

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

Anica Ashbourne,
Applicant,
v.

Donna Hansberry, Global High Wealth, U.S. Dept. of the Treasury, *et al.*,
Respondents.

**APPLICATION FOR A 60-DAY EXTENSION OF TIME
WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

TO THE HONORABLE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c) and Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.2 of the Rules of this Court, Applicant Anica Ashbourne respectfully applies for an order extending by 60 days the time within which she may file a petition for a writ of certiorari. The present deadline is October 6, 2026. Applicant requests an extension to and including December 7, 2026.

1. The judgment for which review is sought was entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Anica Ashbourne v. Donna Hansberry, Donna Prestia, Thomas Collins, Thomas Harker, et al.*, No. 25-5146, arising from United States District Court for the District of Columbia Case No. 1:17-cv-00752-LLA. Applicant timely sought rehearing, and the court of appeals denied the petition for rehearing on July 8, 2026. A copy of the court of appeals' judgment and opinion is attached as Appendix A. A copy of the July 8, 2026 order denying rehearing is attached as Appendix B.



2. This Court will have jurisdiction over a timely filed petition for a writ of certiorari under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

3. Under Rules 13.1 and 13.3, the time for filing a petition for a writ of certiorari following the denial of a timely petition for rehearing is 90 days from the date of entry of the order denying rehearing. Under Rule 30.1, the day of the act or event from which the designated period begins to run is not included in the computation. Because the D.C. Circuit denied Applicant's timely petition for rehearing on July 8, 2026, the current deadline for filing a petition for a writ of certiorari is October 6, 2026.

4. This application is being filed on September 25, 2026, more than 10 days before the current filing deadline. See S. Ct. R. 13.5.

5. Good cause exists for the requested extension. This case presents multiple claims and important federal questions requiring careful review and analysis. Applicant needs additional time to review the record below and prepare a petition that warrants this Court's consideration.

6. Applicant also is litigating a matter in a Maryland circuit court. That concurrent litigation requires substantial attention to pleadings and litigation deadlines. The requested extension will allow Applicant to devote the necessary time to preparing the proposed certiorari petition while continuing to meet her obligations in the Maryland proceeding.

7. The requested extension is sought in good faith and not for purposes of delay.

CONCLUSION

Applicant Anica Ashbourne respectfully requests that the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari be extended by 60 days, to and including **Monday, December 7, 2026**.

Respectfully submitted,



Anica Ashbourne
Pro se Applicant

7422 Drumlea Road
Capitol Heights, MD 20743
taxatty_2000@yahoo.com
(240) 788-7712
Dated: September 25, 2026

APPENDIX A

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5136

September Term, 2025

1:21-cv-01313-LLA

Filed On: December 4, 2025

Anica Ashbourne,

Appellant

v.

Donna Hansberry, Global High Wealth, U.S.
Dept. of the Treasury, et al.,

Appellees

No. 25-5146

1:17-cv-00752-LLA

Anica Ashbourne,

Appellant

v.

Donna Hansberry, Director, Global High
Wealth, et al.,

Appellees

BEFORE: Henderson, Wilkins, and Pan, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motions for summary affirmance, the oppositions thereto, and the replies; the motions to strike the motions for summary affirmance and the oppositions to the motions to strike; and the motions to establish briefing schedules and to schedule oral arguments, it is

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5136

September Term, 2025

ORDERED that the motions to strike be denied. See Stabilisierungsfonds Fur Wein v. Kaiser Stuhl Wine Distributors Pty. Ltd., 647 F.2d 200, 201 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (per curiam). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motions for summary affirmance be granted. The merits of the parties' positions are so clear as to warrant summary action. See Taxpayers Watchdog, Inc. v. Stanley, 819 F.2d 294, 297 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam).

In each case, appellant's claims against the Department of Treasury appellees fail based on res judicata. See Ashbourne v. Hansberry, 894 F.3d 298, 302–03 (D.C. Cir. 2018). Although appellant seeks to avoid res judicata by claiming a fraud on the court in the earlier litigation, she has not met "the high threshold for showing" such a fraud. In re Sealed Case (Bowles), 624 F.3d 482, 489 n.4 (D.C. Cir. 2010); see Baltia Air Lines, Inc. v. Transaction Mgmt., Inc., 98 F.3d 640, 642–43 (D.C. Cir. 1996).

In No. 25-5146, the district court correctly rejected appellant's claims against the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") appellees. To start, because the Privacy Act does not authorize claims against individual DHS employees, the district court properly dismissed those claims. See Martinez v. Bureau of Prisons, 444 F.3d 620, 624 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (per curiam). With respect to appellant's Privacy Act challenge to the accuracy of DHS's letter and enclosed summary of charges, the district court correctly granted summary judgment to DHS because those documents reflected permissible subjective judgments based on appellant's own statements. See Mueller v. Winter, 485 F.3d 1191, 1197 (D.C. Cir. 2007). Similarly, as to appellant's Privacy Act challenge to DHS's disclosure of records, the district court rightly granted summary judgment to DHS because DHS disclosed appellant's records "for a routine use." 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)(3); see Ames v. DHS, 861 F.3d 238, 240 (D.C. Cir. 2017). Next, the district court correctly dismissed appellant's due-process claim based on the DHS appellees' alleged deprivation of her interests in Ashbourne & Company because appellant offered only a "naked assertion[]" devoid of "further factual enhancement." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 557 (2007)). Lastly, even assuming that appellant had a protected liberty or property interest in her employment, the district court rightly granted summary judgment to the DHS appellees as to that claim because they afforded her adequate process by providing her with "notice of the charges and an opportunity to refute them effectively." McCormick v. D.C., 752 F.3d 980, 989 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5136

September Term, 2025

In No. 25-5136, the district court correctly dismissed appellant's claims against the DHS appellees either for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction or for failure to state a claim. Because 42 U.S.C. § 1985 does not clearly waive the United States' sovereign immunity, the district court lacked jurisdiction over appellant's § 1985 claims against the DHS appellees in their official capacities. See 42 U.S.C. § 1985; Dep't of Agric. Rural Dev. Rural Hous. Serv. v. Kirtz, 601 U.S. 42, 48–49 (2024); Clark v. Libr. of Cong., 750 F.2d 89, 103 (D.C. Cir. 1984). As to appellant's § 1985 claims against some of the DHS appellees in their individual capacities, she failed to plausibly plead that the DHS appellees “conspired—that is, reached an agreement”—to engage in any prohibited conduct. Ziglar v. Abbasi, 582 U.S. 120, 154 (2017); see 42 U.S.C. § 1985. Moreover, appellant's § 1985(3) claims fail for the additional reason that she may not invoke that provision “to redress violations of Title VII.” Great Am. Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Novotny, 442 U.S. 366, 378 (1979). Because appellant's § 1985 claims fail, so do her claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1986. See Bowie v. Maddox, 642 F.3d 1122, 1128 (D.C. Cir. 2011). With respect to appellant's claims against the DHS appellees under the Civil Rights Act of 1866, the Fifth Amendment, and the Thirteenth Amendment, Title VII “provides the exclusive judicial remedy for claims of discrimination in federal employment.” Brown v. Gen. Servs. Admin., 425 U.S. 820, 835 (1976); see Ethnic Emps. of Libr. of Cong. v. Boorstin, 751 F.2d 1405, 1415 (D.C. Cir. 1985). As for appellant's Title VII claims, she may not pursue such claims against the DHS appellees in their individual capacities. See Gary v. Long, 59 F.3d 1391, 1399 (D.C. Cir. 1995). Furthermore, appellant forfeited her Title VII claim of race discrimination by failing to respond to appellees' argument that she conceded to the dismissal of that claim. See Eagle Pharms., Inc. v. Azar, 952 F.3d 323, 340–41 (D.C. Cir. 2020). Lastly, appellant failed to plausibly plead her claim of sex discrimination. See Shanks v. Int'l Union of Bricklayers & Allied Craftworkers, 134 F.4th 585, 596–97 (D.C. Cir. 2025).

As to appellant's motion in each case to recuse the district court judge, the district court correctly denied those motions because they rested exclusively on the district court's judicial rulings. See Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994). Finally, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying appellant's motion in each case to alter or amend the judgment. See Morrissey v. Mayorkas, 17 F.4th 1150, 1158 (D.C. Cir. 2021). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motions to establish briefing schedules and to schedule oral arguments be dismissed as moot.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5136

September Term, 2025

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

APPENDIX B

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5136

September Term, 2025

1:21-cv-01313-LLA

Filed On: July 8, 2026

Anica Ashbourne,

Appellant

v.

Donna Hansberry, Global High Wealth, U.S.
Dept. of the Treasury, et al.,

Appellees

No. 25-5146

1:17-cv-00752-LLA

Anica Ashbourne,

Appellant

v.

Donna Hansberry, Director, Global High
Wealth, et al.,

Appellees

BEFORE: Henderson, Wilkins, and Pan, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petitions for rehearing, it is

ORDERED that the petitions be denied.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/
Lillian Wright
Deputy Clerk

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Anica Ashbourne, declare under penalty of perjury that on Friday, September 25, 2026, I served by first-class mail a true and correct copy of the foregoing Application for a 60-Day Extension of Time Within Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, including the attached appendices, on:

Counsel of record for Respondents (representing the federal agencies and the federal employees):

Sam Escher
Assistant United States Attorney
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530
sam.escher@usdoj.gov
(202) 252-2531

Solicitor General of the United States
Room 5616
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 25, 2026.



Anica Ashbourne
Pro se Applicant

7422 Drumlea Road
Capitol Heights, MD 20743
taxatty_2000@yahoo.com
(240) 788-7712