

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WILFREDO FELIX,
Applicant,

v.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Respondent.

Application No. ____
(Arising from U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 24-1308)

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States and Circuit Justice for
the District of Columbia Circuit:

Applicant Wilfredo Felix respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time to file a petition for a
writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of
Columbia Circuit.

1. Judgment Below

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit was
entered on September 18, 2025. (App. A.)

A timely petition for rehearing en banc was filed and denied on December 19, 2025. (App. B.)

Under Supreme Court Rule 13, the current deadline to file a petition for writ of certiorari is March 19, 2026.

2. Extension Requested

Applicant respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time, up to and including May 18, 2026, within which to file a petition for writ of certiorari.

This application is timely filed more than ten days before the current deadline.

3. Good Cause

Good cause exists for the requested extension.

This case presents significant questions concerning the scope of FINRA's authority under Rule 8210, the limits of compelled document production, and the interaction between regulatory enforcement mechanisms and statutory and constitutional constraints.

This matter also involves a default-based disposition that was predicated upon underlying regulatory allegations that have since been set aside in related proceedings. The procedural posture therefore presents intertwined questions concerning agency authority, default enforcement mechanisms, and the effect of subsequent vacatur of predicate findings. Additional

time is necessary to ensure that the petition properly addresses the procedural and jurisdictional implications of that sequence in a manner suitable for this Court's review.

Moreover, this case arises during a period of substantial recalibration in administrative law jurisprudence. The Court's recent decision in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo* has altered the framework governing judicial deference to agency interpretations of statutory authority. The questions presented here implicate the proper application of that evolving framework. Additional time will allow Applicant to ensure that the petition accurately reflects the developing doctrinal landscape.

In addition, a related proceeding involving overlapping legal issues remains pending before the D.C. Circuit. Applicant is proceeding pro se and must compile and synthesize a substantial administrative record and related proceedings to properly present the case for this Court's review.

This request is not made for purposes of delay.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the time to file a petition for writ of certiorari be extended for 60 days, up to and including May 18, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



Wilfredo Felix
1178 Broadway, 3rd Floor
Suite #3194
New York, NY 10001

212.906.4422

wfelixprime@gmail.com

Dated: March 2, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Wilfredo Felix, declare that on March 02, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Application for Extension of Time to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari** by depositing the same in the United States mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Solicitor General of the United States
Room 5614
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wilfredo Felix".

Executed on March 02, 2026.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 2, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Application for Extension of Time to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari was served by electronic mail and by first-class mail upon counsel for Respondent Securities and Exchange Commission as follows:

Mr. Jeffrey Alan Berger
Attorney
Securities and Exchange Commission
bergerjc@sec.gov

Mr. Stephen G. Yoder
Attorney
Securities and Exchange Commission
yoders@sec.gov

Mr. Jordan Kennedy
Attorney
Securities and Exchange Commission
kennedyjo@sec.gov

Office of the General Counsel
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20549

Respectfully submitted,



Wilfredo Felix

APPENDIX

Appendix A – Judgment (Sept. 18, 2025)

Appendix B – Order Denying Rehearing (Dec. 19, 2025)

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-1308**September Term, 2025****SEC-3-21246****Filed On:** September 18, 2025

Wilfredo Felix,

Petitioner

v.

Securities and Exchange Commission,

Respondent

**PETITION FOR REVIEW FROM AN ORDER OF
THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

BEFORE: Walker, Childs, and Pan, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This petition for review of an order of the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) was considered on the briefs and appendix filed by the parties. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, the motion to supplement the record, the opposition thereto, and the reply, it is

ORDERED that the motion to supplement the record be dismissed as moot in part and denied in part. To the extent that petitioner seeks to provide documents that are already part of the administrative record, the motion is dismissed as moot. The motion is otherwise denied because petitioner has not demonstrated that supplementation is appropriate. See 15 U.S.C. § 78y(a)(5); Mozilla Corp. v. FCC, 940 F.3d 1, 61 (D.C. Cir. 2019). It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the petition for review be denied. Petitioner seeks review of an SEC order sustaining the result of a Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”) disciplinary action taken against him based on his failure to comply with FINRA’s investigative requests. The SEC’s conclusions that petitioner received the requests and failed to comply with them are supported by substantial evidence, and petitioner’s unsupported arguments that he either did comply or never received the requests are unpersuasive. See 15 U.S.C. § 78y(a)(4) (“The findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, are conclusive.”). Petitioner’s arguments concerning the default decision issued by FINRA are also

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-1308**September Term, 2025**

unavailing. The record contains substantial evidence demonstrating that the disciplinary complaint was properly served under FINRA Rule 9134(b), and petitioner has not pointed to any obligation on the part of FINRA to undertake additional efforts to ascertain new address information for petitioner.

Furthermore, the SEC did not abuse its discretion in sustaining the sanction imposed by FINRA. See PAZ Sec., Inc. v. SEC, 566 F.3d 1172, 1174 (D.C. Cir. 2009). The SEC explained the remedial purpose of the associational bar, considered whether there were aggravating or mitigating factors, and determined that the sanction was not excessive or oppressive, particularly in light of the importance of the information requested to FINRA's regulatory mission. See Saad v. SEC, 980 F.3d 103, 106 (D.C. Cir. 2020); see also 15 U.S.C. § 78s(e)(2). Petitioner has not shown that the SEC abused its broad discretion simply because he was sanctioned with an associational bar in a prior, separate FINRA proceeding.

Petitioner's remaining arguments, including his constitutional challenges, are forfeited because he either did not raise them before the SEC, see 15 U.S.C. § 78y(c)(1); Doe v. SEC, 28 F.4th 1306, 1316 (D.C. Cir. 2022), or raises them in this court only "in the most skeletal way," see Gov't of Manitoba v. Bernhardt, 923 F.3d 173, 179 (D.C. Cir. 2019).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-1308

September Term, 2025

SEC-3-21246

Filed On: December 19, 2025

Wilfredo Felix,

Petitioner

v.

Securities and Exchange Commission,

Respondent

BEFORE: Srinivasan, Chief Judge, and Henderson, Millett, Pillard, Wilkins,
Katsas, Rao, Walker, Childs, Pan, and Garcia, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for rehearing en banc, and the absence of a request by any member of the court for a vote, it is

ORDERED that the petition be denied.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk