No. ______

IN THE
**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

MARISOL MARTINEZ,
*Applicant,*

v.

SAVVY IN, LLC,
*Respondent.*

ON APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

**APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

To the Honorable Amy Coney Barrett,
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States
and Circuit Justice for the Seventh Circuit

Marisol Martinez
Applicant, Pro Se
933 W. Washington St.
Alexandria, Indiana 46001
alexindianamm@gmail.com
765-233-6298

Applicant Marisol Martinez, proceeding pro se, respectfully applies under Rules 13.5, 22, and 30 of this Court for a 60-day extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari. This extension is sought solely on Applicant's behalf. The present deadline is October 28, 2026. Applicant requests an extension through December 27, 2026; because that date falls on a Sunday, Rule 30.1 would make the operative filing date Monday, December 28, 2026.

**JUDGMENT, TIMELINESS, AND JURISDICTION**

1. The Court of Appeals of Indiana affirmed the denial of Applicant's motion to set aside a tax deed on February 19, 2026 (Exhibit A), denied rehearing on April 16, 2026 (Exhibit B), and the Indiana Supreme Court denied transfer on July 30, 2026 (Exhibit C). Martinez v. Savvy IN, LLC, Court of Appeals Case No. 25A-TP-644.
2. Under Rule 13.1, the petition for a writ of certiorari is presently due 90 days after the Indiana Supreme Court denied discretionary review, on October 28, 2026. This application is being filed more than ten days before that deadline. No prior application for an extension has been made in this case.
3. This Court would have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a). Applicant seeks review of the final state-court judgment in a case in which she asserted a right under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court of Appeals' judgment became final for purposes of review in this Court when the Indiana Supreme Court denied discretionary transfer on July 30, 2026.

## THE PROPOSED PETITION

4. The proposed petition will present a federal constitutional question concerning the adequacy of notice before the permanent deprivation of real property through a tax sale. Applicant contends that the state courts upheld the tax deed without applying the governing federal due-process standard to evidence that the mailed notice lacked the complete private-mailbox designation required at a commercial mail-receiving facility and that the official postal record identified delivery only to the facility's bare street address.
5. The petition will not ask this Court merely to reweigh evidence or correct a state-law error. Applicant is working to frame the question under this Court's due-process precedents, to

demonstrate where the federal issue was raised and preserved, and to address the state court's reliance on waiver, briefing, and factual grounds.

## GOOD CAUSE FOR THE REQUESTED EXTENSION

6. The record is extensive and procedurally layered. It includes the Trial Rule 60(B) proceedings, competing notice and mailing documents, a hearing transcript, multiple appendix volumes, the opening and reply briefs in the Court of Appeals, the memorandum decision, a petition for rehearing, a petition to transfer, and the orders denying rehearing and transfer. A careful review is necessary to ensure that every factual assertion and record citation in the certiorari petition is accurate.
7. The preservation and vehicle issues require particular care. The Court of Appeals disposed of several arguments through waiver or inadequate-development doctrines and did not expressly analyze the preserved notice claim under the federal standards Applicant invoked. The petition therefore must identify precisely where the federal claim was raised, distinguish the federal question from state statutory disputes, and address whether any state-law ground is independent and adequate.
8. Applicant is proceeding pro se and has made sustained, concrete efforts to obtain legal assistance. Before the Trial Case concluded, she contacted more than thirty Indiana attorneys, both private and through an employer-sponsored legal plan, but was unable to secure representation. Applicant also contacted legal-aid organizations, but those organizations did not handle this type of real estate issue or civil matter, and her requests for court-appointed assistance in both the trial court and the Court of Appeals were denied. Beginning within one day after the Indiana Supreme Court's July 30, 2026 order denying transfer, Applicant contacted national public-interest organizations, consumer-law

organizations, and law-school clinics, including Pacific Legal Foundation, the Institute for Justice, the National Consumer Law Center, and several university-based Supreme Court clinics. Professor James W. Ely, Jr. explained that he is retired and could not prepare an amicus brief himself, but referred Applicant to another organization and indicated willingness to join an amicus filing if one proceeds. These efforts remain ongoing, and the extension would give potential counsel and interested organizations time to evaluate the record and the constitutional question presented.

9. Applicant has also been required to address a separate and unexpected garnishment proceeding while pursuing this appeal. Applicant filed her petition to transfer on May 21, 2026. While that petition remained pending, her first garnished paycheck was issued on June 26, 2026, and the transfer proceedings were transmitted to the Indiana Supreme Court on June 29, 2026. Applicant had received no notice of, and had no knowledge of, either the underlying action or the foreign judgment entered from it before the garnishment began.

Within days after the first garnishment, Applicant filed a verified Trial Rule 60(B) motion on July 4, 2026, seeking emergency relief from the garnishment and from the underlying judgment, with supplemental filings over the following two weeks. A hearing was held July 17–28, 2026; the court denied temporary relief but continued the motion for further proceedings on September 29, 2026. Two days later, on July 30, 2026, the Indiana Supreme Court denied transfer in this case.

Applicant consulted an attorney regarding the garnishment matter on August 3, 2026, but has not secured representation and may again be required to proceed pro se while continuing to seek counsel. Applicant works part time, in part because of health and medical limitations and in part because of the time required to litigate the proceedings affecting her property. After wage-and-tax calculations, garnishment has left Applicant with as little as approximately $28 in net earnings above the protected amount per biweekly pay period, while withholding roughly $116, showing the severity of a garnishment Applicant must litigate alongside this appeal. That competing proceeding, not the financial hardship itself, has materially reduced the time available to prepare the petition, notwithstanding Applicant's continuing diligence and willingness to obtain qualified counsel.

10. Applicant has acted diligently. She began preparing for potential Supreme Court review immediately after transfer was denied, is assembling a substantial draft, and is continuing to review the record and authorities. The requested extension is not sought for delay. It is requested so that the petition can accurately present the federal constitutional question, comply with this Court's procedural requirements, and include a complete and properly organized appendix.
11. The requested extension will not prejudice Respondent. No proceeding in the state courts is awaiting the filing of the petition, and the requested period does not exceed the 60 days authorized by Rule 13.5.

## CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari be extended by 60 days, through December 27, 2026, with the operative filing date of Monday, December 28, 2026, under Rule 30.1.

Respectfully submitted,

Marisol Martinez

Marisol Martinez, Applicant, Pro Se
933 W. Washington St., Alexandria, Indiana 46001
alexindianamm@gmail.com • 765-233-6298

Date: August 6, 2026