

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

NEAG.

v.

J.Z.M.,

Respondent

RICHARD DUCOTE, ESQ.,

Petitioner

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR., ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT:

Petitioner Richard Ducote, Esq., appearing herein *pro se*, respectfully requests a sixty (60) extension of time to file his petition for writ of certiorari in this Court, to and including October 25, 2026, for the following reasons, all as are shown in the attached Ex. 1, *Appellant Richard Ducote, Esq.'s Petition for Writ of Mandamus*, including Ex. 1's Apps. A-F, which is still pending the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania:

1) The decision for which certiorari could be sought in this Court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1257, was issued on July 8, 2025, by the Superior Court of Pennsylvania [Ex.1, App. A], which also denied Petitioner's timely application for reargument on September 18, 2025 [Ex.1, App. B]. Petitioner's timely *Petition for Allowance of*

Appeal [Ex. 1, App. C] was denied by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on May 28, 2026 [Ex. 1, App. D]. Therefore, under Rule 13 (1) Petitioner's certiorari petition deadline is August 26, 2026. This application is being filed at least ten (10) days prior to August 26, 2026, as required by Rule 13(5).

2) In the underlying child custody proceeding, as the Superior Court of Pennsylvania decision at issue [Ex.1, App. A] shows, Petitioner appealed a "gag order" the trial court *sua sponte* issued against him, as well as contempt of court findings and sanctions, all assertedly fraught with constitutional due process violations. However, in affirming the trial court's rulings, the Superior Court refused to consider Petitioner's appeals from the trial court's prior denials of the Petitioner's several motions to recuse the trial judge on constitutional due process grounds, as the Superior Court deemed these to be interlocutory judgments which could only be reviewed on appeal after the trial court rendered a final child custody ruling.

3) Once the final child custody judgement was entered on October 7, 2025, while Petitioner's appeal was still pending, Petitioner on June 3, 2026, filed *Appellant Richard Ducote, Esq.'s Application to Reopen / Reinstate Appeals* [Ex.1, App. E] seeking to force the Superior Court to substantively address the appeal recusal denials, the determination of which could consequently require the reversal of the appealed "gag order," and the contempt findings / sanctions. Yet, the Superior Court denied this application as well on June 12, 2026 [Ex. 1, App. F].

4) The extension of time now sought in this application is primarily based on the fact that *Appellant Richard Ducote Esq.’s Petition for Writ of Mandamus* [Ex.1, Apps. A-F], filed in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on July 13, 2026, is still pending. Should that petition be granted, and the Superior Court then forced to confront Petitioner’s appeal of the denied recusal orders, Petitioner could prevail in a finding that the trial court should have first recused herself, requiring that the “gag order” and the contempt rulings primarily to be challenged in any certiorari petition in this Court be retroactively vacated.

5) Therefore, the need for any certiorari petition to be filed in this Court may be vitiated by the final outcome of the appellate proceedings below, which could render moot all of Petitioner’s contested issues to be argued here.

Wherefore, for these reasons, and in the interest of judicial economy, Petitioner respectfully requests a sixty (60) extension of time to file his petition for writ of certiorari in this Court, to and including October 25, 2026. Sixty (60) days should be adequate time to reveal whether any such petition would be ripe for filing, or even necessary.

August 13, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Ducote

Richard L. Ducote, Esq.

of the Supreme Court Bar

318 East Boston Street, 2nd Floor

Covington, LA 70433

(985) 898-2755 / (985) 898-2754 Fax

rducote@ducotelaw.com

Petitioner pro se

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Richard Ducote, Esq., a member of the Supreme Court Bar, hereby certify that a copy of this pleading was served on the following counsel for all parties pursuant to Rule 29 (3), by Fed Ex commercial delivery, for delivery within three (3) calendar days, and by email at or before the time of filing with the Clerk:

1) Norman Perlberger, Esq.

np@perlbergerlaw.com

Counsel for Respondent J.Z.M.

2 Bala Plaza, Suite 300

Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004-1512

2) Michael Daley, Esq.

michael.daley@pacourts.us

Counsel for Superior Court of Pennsylvania

Administrative Office of the Courts

1515 Market Street, Ste 1414

Philadelphia, PA 19102

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Ducote

Richard Ducote, Esq.
of the Supreme Court Bar
August 13, 2026