

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

AMAURY RODRIGUEZ,

*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Respondent.*

---

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A  
WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM A JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

---

**TO THE HON. CLARENCE THOMAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

---

Pursuant to Rules 13.5, 22, and 30 of this Court, petitioner Amaury Rodriguez respectfully requests a 30-day extension of time, up to and including August 24, 2026, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari from the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Petitioner has not previously sought an extension of time from this Court. Petitioner is filing this Application at least ten days before the current deadline, which is July 23, 2026. *See* Sup. Ct. R. 13.5. The jurisdiction of this Court will be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

Petitioner pleaded guilty to distributing child pornography. The district court ultimately imposed a lifetime term of supervised release. One of the terms of supervised release prohibited petitioner from possessing or using the internet without prior court approval. Petitioner objected that lifetime internet restriction, arguing that it was overbroad in light of *Packingham v. North Carolina*, 582 U.S. 98 (2017), which recognized a First Amendment right to access the internet for those who had already completed their sentences. The court overruled that objection.

On appeal, petitioner reiterated that argument, but the Eleventh Circuit affirmed the lifetime internet restriction of supervision. Applying circuit precedent, the Eleventh Circuit held that *Packingham* did not apply to those on supervised release because *Packingham* involved sex offenders who had already completed their sentence. As will be explained in the petition, the lower state and federal courts have divided on whether the First Amendment right recognized in *Packingham* applies to criminal defendants who have not yet completed their sentence and who remain under court supervision. A copy of the Eleventh Circuit's decision is attached here.

Undersigned counsel will not have sufficient time to prepare and file the certiorari petition by the current deadline due to the press of other business. *See, e.g., United States v. Spearman*, 11th Cir. No. 24-10300 (petition for rehearing due July 9, 2026); *United States v. Hernandez*, 11th Cir. No. 25-14146 (reply brief due July 6, 2026); *United States v. Benitez*, 11th Cir. No. 26-11052 (reply brief due July 8, 2026); *United States v. Fernandez*, 11th Cir. No. 26-11710 (initial brief due July 28, 2026). Counsel believes that additional time is important to ensure the effective

representation of petitioner. No party will be prejudiced by the requested extension.

Accordingly, petitioner respectfully requests that an order be entered extending the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari by 30 days, which would extend the current deadline from July 23, 2026, to August 24, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

HECTOR A. DOPICO  
Federal Public Defender

June 30th, 2026

By: /s/ Andrew L. Adler  
Andrew L. Adler  
*Counsel of Record*  
Assistant Federal Public Defender  
1 E. Broward Blvd., Suite 1100  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301  
(954) 356-7436  
Andrew\_Adler@fd.org