

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CARNELL LOUIS DODSON

- Petitioner

VS.

ERIC GUERRERO

- Respondent

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO
FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

JURISDICTION

On September 29, 2025, The United States DISTRICT Court for the Southern District of Texas, Galveston Division dismissed petitioner's writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The Court also denied petitioner's motion for evidentiary hearing, as well, denied petitioner a certificate of appealability. On October 24, 2026, Mr. Dodson filed a motion to re-open time for notice of appeal. On January 7, 2026, Mr. Dodson's appeal was docketed with the United States

(1)



RECEIVED
SEP 22 2026
14-18-12

Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. On February 4, 2026 Mr. Dodson filed an application for Issuance of Certificate of Appealability. On June 26, 2026, The United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, denied Mr. Dodson's motion for C.O.A, and did not reach whether the district court erred in denying an evidentiary hearing. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254.

Now comes, Carnell Louis Dodson, pursuant U.S.C. Supreme Court Rule 30.3, to present this motion to Honorable Justice Alito, and associates, humbly requesting an extension of time to file his Writ of Certiorari.

GOOD CAUSE

Petitioner is proceeding Pro Se, and presently is confined at the D.B. Ellis Unit in Huntsville, TX.. Petitioner respectfully request an extension of time to a Writ of Certiorari. Petitioner respectfully request an additional 30, to 60 days to file

from the outset of Mr. Dodson's habeas corpus journey, he has experienced impediments, Mr. Dodson attempted many times to gain access ^{from counsel} to client/attorney files before preparing his initial habeas corpus petition, under his had a right to these documents as part of his discovery, Mr. Dodson even filed a motion to have the trial judge compel trial counsel to produce these files, only to ^{experience} have the district motion dated by the district clerk and void the motion. Mr. Dodson sought the help of the appeals court, via writ of mandamus to compel the district clerk to perform her ministerial duty, all to no-avail. Prior to finalizing my habeas corpus application pursuant T.C.C.P. Art. 11.07, trial counsel was killed in a car accident, Mr. Dodson filed a motion requesting ^{appointed} counsel be provided, because of a need for de hors evidence to substantiate my ineffective assistance claims "and evidence of alleged conflict of interest might be found in attorney-client correspondence or other documents that, in the typical criminal trial, are not introduced" *Billy-Eko v. United States*, 8 F.3d 111, 114 n.9-10. Nevertheless, the State's attorney who tried Mr. Dodson's case was designated to resolve claims the trial court conceded were "controverted and unresolved issues of fact", An affidavit based on opinions, speculation, conclusory allegations ^{and} ~~not supported by any evidence de hors or documentary~~ were submitted to ^{the} trial court as ~~factual~~ findings are the court

this petition, or such other period as the Court deems appropriate. Petitioner asserts that good cause exist for the requested extension, petitioner's unit of confinement is presently subject to a lockdown, it was unforeseeable, but in times past have lasted up to 30 days; it began September 10, 2026. Nevertheless, the lockdown has substantially restricted petitioner's meaningful access to the institutions law library, and other legal resources necessary to complete my research, and prepare to finalize a petition for writ of certiorari. Despite these restrictions, petitioner has been working diligently, and has not abandoned, or delayed his efforts to seek review. The circumstances affecting petitioner's access to legal material are beyond his control. The lockdown has nevertheless materially impaired his ability to conduct the legal research necessary to present the questions for review accurately, and concisely, and to complete the petition in compliance with the Court's requirements.

The petitioner respectfully submits the requested extension, and asserts it is necessary

to ensure that petitioner has a meaningful opportunity to and file his petition. Petitioner is proceeding in good-faith, and intends to file the petition as promptly, as reasonably possible once meaningful access to the necessary legal resources is restored. Accordingly, petitioner respectfully request that the Court grant this motion for extension of time, and extend the September 26, 2026, deadline for filing the petition for writ of certiorari.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the under signed swear under perjury of law, that all the information in this motion is true, and correct.

Carnell Louis Dodson #02261564
Pro-Se petitioner

Carnell Louis Dodson
O.B. Ellis Unit
1697 FM 980 Rd.

Huntsville, TX. 77343

(4)



United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-40780

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 26, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

CARNELL LOUIS DODSON,

Petitioner—Appellant,

versus

ERIC GUERRERO, *Director,*
Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division,

Respondent—Appellee.

Application for Certificate of Appealability
The United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:22-CV-287

UNPUBLISHED ORDER

Before SMITH, HIGGINSON, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

Carnell Dodson, Texas prisoner #2261564, moves for a certificate of appealability (“COA”) to appeal the denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 application challenging his 35-year sentence for aggravated robbery. Dodson contends that he was denied effective assistance of counsel and that the prosecutor violated his due process rights by not providing notice of intent to intro-

No. 25-40780

duce extraneous offense evidence during sentencing. Dodson also challenges the denial of an evidentiary hearing.

To obtain a COA, Dodson must make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). Where, as here, the district court has rejected a claim on the merits, an applicant “must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

Dodson has not made the requisite showing. *See id.* Accordingly, the motion for a COA is DENIED. Because Dodson fails to make the necessary showing for the issuance of a COA, we do not reach whether the district court erred in denying an evidentiary hearing. *See United States v. Davis*, 971 F.3d 524, 534–35 (5th Cir. 2020).