

ORIGINAL

No. **26-5365**

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAY 28 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Emma Stone, PETITIONER

vs.

EXTRA SPACE MANAGEMENT, INC.; et al., RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Emma Stone

(Your Name)

607 Legendary Lane

(Address)

Cincinnati, OH, 45255

(City, State, Zip Code)

US+1 323 961 7705

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Is the idea of structure and content within a specific and special medium encapsulating the U.S. Constitution past its' sell-by-date as it relates to this Case?

LIST OF PARTIES

A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is provided below. If a party is a corporation with a stock ticker symbol, that symbol is also included.

- Extra Space Management, Inc (NYSE: EXR), (Counsel: Danielle Kieler, Attorney At Law, Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker LLP) (Defendant)
- Mr Joseph Trupin (Defendant)
- United States Of America (Care of: The Honorable Assistant Attorney General, United States Department Of Justice) (Defendant)
- Emma Stone (Petitioner)

RELATED CASES

- Court of Los Angeles: 18STRO06162 (Stone v Clarkson (1615 N. Laurel Ave. Ass)), 20STCV40267 (Stone v City of Los Angeles), 19STFL02316
- Federal Court California: CV22-2603-SB(DFM) (Stone v 1615 N Laurel Ave Association and the State of California (incl. other relevant 1615 N. Laurel Ave. Ass Cases at Court of Los Angeles: BC608095, 12SB0843, 16IWSC05401), and at Federal Central District Court pertaining to Westcom Property Services, Inc.: (2:19-cv-09314),
- 9th Circuit Court of Appeal: 22-55552

INCLUSION

- Decision of THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
- Decision of THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals is included in the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was Case: 25-7621, 02/27/2026, DktEntry: 9.1, Page 1 of 1.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Upon filing the complaint with the Court, the federal questions were timely and properly raised. The Supreme Court is the appropriate entity with jurisdiction within the United States to review the judgment on a writ of certiorari. And the Petitioner, with limited means, presents meritorious claims. Including those pertaining to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) which is the only legally binding universal anti-corruption instrument to which the United States is a supporting party and signatory in its' implementation. Likewise to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the global and comprehensive statement of inalienable human rights, to which the United States of America signed, finally ratifying the Human Rights Treaty in 1992, long after the majority of the rest of the world despite being one of the key players to draft the Covenant.

As this case has continued to forcefully languish beyond the financial reach of the Petitioner, the psychological barriers have also been an incessant and increasing impediment to access justice. It isn't just the needless cost of complying with the rules of court including the rules of procedure which have imposed requirements preventing the just resolution of proceedings. Nor even mistakes on the part of the Supreme Court of the United States ie. incorrectly dating the associated postmarking and reception of the petition as one example.

It is apparent there has been a conscious and corrupt desire on the part of all of the Defendant parties to underhandedly leverage, besides any actual procedural device, any tool of attrition. It is not just aspects of the Court rules which have contributed to the problems for the Petitioner by making understanding and complying with procedural obligations unduly burdensome and costly. This in of itself makes the Petitioner wonder about the preferred audience to which the rules of Court are actually aimed. Indeed, the extent to which any assumptions on which the rules are based actually respond to the universally held idea of what justice ought to entail.

The Petitioner is adamant the justice system within the United States of America (and this includes the state of California), or indeed anywhere else, must deliver justice for one and all through fair and timely processes and procedures. And ones that are relevant and responsive to the needs and expectations of all the individuals who may be obliged to use the Courts. However, ensuring respect for all and proportionality between the investment of resources required by parties to comply with obligations in litigating, and the nature, the complexity, the value, and indeed the critical importance to the parties in question and wider society, of each dispute, is sorely lacking. And anywhere these days. Upholding accessibility by ensuring everyone is able to use courts to assert and defend their rights is challenging. This includes ensuring that adequate information and advice is available, cost barriers are genuinely and beneficially minimized, and that processes are comprehensible and culturally responsive.

Here it is essential to note the Founding Fathers of the United States established the necessity for remedies and/or access to justice via the United States Constitution which took effect on March 4, 1789. The preoccupation with and consideration of access to justice was deemed part of the rule of law and good governance. Without enforcement mechanisms, access to justice and the rule of law was meaningless. Therefore detrimental not least to both domestic and international relations. And the mere availability of remedies was insufficient. In the context of a broad administration of justice, an individual's fair participation in proceedings was required. This is recognized today in Article 8 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Whether the Founding Fathers of the United States of America or the original United Nations Committee chaired by an American woman no less, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, both groups were attentive to vulnerabilities and respectful of the necessity of the evolution of State obligations to address any individual(s) marginalized and/or disadvantaged in his/he/their pursuit of justice and protection of rights. At both periods in history, the individuals making up these two particular and very distinct groups considered access to justice an object of sound public policy. Access to justice was a right in itself requiring effective governmental planning, institutional components, and legislation. And without this or the careful maintenance thereof, it resulted in a lack of domestic remedies or the exhaustion of domestic remedies, as it does so today.

Access to justice concerns the ability of any individual(s) to have his/her/their civil rights vindicated, and breaches of those rights compensated, in a procedurally fair and transparent manner by neutral adjudicators in accordance with law. This is a fundamental right duly recognized by the Founding Fathers of the United States of America and the original United Nations Committee. Each and every one of us ought to be equally able to obtain redress within legal institutions for this exemplifies central rule of law values.

Not so much today.

This year of 2026 we are at what may well be the most significant turning point in history. We truly are and disconcertingly so. Our world continues its longstanding trajectory of deteriorating peacefulness and alarming and increasing lawlessness. There are now more active state-based conflicts than at any point since the end of the Second World War. And the increasing use of AI in warfare, let alone within the legal field, is raising serious and well-founded concern about the erosion of meaningful human(e) oversight in what is often lethal decision-making. Geopolitical risks exceed levels of the Cold War, and without a rapid yet well-reasoned investment in our attitudes regarding multilateral institutions alone, including what were once rightly esteemed structures of law and order, the damage, or rather noxious rot, will become too firmly entrenched. This will result in the loss of the guarantee of access to justice, likewise democratic governance as those of us of a certain age once knew it.

It is also within the legal field that quality decision-making is absolutely essential to ensure that processes exist to avoid and prevent the rot setting in with miscarriages of justice and other errors occurring. Providing for principled and proportional appeal rights, so as to allow for the correction of error and the provision of clear guidance, ensuring alignment and coherence between the role and jurisdictions of the various courts involved in providing justice, and between the procedures and processes of each of those courts and their role in the system, is fundamental to bona fide justice.

So the Petitioners' claims not least pertaining to the safeguarding of her personal property are just as much about the safeguarding of access to justice, to democracy, and to peace. The petition is therefore a universal matter, relatable to one and all, and requires unaffected integrity from those with the power, the means, and the resources to appropriately deal with.

REASON(S) FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

In virtue of the following two excerpts from the October 2021 episode "A quelques pas de l'infini" contained within the RTS1 television series "Passe-moi les jumelles" (<https://www.rts.ch/play/tv/emission/passe-moi-les-jumelles?id=394095>). The two excerpts here present two of the Monks of the Cistercian Order at Hauterive Abbey, 7km from Fribourg in Switzerland.

The Cistercian Order also has a Constitution. The Carta Caritatis is the Constitution of the Cistercian Order, and was approbated in 1119 by Pope Calixtus II. The Carta Caritatis contains the world-famous passage "Una caritate, una regula, similibusque vivamus moribus", or translated into English "may we all live in one love under one rule and with like customs".

Please watch somewhere peaceful, and in the original French version with English subtitles as opposed to the auto-dubbing. May the viewing help reaffirm your deepest purpose with what so truly calls justice, democracy, and peace forward in our world.

At 43:10 "Who am I?....." to 43:46

At 51:16 "This morning I meditated on the end of the Gospel St John..." to 51:45

See the clips at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1idx03HnX5g>

Or here via RTS: <https://www.rts.ch/emissions/passe-moi-les-jumelles/2021/video/abbaye-de-hauterive-26815572.html>

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

E Stone

Date: 05/25/2026