

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Marilyn Monae Green,
Petitioner,

V.
STATE OF OKLAHOMA
Respondent.

Application for Extending
Time to File Petition
for writ of Certiorari

RECEIVED
MAR 10 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

To: Justice Neil M. Gorsuch, Circuit Justice for the
Tenth Circuit.

Petitioner, Marilyn Monae Green, respectfully applies to this Court
for an order extending the time in which to file their petition for
writ of certiorari from Saturday, February 7, 2026 to Thursday
April 7, 2026, period of SIXTY (60) days. This Court has Jurisdic-
tion under 28 USC § 1257. In support of this Application,
Petitioner states as follows:

(1) On August 7, 2025, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals
issued an "order to show cause" in an appeal by the Petitioner,
Case number F-2025-438 (attached), wherein the Court ordered
a response to its order. On October 8, 2025, the appeal was
dismissed (attached). On November 7, 2025, the Oklahoma
Court of Criminal Appeals denied Petitioner's motion for
rehearing.

(2) This case raises important questions regarding established
federal law as construed by the Court in *Farewell v. California*,
422 U.S. 806, 93 S.Ct. 2525, 2541 (1975); *McKaskle v.*
Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168, 177 n.8, 104 S.Ct. 944, 79 L.Ed.2d 122 (1984);
Stacy v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052 (1984);
Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 556, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 2976 (1974);
Wilkinson v. Austin, 545 U.S. 209, 221, 125 S.Ct. 2384, 2393 (2005).

EVANS V. LUEY, 469 U.S. 387, 393. 105 S.Ct. 830, 834, 83 L.Ed. 2d 821 (Class); Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545, 552, 85 S.Ct. 1187, 1191 (1965); Chambers v. Florida, 309 U.S. 227, 241, 60 S.Ct. 472, 479 (1940); Griffin v. Illinois, 351 U.S. 12, 18-19, 76 S.Ct. 585, 590-91 (1956); and the ruling by the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals is seemingly in conflict with these precedents. Specifically, this case raises issues concerning the denial of self representation in trial court through chilling threats, ineffective assistance of counsel due to counsel's recovery from an complex surgical procedure simultaneously during trial, denial of the fundamental requirements of due process by a state appellate court and a total ineffectiveness due to Petitioner's indigent status.

(3) Petitioner now seeks a writ of certiorari. This Court's jurisdiction to grant the same arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

(4.) According to Supreme Court Rule 13.3, the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari runs from the date of the denial of rehearing. In this case, the Petitioner's motion for rehearing was denied on November 7, 2025 (attached). The Petition for a writ of certiorari in this case is therefore due by February 7, 2026. However, the time granted by Supreme Court Rule 13 will be insufficient to allow Petitioner, a prose prisoner to do justice to the issues at hand. Therefore, Petitioner seeks an extension of sixty (60) days in which to file their petition for writ of certiorari. See Supreme Court Rule 13.5 (CA) Justice may extend the time to file a petition for writ of certiorari for a period not exceeding 60 days.


(5) In compliance with Supreme Court Rule 13.5, which requires that any application for an extension of time must be filed at least 10 days before that date, or, in this case by January 28, 2026, this request is timely filed on January 29, 2026. The request is made in good faith and not for the purpose of delay. Specifically, the request

is made because of the importance of the issues at hand, trial court threatened to revoke bail and Jail Retitioner for her decision of self representation and ineffective assistance of Counsel through Counsel's complex surgical recovery simultaneous history of Oklahoma's Courts refusal to correct unconstitutional trial violations. Retitioner requests additional time to prepare the Petition with the requisite thoroughness and care.

(6) other obligations, including federal civil cases and federal circuit appeals, and retaliation from prison officials for exercising these rights, precluded Retitioner from being able to devote adequate time and attention in the preparation of a Petition for writ of certiorari. Therefore, in light of both of Retitioner's current obligations and the importance of the issues that will be presented in this case, Retitioner submits that a sixty (60) day extension is necessary and appropriate in order to effectively prepare the Petition for certiorari.

Wherefore, in the interest of justice and for good cause shown, Retitioner, respectfully requests that this Court extend the current February 7, 2026 deadline until April 7, 2026.

Respectfully Submitted,


Marilyn Monroe Green
Prisoner

Proof of Service / Prisoner Mailbox Rule

I declare that a copy of the foregoing was mailed to the below addressee's on January 21, 2026 with sufficient postage attached, by handing directly to mailroom staff Miller.

NO. 11-11-11

(1) Mercedes Vasquez - Assistant D.A.
315 SW 5th St, KMSOZ
Lawton, OK 73501

(2) Supreme Court Clerk
1 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20543

I declare under penalty of Perjury of the laws
of the United States.

~~Executed~~
Executed on Jan 20, 2016
Holdenville, Oklahoma, 74848

Mailing address

Marilyn Monroe Green #744047
Box 133rd Road
Holdenville, OK 74848

Marilyn Monroe Green

Page 4

**IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

FILED
IN COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

OCT - 8 2025

SELDEN JONES
CLERK

MARILYN MONROE GREEN PORTER,)

Appellant,)

v.)

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)

Appellee.)

No. F-2025-438

Handed to LLC
10/15/25
Verified 10/15/25
Deadline end 10/28/25

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

On May 2, 2025, Appellant, pro se, filed a notice of intent to appeal and designation of record with the trial court clerk following her conviction in Comanche County District Court Case No. CF-2022-332. Appellant filed a copy of this notice with the Clerk of this Court on June 6, 2025. An attorney has not entered an appearance in this appeal on behalf of Appellant. Appellant is attempting to proceed pro se.

In an Order issued August 27, 2025, Appellant was directed to file a response and show cause why an application to proceed on appeal pro se, as required by Rule 1.16, *Rules of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals*, Title 22, Ch.18, App. (2025), has not been filed in this matter. Appellant's response was filed with the Clerk of this

Court on September 26, 2025. Appellant has not obtained an order from the trial court allowing her to proceed pro se.


This Court has recognized "that there is no federal constitutional right for a defendant to represent himself on direct appeal." *Stouffer v. State*, 2007 OK CR 4, ¶ 3, 154 P.3d 88, 89 (citing *Martinez v. Court of Appeal of California*, 528 U.S. 152 (2000)). Even so, this Court permits self-representation on direct appeal so long as an Appellant who desires to proceed pro se complies with the basic procedures set forth in Rule 1.16. Appellant has not complied with these procedures. We find Appellant has not shown cause for her failure to comply with the rules of this Court.

Accordingly, the above styled certiorari appeal is **DISMISSED**. Issuance of this order concludes proceedings before this Court.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

WITNESS OUR HANDS AND THE SEAL OF THIS COURT this


8th day of October, 2025.



GARY L. LUMPKIN, Presiding Judge



WILLIAM J. MUSSEMAN, Vice Presiding Judge



DAVID B. LEWIS, Judge



ROBERT L. HUDSON, Judge



SCOTT ROWLAND, Judge

ATTEST:


Clerk

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS FILED
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

MARYLYN MONROE GREEN PORTER,)	NOV - 7 2025
)	SELDEN JONES
Appellant,)	CLERK
)	
v.)	No. F-2025-438
)	
STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)	
)	
Appellee.)	

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING

Appellant has filed a petition for rehearing challenging this Court's October 8, 2025, order dismissing her appeal, in Comanche County District Court Case No. CF-2022-332, for failure to comply with the procedures to proceed pro se.


A petition for rehearing cannot be filed, as a matter of course, but only for the following reasons: (1) some question decisive of the case and duly submitted by the attorney of record has been overlooked by the Court, or (2) the decision is in conflict with an express statute or controlling decision to which the attention of this Court was not called either in the brief or in oral argument. Rule 3.14(B), *Rules of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals*, Title 22, Ch.18, App. (2025). Appellant has not established that some question was overlooked by

the order dismissing this appeal, or that the dismissal conflicts with an express statute or controlling decision. Therefore, the petition for rehearing should be, and is hereby, **DENIED**.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

WITNESS OUR HANDS AND THE SEAL OF THIS COURT this


7th day of November, 2025.




GARY L. LUMPKIN, Presiding Judge



WILLIAM J. MUSSEMAN, Vice Presiding Judge



DAVID B. LEWIS, Judge




ROBERT L. HUDSON, Judge



SCOTT ROWLAND, Judge

ATTEST:



Clerk