

No. _____

In The Supreme Court of the United States

MICHAEL PRETE,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari to the Rhode Island Supreme Court

**PETITIONER'S APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
February 17, 2026

RECEIVED

FEB 24 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

For extraordinary circumstances (beyond Petitioner's control) briefly discussed herein, Petitioner respectfully requests, in accordance with Rule 13.5, an extension to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Petitioner's seeking review by this Court ("SCOTUS") of the R.I. Supreme Court's ("RISC") 10/24/25 dismissal order (Appendix A). Per Rule 13.1, Petitioner's deadline to appeal to SCOTUS is 3/19/26 (RISC denied rehearing on 12/19/25 (Appendix B)). SCOTUS has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1257.

The reasons for this request include, among other things, because of the State, etc., since RISC's 12/19/25 order, Petitioner's (who's acting *pro se*) been bombarded with having to, among other things, file at least 13 submissions in these matters in four different courts with MORE filings (not including Petitioner's forthcoming SCOTUS appeal) to come.

To provide a brief glimpse into what Petitioner's dealing with, attached hereto (Appendix C (83 pages (App.3-85)) & Appendix D (21 pages (App.86-106))) are two of Petitioner's recent filings Petitioner's been forced to prepare. For extremely brief background see Appendix E.

Above's a brief glimpse of the MONTHS long derailment the State, etc. has caused upon Petitioner which has intentionally diverted Petitioner's attention away from this appeal, etc. As SCOTUS knows, Petitioner's entitled to 90 days to appeal State court decisions (*See* Rule 13.1). Among others, the State, etc. has intentionally deprived Petitioner of his time (and the efforts, etc. are continuing). Note, RISC was

advised, in advance of its decision, that Petitioner would be seeking review from SCOTUS of their decisions.

On 10/24/25, RISC dismissed Petitioner's appeal claiming the appeal subject matter (bail modification (the revocation, as reflected on the face of the lower court record, of Petitioner's Pre-Trial personal-recognizance bail)) is an impermissible interlocutory appeal. RISC's decision directly defies SCOTUS's binding precedent specifically identifying bail modification appeals are PERMISSIBLE interlocutory appeals (*see Stack v. Boyle*, 342 U.S. 1 (1951)). After Petitioner moved for rehearing, RISC not only denied Petitioner's rehearing but, out-of-nowhere, declared that RISC would not entertain any of Petitioner's filings as long as there was an outstanding warrant (Appendix B) (despite that being the very subject matter of the appeal). The lower court's bail revocation (and imposition of "Held Without Bail" (A.K.A. no bail) and issuance of a warrant) was issued on false pretenses (e.g. the lower court judge claimed Petitioner failed to appear at a Pre-Trial Conference (A.K.A. Status Conference) however, among other things: Petitioner's Pre-Trial personal recognizance bail specifically states Petitioner only needs to appear at required court sessions (the required court sessions are specifically identified by court rule (Pre-Trial Conferences aren't among those identified)); that same judge's predecessor admitted (on the recorded record) Petitioner wasn't required to appear at Pre-Trial Conferences; the court clerk documented to Petitioner that Petitioner wasn't under an order to appear at the Pre-Trial Conference; the lower court's protocol states status updates may be

provided to the court via e-mail (without the need for a court appearance); and before the Pre-Trial Conference and before the lower court judge's bail revocation, etc. Petitioner formally provided (as documented in the court record) the judge (both into the court record AND e-mailed directly to the judge (personally)) with ANOTHER Status Update of the case (Petitioner had already voluntarily done so TWICE within the previous month (in other words, Petitioner provided the judge with THREE status updates within a month before the Pre-Trial Conference)) (it also bears noting, before, during and after the Pre-Trial Conference and bail revocation, Petitioner's case was still on appeal (as Petitioner advised the judge in all three Status Updates))).

Petitioner's appeal to SCOTUS will be addressing, among other things, RISC's Intentional Defiance of SCOTUS's Binding Case-Law, etc. Especially given State's unrelenting efforts, Petitioner needs time to attempt to adequately address the appeal.

In the interest of justice and for good cause shown, for extraordinary circumstances (beyond Petitioner's control) briefly discussed herein, in accordance with Rule 13.5, Petitioner respectfully requests a 60-day extension, up to and including 5/18/26, to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully,



Michael Prete

782 Boston Neck Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
February 17, 2026