

Application No. - - - - -

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PEYMAN ROSHAN,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

CHIKA SUNQUIST,

Defendant and Appellee.

On Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of
Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Case No. 25-3157

**APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PETITION
FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI BY SIXTY (60) DAYS**

Peyman Roshan, SB#303460
1757 Burgundy Place
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(415) 305-7847
roshan@pursuelegal.com

APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

This Application is made to the Honorable Elena Kagan, as Circuit Justice for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, see S.Ct.R. 30.3 (hereafter “Rule”). On May 5, 2026, the Ninth Circuit issued a Memorandum Disposition and entered judgment affirming the District Court’s dismissal of this case.

Pursuant to Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.2, Appellant Peyman Roshan (“Roshan”) respectfully requests that the time to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this matter be extended by sixty (60) days based on the necessity for Roshan to incorporate into this appeal a dismissal based on the application of the *Roquer-Feldman* doctrine, this Court’s recent decision in *Pung v. Isabella County, Mich.*, No. 25-95 (Decided June 23, 2026), which impliedly held the *Roquer-Feldman* doctrine inapplicable in a case with similar circumstances. In addition, Roshan’s petition will discuss issues relating this Court’s recent decision in *T.M. v. University of Maryland Medical System Corp.*, No. 25-197 (Decided June 18, 2026). While the issue this Court decided in *T.M.* does not affect this appeal, Roshan will be raising issues that were discussed by

the petitioner and the Court but were not decided because they were not properly included in the questions presented by the petitioner in T.M. and which issues will affect this case.

Roshan therefore respectfully requests a 60-day extension.

Dated this 20th day of July, 2026.

Respectfully submitted:



Peyman Roshan
In Pro Per

DECLARATION OF PEYMAN ROSHAN

1. I am an attorney admitted in California. I am the plaintiff and appellant. The following matters are from personal knowledge.
2. On May 5, 2026, the Ninth Circuit issued a Memorandum Disposition and entered judgment affirming the District Court's dismissal of this case in part based on the application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.
3. In addition, Roshan's petition will discuss issues relating this Court's recent decision in *T.M. v. University of Maryland Medical System Corp.*, No. 25-197 (Decided June 18, 2026). While the issue this Court decided in T.M. does not affect this appeal, Roshan will be raising issues that were discussed by the petitioner and the Court but were not decided because they were not properly included in the questions presented by the petitioner in T.M. and which issues will affect this case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury of the law of the United States that the foregoing statements of fact are true and correct.
Dated this July 20, 2026 in Santa Rosa, California.



Peyman Roshan
In Pro Per

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 5 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

PEYMAN ROSHAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHIKA SUNQUIST, California Real Estate
Commissioner; DOUGLAS R.
MCCAULEY; CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-3157

D.C. No.

4:24-cv-02789-JST

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Jon S. Tigar, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 30, 2026**

Before: McKEOWN, N.R. SMITH, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Peyman Roshan appeals the district court's order dismissing his claims
against Chika Sunquist, Douglas McCauley, and the California Department of Real

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision
without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Estate (“DRE”). We review questions of sovereign immunity under the Eleventh Amendment and applications of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine de novo. *Savage v. Glendale Union High Sch.*, 343 F.3d 1036, 1040 (9th Cir. 2003) (Eleventh Amendment immunity); *Carmona v. Carmona*, 603 F.3d 1041, 1050 (9th Cir. 2010) (*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

1. Roshan’s claims against the DRE fail because the DRE is a state agency and California has not waived sovereign immunity. *See Roshan v. McCauley*, 130 F.4th 780, 783 (9th Cir. 2025) (characterizing the DRE as a state agency). California has not “unequivocally expressed” a waiver of Eleventh Amendment immunity, *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 99 (1984), and “a State’s consent to suit in its own courts is not a waiver of its immunity from suit in federal court,” *Sossamon v. Texas*, 563 U.S. 277, 285 (2011). The Supreme Court did not silently modify this doctrine in *DeVillier v. Texas*, 601 U.S. 285 (2024), as Roshan contests.

2. Roshan’s remaining claims on appeal fail due to the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. This doctrine “prohibits federal district courts from considering ‘de facto appeals’—suits in which ‘the adjudication of the federal claims would undercut the state ruling.’” *Searle v. Allen*, 148 F.4th 1121, 1128 (9th Cir. 2025) (quoting *Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam*, 334 F.3d 895, 898 (9th Cir. 2003)). Though he has sued

the DRE, Sunquist, and McCauley, Roshan seeks a de facto appeal of the California Supreme Court's decision to deny review of the California State Bar disciplinary order at the foundation of the defendants' actions. His claims are analogous to those dismissed in *D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), *see id.* at 486–87. *Williams v. Reed*, 604 U.S. 168 (2025), does not alter this analysis, *id.* at 179. The district court therefore appropriately dismissed Roshan's claims.

AFFIRMED.

Application No. -----

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PEYMAN ROSHAN,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

CHIKA SUNQUIST,

Defendant and Appellee.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Peyman Roshan, hereby certify that on this 20th day of July, 2026, I caused a copy of the Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 25-3157, in this case to be served by United States Postal service to opposing counsel Rachel J. Yoo, California Department of Justice, 300 South Spring St., Ste. 1702, Los Angeles, CA 90013.

I further certify that all parties required to be served have been served.



Peyman Roshan