. Weiss, facilitated the Broward Florida court appointment of his Temporary Guardianship client Monarch Care to Intentionally Deny Applicant's Mother necessary medications and facilitate the DNR execution of Applicant's Mother while Stealing Mother's New Car and Assets.

Florida court record reflects that Respondent's Florida counsel Scott Weiss facilitated the theft of Applicant's Mother's New BMW and engineered the Looting of \$1Million of Mother Joyce Abraham's and Applicant's monies, jewelry, art, antiques and valuables After facilitating involuntary medication deprivation and drugging of Applicant's Mother.

Pursuant to Respondent's and Defendants' counsels' threats in New York, Monarch Care, Scott Weiss and their criminal accomplices facilitated the Florida DNR execution of Applicant's Mother Joyce Abraham. Pursuant to the New York/Florida engineered DNR Order, Applicant's American Mother Joyce Olshen Abraham Died on February 27, 2023.

In furtherance of this interstate HOBBS Act criminal enterprise, as threatened in New York by Wiss Partners and Kerwick on behalf of Respondent, Defendants and Defendants' counsel, Florida estate trafficking attorney Scott Weiss representing Wiss, Kerwick and Florida accomplices while Never retained as Applicant's counsel, filed a SLAPP frivolous lawsuit against Applicant for legal fees related to Weiss' and accomplices'

facilitation of Wiss Partners' New York threatened DNR execution of Applicant's Mother; See **Weiss v. Abraham**, Florida 4DCA 2025-1962.

In addition to the above unprovoked SLAPP LAWFARE cases related to Wiss Partners'/Kerwick's and Opposing Counsels' threatened and facilitated premeditated felony murder of Applicant's Mother Joyce Abraham and looting of \$1Million of Mother's and Applicant's monies, jewelry, art, antiques and family heirlooms from their Broward Florida home, Applicant presently is litigating several Florida cases related to her Mother's SWATTED Kidnapping and Premeditated Felony Murder.

The Following are the Presently Litigated Florida Case Numbers Resulting from Respondent's, Respondent's and Defendants' Counsel's threats against Applicant and Applicant's SWATTED and DNR executed American Mother Joyce Olshen Abraham:

1. Florida Supreme Court Case **Abraham v. Monarch Care**, et. SC 2025-0761;
2. **Scott Weiss v. Robin Abraham**; Florida 4D 2025-1962;
3. **In re: Estate of Joyce Abraham**; PRC 23 4490;
4. **In re: Temporary Guardianship of Joyce Olshen Abraham**; PRC22-6555;
5. **In re: Joyce Olshen Abraham**; 22 MHC-4307;
6. **In re: Joyce Abraham related Domestic Violence**; 22DR0008999

Conclusion

Applicant requests that the time to file a writ of certiorari in the above-captioned matter be extended 60 days to and including April 13, 2026.

Dated this 28th day of January 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ R. Abraham, Esq.
Florida, New York and DC Attorney
Attorney Pro Se
9440 Santa Monica Blvd.
Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Business Office: 310.887.1400
Email: robyna@hbglobal.tv
raa8@georgetown.edu

Counsel for Applicant

EXHIBIT A

23-7779 (L)
Abraham v. Leigh

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

SUMMARY ORDER

RULINGS BY SUMMARY ORDER DO NOT HAVE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT. CITATION TO A SUMMARY ORDER FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2007, IS PERMITTED AND IS GOVERNED BY FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 32.1 AND THIS COURT'S LOCAL RULE 32.1.1. WHEN CITING A SUMMARY ORDER IN A DOCUMENT FILED WITH THIS COURT, A PARTY MUST CITE EITHER THE FEDERAL APPENDIX OR AN ELECTRONIC DATABASE (WITH THE NOTATION "SUMMARY ORDER"). A PARTY CITING A SUMMARY ORDER MUST SERVE A COPY OF IT ON ANY PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 27th day of May, two thousand twenty-five.

PRESENT:

ROBERT D. SACK,
RICHARD C. WESLEY,
BETH ROBINSON,
Circuit Judges.

Robyn Abraham,

*Plaintiff-Counter Defendant-Appellant-
Counter Cross-Appellee,*

v.

23-7779 (L);
23-7867 (XAP)

Abby Leigh, as Executrix of the Estate of
Mitch Leigh,

*Defendant-Counter Plaintiff-Appellee-
Counter Cross-Appellant,*

Abby Leigh in her individual capacity,
Abby Leigh Ltd., The Viola Fund,
Martha Wasserman, in her individual
capacity and as Executrix of the Estate of
Dale Wasserman, Hellen Darion, in her
individual capacity and as Executrix of
the Estate of Joseph Darion, and Alan
Honig.

Defendants.

FOR PLAINTIFF-COUNTER DEFENDANT-
APPELLANT-COUNTER CROSS-APPELLEE:

Robyn Abraham, pro se,
Beverly Hills, CA.

FOR DEFENDANT-COUNTER PLAINTIFF-
APPELLEE-COUNTER CROSS-APPELLANT:

Tamar S. Wise, Cozen
O'Connor, New York,
NY; H. Robert Fiebach,
Cozen O'Connor,
Philadelphia, PA.

Appeal from a judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern
District of New York (Katherine Polk Failla, *Judge*).

UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED,
ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the district court's October 16, 2023 judgment
is AFFIRMED, Cross-Appellant Leigh's cross-appeal is DISMISSED as moot, and
all pending motions are DENIED as moot.

As relevant to this appeal, Robyn Abraham sued Abby Leigh, as Executrix

of the Estate of Mitch Leigh, the composer of the musical *Man of La Mancha*, seeking damages for breach of a contract Abraham had executed with Mitch Leigh before his death relating to production rights for a revival of the musical. Abby Leigh filed a counterclaim alleging that Abraham breached a fiduciary duty to Mitch Leigh by entering into a business contract with him while serving as his lawyer. During the district court proceedings, the court sanctioned Abraham for submitting false documents by precluding her from using the documents as evidence and awarding fees and costs to Leigh. Ultimately, the district court granted Leigh summary judgment on Abraham's breach of contract claim. The court subsequently awarded Leigh default judgment on her counterclaim due to Abraham's misrepresentations to the court regarding her availability for a hearing.

Abraham v. Leigh, No. 17-cv-5429, 2023 WL 6811647 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 16, 2023).

In the lead appeal, Abraham challenges a number of the district court's adverse decisions. In the cross-appeal, Leigh seeks review of the district court order sanctioning Abraham for filing false documents; Leigh contends that the court should have dismissed Abraham's action instead of simply excluding the documents and awarding fees and costs. Additionally, Abraham has filed multiple motions requesting that this Court take judicial notice of certain publicly available documents and seeking to unseal certain documents. Leigh has filed

motions to strike Abraham's briefs, dismiss the appeal, and strike Abraham's second special appendix. We assume the parties' familiarity with the remaining facts, the procedural history, and the issues on appeal.

We first address the lead appeal, 2d Cir. 23-7779, in which Abraham represents herself. Although we generally afford special solicitude to pro se litigants, "a lawyer representing [her]self ordinarily receives no such solicitude at all." *Tracy v. Freshwater*, 623 F.3d 90, 101–02 (2d Cir. 2010). We see no reason to depart from that rule here.

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure Rule 28(a) requires the appellant's brief to contain, among other things, "a statement of the issues presented for review," "a summary of the argument," and "the argument, which must contain . . . appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies." Abraham's brief does not present in this form any discernible arguments specifically challenging the legal grounds for the district court's decision awarding Leigh summary judgment on Abraham's contract claim, its grant of default judgment to Leigh on Leigh's breach of fiduciary duty counterclaim, its order assessing sanctions against Abraham, or any other potentially dispositive issue. Instead, she appears to argue generally that we should vacate or reverse *every* order issued by the district court on the

ground that her former counsel and the district court engaged in misconduct that undermines the integrity of the district court's proceedings. Abraham's wide-ranging accusations are not supported by, and in many cases are contradicted by, the record. We thus reject her broad request to revisit all of the district court's rulings.

This conclusion disposes of most, if not all, of Abraham's arguments on appeal. "[W]e need not, and normally will not, decide issues that a party fails to raise in [their] appellate brief." *Moates v. Barkley*, 147 F.3d 207, 209 (2d Cir. 1998); *see also LoSacco v. City of Middletown*, 71 F.3d 88, 93 (2d Cir. 1995) (concluding that "we need not manufacture claims of error" for a self-represented litigant). And while Abraham mentions the district court orders denying her relief in bullet-point form, other than the broad allegations of misconduct by the court and counsel, she makes no argument as to why she should be granted relief on appeal in connection with any specific order. *See Gerstenbluth v. Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC*, 728 F.3d 139, 142 n.4 (2d Cir. 2013) (self-represented litigant "waived any challenge" to the district court's adverse ruling because brief mentioned that ruling only "obliquely and in passing").

The only possible exception is her claim that the district court erred by ordering that a portion of Abraham's settlement with two other defendants be

Case: 23-7779, 05/27/2025, DktEntry: 194.1, Page 6 of 6

allocated to her former counsel to offset Abraham's fee obligations. But Abraham herself requested that the court enforce the oral agreement with her former counsel by releasing the contested funds pursuant to the terms of that agreement.

For the above reasons, in the lead appeal, the district court's judgment is **AFFIRMED**. In light of our affirmance of the district court's judgment, Leigh's cross-appeal challenging the district court's sanction order on the basis that it should have dismissed Abraham's claims is moot and is therefore **DISMISSED**.

Finally, Abraham's motion to unseal documents is **DENIED** on the merits, and all other pending motions are **DENIED** as moot because they are not relevant to any dispositive issue. *See Saleh v. Sulka Trading Ltd.*, 957 F.3d 348, 357 n.8 (2d Cir. 2020) (denying as moot a motion for judicial notice that addressed facts relevant only to an issue the Court did not reach); *United States v. Bleznak*, 153 F.3d 16, 21 n.2 (2d Cir. 1998) ("Because these [facts] are not relevant to our disposition of this appeal, we deny the [judicial notice] motion as moot.").

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe". To the left of the signature is a circular official seal or stamp, though the text on the stamp is not clearly legible.

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 4th day of November, two thousand twenty-five.

Robyn Abraham,

Plaintiff - Counter Defendant - Appellant-
Counter Cross-Appellee,

v.

Abby Leigh, as Executrix of the Estate of Mitch Leigh,

Defendant - Counter Plaintiff - Appellee-
Counter Cross-Appellant,

Abby Leigh in her individual capacity, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Docket Nos: 23-7779 (Lead)

23-7867 (XAP)

Appellant-Cross-Appellee, Robyn Abraham, filed a petition for panel rehearing, or, in the alternative, for rehearing *en banc*. The panel that determined the appeal has considered the request for panel rehearing, and the active members of the Court have considered the request for rehearing *en banc*.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition is denied.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk


Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe