

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LISA MARIE PEREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA; MIKE PALLARES; and LAVELLE PARKER,

Respondents.


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

To the Honorable Elena Kagan, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit Justice for the Ninth Circuit:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 13.5 and 30, Petitioner Lisa Marie Perez respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time, to and including February 22, 2027, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the September 25, 2026 order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Case No. 25-5877. Without an extension, the 90-day period for filing the petition is expected to expire on December 24, 2026. The jurisdiction of this Court would be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

1. The judgment or order sought to be reviewed is the Ninth Circuit's September 25, 2026 order denying Petitioner's motions for reconsideration and reconsideration en banc in Case No. 25-5877. The Ninth Circuit's order states that the motions were deemed timely filed and were denied, denied the remaining motions, and stated that the Court would not entertain further filings in the closed case.

2. The September 25 order followed the Ninth Circuit's April 28, 2026 order denying Petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability. Petitioner did not receive the April 28 order when it was entered.



3. The record establishes that Petitioner filed a Notice of Change of Address with the Ninth Circuit on March 19, 2026, and that the change was entered by the Clerk on March 20, 2026. Thus, the Court had the updated address before the April 28 order was entered.

4. Petitioner did not receive the April 28 order or notice of its entry at that time. Petitioner later received the denial notice at her General Delivery address on August 10, 2026. Petitioner promptly contacted the Ninth Circuit Clerk to request information concerning the date, method, and address used to serve the April 28 order, including any mailing or service record.

5. On August 18, 2026, Petitioner filed a motion asking the Ninth Circuit to accept her petition for panel rehearing out of time and simultaneously sought panel rehearing of the April 28 order. Petitioner explained that she was not claiming that the rehearing deadline automatically restarted; rather, she asked the Court to consider the lack of notice and the circumstances of service as good cause for permitting the filing.

6. The Ninth Circuit subsequently deemed Petitioner's reconsideration motions timely filed and denied them on September 25, 2026. Petitioner therefore now seeks to preserve her opportunity to invoke this Court's jurisdiction while she prepares a petition for a writ of certiorari.

7. Good cause exists for the requested extension. Petitioner is proceeding pro se. The procedural history has been complicated by the failure to receive timely notice of the April 28 disposition despite the filing and entry of a change of address before that order was entered. Petitioner acted promptly after learning of the order, sought information from the Clerk, and pursued reconsideration in the Ninth Circuit. The Ninth Circuit's September 25 order expressly deemed the reconsideration motions timely filed.

8. The requested extension will allow Petitioner sufficient time to prepare a complete petition addressing the federal constitutional issues presented by the case, including the issues concerning the trial record and the audiovisual evidence that Petitioner has sought to obtain and preserve in the Ninth Circuit. Petitioner is not seeking an extension to delay the proceedings; she seeks sufficient time to prepare the petition after the unusual notice and procedural circumstances described above.

9. Supreme Court Rule 13.5 permits a Justice, for good cause, to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari for a period not exceeding 60 days. Petitioner therefore requests the full 60-day extension, through February 22, 2027.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner Lisa Marie Perez respectfully requests that the Court grant this Application and extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in Ninth Circuit Case No. 25-5877 to and including February 22, 2027.

Respectfully submitted,



LISA MARIE PEREZ

Petitioner, Pro Se

General Delivery

Oroville, California 95965

Date: October 1, 2026

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Lisa Marie Perez, certify that on October 1, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Application to Extend the Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, together with the accompanying materials, upon counsel for Respondents at the address reflected in the Ninth Circuit record, by United States Mail, postage prepaid.

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

Executed on October 1, 2026, at Oroville, California.



LISA MARIE PEREZ

Petitioner, Pro Se

PROPOSED EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY APPLICATION

Exhibit A — September 25, 2026 Ninth Circuit order denying reconsideration/reconsideration en banc.

Exhibit B — April 28, 2026 Ninth Circuit order denying certificate of appealability. (not available/unavailable at time of filing)

Exhibit C — Ninth Circuit docket showing the March 19, 2026 Notice of Change of Address and March 20, 2026 docket entry.

Exhibit D — August 18, 2026 Motion to Accept Petition for Panel Rehearing Out of Time and Petition for Panel Rehearing, including declaration concerning actual receipt on August 10, 2026.

Exhibit E — August 18, 2026 Request for Information Regarding Service of April 28, 2026 Order.

EXHIBIT

A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

SEP 25 2026

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

LISA MARIE PEREZ, FKA Lisa Marie
Belyew,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA; et al.,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 25-5877

D.C. No.

2:19-cv-00294-DAD-AC

Eastern District of California,

Sacramento

ORDER

Before: MILLER and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

The motions (Docket Entry Nos. 12, 16) for reconsideration and reconsideration en banc are deemed timely filed and are denied. *See* 9th Cir. R. 27-10; 9th Cir. Gen. Ord. 6.11.

All remaining motions are denied.

This court will not entertain further filings in this closed case.

EXHIBIT B

(not available/unavailable at time of filing)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 28 2026

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

LISA MARIE PEREZ, FKA Lisa Marie
Belyew,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA; et al.,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 25-5877

D.C. No.

2:19-cv-00294-DAD-AC

Eastern District of California,
Sacramento

ORDER

Before: TALLMAN and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

The request for a certificate of appealability (Docket Entry Nos. 3 & 5) is denied because appellant has not made a “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *see also Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003).

Any pending motions are denied as moot.

DENIED.

EXHIBIT

C

PUBLIC DOCKET FOR

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Court of Appeals Docket #: 25-5877

Docketed: 09/18/2025

Case Name: Perez v. People of the State of California, et al.

Status: Closed

Nature of Suit: 3530 Habeas Corpus

Appeal From: Sacramento, Eastern California

Fee Status: IFP

Case Type Information

1. Prisoner
2. Private
3. 2254 Habeas Corpus

Originating Court Information

District: Eastern District of California: 2:19-cv-00294-DAD-AC

Trial Judge: Dale A. Drozd, District Judge

Date Filed: 02/11/2019

Date Order/Judgment	Date Order/Judgment EOD	Date NOA Filed	Date Rec'd COA
09/10/2025	09/10/2025	09/15/2025	09/16/2025

Associated Cases

Role (To)	Case Number (Connected To)	Connected To	Starting	Ending
Prior-Rel	24-3784	Perez v. Core	09/18/2025	
Related	24-1329	Perez v. Lorman, et al.	09/18/2025	
Prior-Rel	24-129	Perez v. Moreland, et al.	09/18/2025	
Prior-Rel	24-3966	Perez v. Parker	09/18/2025	
Prior-Rel	25-4026	Perez v. United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, Sacramento	09/18/2025	
Prior-Rel	24-2943	Perez v. USDC, Sacramento	09/18/2025	

Party and Attorney Listing

LISA MARIE PEREZ
 FKA Lisa Marie Belyew,
 Petitioner - Appellant

Lisa Marie Perez
 [Pro Se]
 General Delivery
 Oroville, CA 95965

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 Respondent - Appellee

Justain P. Riley, Deputy Attorney General
 Email: justain.riley@doj.ca.gov
 [Government]
 AGCA-Office of the California Attorney General
 1300 I Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

MIKE PALLARES
 Respondent - Appellee

Justain P. Riley, Deputy Attorney General
 Email: justain.riley@doj.ca.gov
 [Government]
 AGCA-Office of the California Attorney General
 1300 I Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

LAVELLE PARKER, Warden
 Respondent - Appellee

Justain P. Riley, Deputy Attorney General
 Email: justain.riley@doj.ca.gov
 [Government]
 AGCA-Office of the California Attorney General
 1300 I Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

LISA MARIE PEREZ, FKA Lisa Marie Belyew,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA; MIKE PALLARES; LAVELLE PARKER, Warden,

Respondents - Appellees.

Docket

LEGEND:
(R) - Restricted Document
(L) - Locked Document

Date Filed	Entry #	Public Docket Text
09/18/2025	1	CASE OPENED. A copy of your notice of appeal / petition filed in 2:19-cv-00294-DAD-AC has been received in the Clerk's office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The U.S. Court of Appeals docket number 25-5877 has been assigned to this case. All communications with the court must indicate this Court of Appeals docket number. Please carefully review the docket to ensure the name(s) and contact information are correct. It is your responsibility to alert the court if your contact information changes. Resources Available For more information about case processing and to assist you in preparing your brief, please review the Case Opening Information (for <u>attorneys</u> and <u>pro se litigants</u>) and review the <u>Appellate Practice Guide</u> . Attorneys should consider contacting the court's <u>Appellate Mentoring Program</u> for help with the brief and argument. [Entered: 09/18/2025 11:38 AM]
09/18/2025	2	COA SCHEDULE NOTICE. Needs a certificate of appealability. Date COA denied in DC: 09/10/2025. [Entered: 09/18/2025 11:43 AM]
09/19/2025	3	MOTION for Certificate of Appealability filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 09/19/2025 02:18 PM]
09/29/2025	4	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT pursuant to FRAP 26.1 and CR 26.1-1 filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 09/29/2025 03:29 PM]
12/23/2025	5	SUPPLEMENT to to Motion or Response to Motion filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez.[COURT ENTERED-From case 25-4026] [Entered: 01/12/2026 04:10 PM]
03/19/2026	6	NOTICE of change of address filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 03/20/2026 10:02 AM]
04/28/2026	7	ORDER FILED. Richard C. TALLMAN, Milan D. SMITH, Jr. The request for a certificate of appealability (Docket Entry Nos. 3 & 5) is denied because appellant has not made a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); see also Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003). Any pending motions are denied as moot. DENIED. [Entered: 04/28/2026 10:44 AM]
08/07/2026	8	MOTION to Supplement or Correct Record filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 08/11/2026 07:51 AM]

Date Filed	Entry #	Public Docket Text
08/07/2026	9	REQUEST for Public Information filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 08/11/2026 07:57 AM]
08/11/2026	10	DOCUMENT SENT. Sent Appellant a copy of the docket sheet in response to the request filed on 08/07/2026. [Entered: 08/11/2026 08:48 AM]
08/21/2026	11	CORRESPONDENCE filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 08/21/2026 03:14 PM]
08/21/2026	12	MOTION to Reconsider Dispositive Order filed by Appellant Lisa Marie Perez. [Entered: 08/21/2026 03:23 PM]

Docket as of 8/24/2026 2:39 PM

EXHIBIT

D

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-5877

LISA MARIE PEREZ,

FKA LISA MARIE BELYEW,

Petitioner–Appellant,

v.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA;

MIKE PALLARES; and LAVELLE PARKER,

Respondents–Appellees.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING OUT OF TIME AND
PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING OF APRIL 28, 2026 ORDER DENYING
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

Petitioner Lisa Marie Perez, formerly Lisa Marie Belyew, proceeding pro se, respectfully moves for relief from the filing deadline and simultaneously petitions for panel rehearing/reconsideration of the Court’s April 28, 2026 order denying a certificate of appealability (“COA”).

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner is not asking the Court to treat the April 28, 2026 rehearing deadline as automatically restarted. She recognizes **that Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 40** ordinarily establishes a 14-day period for a petition for rehearing. **See Fed. R. App. P. 40(d)(1)**. She is asking the Court to exercise its authority to permit the filing now because she did not receive the April 28 order when it was entered and therefore did not know that the order had been entered or that a rehearing deadline had begun to run.

The Ninth Circuit docket shows that Petitioner filed a notice of change of address on March 19, 2026, entered by the Clerk on March 20, 2026. The same docket then records the April 28, 2026 order denying the COA. The docket copy presently in Petitioner's possession does not show a service date for the April 28 order. See Ninth Circuit docket, **Case No. 25-5877**. Petitioner has separately written the Clerk requesting confirmation of when and how the April 28 order was served. She files this motion now rather than waiting for that response, so that the Court is promptly placed on notice of the problem and of her request for relief.

Petitioner asks the Court to accept the accompanying petition for panel rehearing, or alternatively to hold the petition in abeyance pending the Clerk's response concerning service of the April 28 order.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. The Ninth Circuit opened **Case No. 25-5877** on September 18, 2025 from Petitioner's Eastern District of California habeas proceeding. The docket states that the appeal required a certificate of appealability.
2. Petitioner filed her Motion for Certificate of Appealability on September 19, 2025. She later filed a supplement to that motion on December 23, 2025; the docket reflects that the supplement was entered in January 2026

as a court-entered filing from related **Case No. 25-4026**.

3. On March 19, 2026, Petitioner filed a Notice of Change of Address. The docket reflects entry of the change on March 20, 2026.

4. On April 28, 2026, Judges Richard C. Tallman and Milan D. Smith, Jr. entered an order stating that the request for a certificate of appealability was denied because Petitioner had not made a “**substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right,**” citing **28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2)** and **Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003)**. The order also denied the pending motions as moot.

5. Petitioner did not receive the April 28 order when it was entered. She learned of the denial only when the notice was later received in the mail in August 2026. Petitioner received the April 28, 2026 denial notice at her General Delivery address on August 10, 2026.

6. After learning of the disposition, Petitioner promptly sought information from the Clerk concerning the service of the April 28 order. Her request asks the Clerk to identify whether and when the order was served and to whom it was sent. Petitioner is filing this motion before receiving the Clerk’s response so that she does not further delay seeking relief.

II. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO PERMIT THE FILING

7. **Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26(b)** provides that, for good cause, the Court may extend a time prescribed by the rules or permit an act to be done after the time has expired. **Fed. R. App. P. 26(b)**. Petitioner does not contend that the Court must find that the deadline restarted merely because she lacked actual notice. She asks the Court to determine whether the circumstances shown here constitute good cause for permitting the filing.

8. The circumstances are unusual and outside Petitioner’s control. The docket shows that Petitioner supplied an updated address before the April

28 order was entered. She states under penalty of perjury that she did not receive the order when it was entered and did not know that the Court had denied the COA until she later received notice in the mail.

9. **Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 45(c)** provides that, upon entry of an order or judgment, the circuit clerk must immediately serve notice of entry on each party and note the date of service on the docket. Petitioner therefore respectfully requests that the Court consider the Clerk's service record when deciding this motion.

10. Petitioner has acted promptly after obtaining actual notice. She has not deliberately ignored a known deadline. The purpose of this motion is to preserve her opportunity to ask the panel to reconsider the April 28 disposition while the Clerk's service information is being obtained.

11. Denying the motion without considering the notice circumstances would create a substantial risk that Petitioner loses her only opportunity for panel reconsideration based upon a deadline of which she says she had no actual notice. Petitioner respectfully submits that allowing the filing will not prejudice Respondents, who will have the opportunity to respond if the Court requests a response.

III. THE APRIL 28 ORDER SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED

12. **Circuit Rule 27-10** requires a request for reconsideration to state with particularity the points of law or fact that the Court overlooked or misunderstood. Petitioner respectfully identifies the following points for reconsideration. She does not ask the panel to reweigh the entire state-court record. She asks the panel to consider whether the record, viewed under the COA standard, permits reasonable jurists to debate the constitutional claims.

13. **First**, the record presents a substantial constitutional question concerning the length and circumstances of the criminal proceedings and

Petitioner's repeated assertions that the proceedings were delayed beyond the ordinary speedy-trial period. Petitioner's written materials identify substantial periods of delay and contend that the delay caused loss of witnesses, loss or destruction of evidence, and impairment of her ability to defend herself. The materials submitted to the Court also identify the Colusa proceedings and the transfer of Petitioner between counties. These issues are supported by the underlying state-court records.

14. **Second**, the record presents substantial questions concerning suppression and involuntary statements. Petitioner's state-court filings asserted that statements attributed to the alleged victim were obtained under circumstances involving coercion, medical sedation, and alleged threats, and that other statements were used against her. Her February 2018 written motion specifically argued that the statements were involuntary and sought suppression under the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments. The record also contains the supporting factual allegations and authorities. See Petitioner's February 2018 suppression materials.

15. **Third**, the record presents substantial questions concerning exculpatory evidence and disclosure. Petitioner repeatedly sought law-enforcement records and other evidence, including records relating to the prosecution's investigation. The Colusa clerk's record indexes multiple motions to compel law-enforcement records, motions concerning disclosure/preservation of exculpatory evidence, and related prosecution responses. Those filings demonstrate that the discovery issues were not merely conclusory allegations.

16. **Fourth**, Petitioner raised allegations of prosecutorial misconduct and asserted that evidence was withheld, altered, lost, destroyed, or not preserved. Her written federal materials identified Brady and due-process concerns and asserted that the withheld or missing evidence could have affected the defense. The state record contains motions and proceedings addressing disclosure and preservation of evidence. The COA question is whether reasonable jurists could debate the constitutional claim, not

whether Petitioner has already proved the ultimate merits of the claim.

17. **Fifth**, Petitioner raised a constitutional claim concerning her ability to testify and the effectiveness of trial and appellate counsel. Her written materials identify the denial of the right to testify and ineffective assistance of standby/trial counsel and appellate counsel. The underlying record contains repeated disputes about representation, requests for substitution of counsel, and Petitioner's efforts to represent herself.

18. **Sixth**, Petitioner raised cumulative-error and due-process arguments. Her written materials assert that the combined effect of the alleged evidentiary, discovery, counsel, trial, and sentencing errors deprived her of a fundamentally fair proceeding. Even if individual errors were viewed separately as insufficient, the Court should consider whether reasonable jurists could debate the combined constitutional effect.

19. The Court's April 28 order states only that Petitioner failed to make a "**substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.**" The order does not identify which of the constitutional issues presented in Petitioner's COA materials failed the COA standard or explain why reasonable jurists could not debate the district court's disposition. Petitioner respectfully requests reconsideration so the panel can evaluate the particular constitutional issues against the full record and the arguments actually presented.

20. The Supreme Court has explained that a COA inquiry is a threshold inquiry and that a petitioner need not establish that she will ultimately prevail. **Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336–37 (2003)**. The question is whether reasonable jurists could debate whether the petition should have been resolved differently or whether the issues deserve encouragement to proceed further. **Id. at 336.**

21. Petitioner therefore respectfully asks the panel to reconsider the COA denial in light of the specific record-supported constitutional issues identified above and the full state-court record now assembled.

IV. REQUEST CONCERNING THE CLERK'S SERVICE RECORD

22. Petitioner has requested from the Clerk confirmation of the date and method by which the April 28 order was served. Petitioner respectfully asks that the Court either (a) accept this petition now and permit the Clerk's response to be filed or considered as supplemental information, or (b) hold this motion and petition in abeyance for a short period pending the Clerk's response.

23. Petitioner further asks that, if the Court concludes that additional procedural relief is required because the ordinary rehearing period expired before she received notice, the Court identify the appropriate procedure or grant such relief as the Court is authorized to provide under the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Ninth Circuit Rules.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner Lisa Marie Perez respectfully requests that the Court:

- (1) accept this motion and accompanying petition for panel rehearing notwithstanding the elapsed ordinary filing period, based upon the lack-of-notice circumstances and good cause;
- (2) alternatively, hold the filing in abeyance pending the Clerk's response concerning service of the April 28, 2026 order;
- (3) reconsider the April 28, 2026 order denying a certificate of appealability;
- (4) grant a certificate of appealability as to the substantial constitutional issues identified in Petitioner's COA materials, or otherwise provide the relief the Court deems appropriate; and

(5) grant any other relief necessary to prevent manifest prejudice resulting from Petitioner's lack of notice of the April 28 disposition.

DECLARATION OF LISA MARIE PEREZ

I, Lisa Marie Perez, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the following is true and correct:

1. I am the Petitioner–Appellant in **Case No. 25-5877**.
2. I filed a Notice of Change of Address with the Ninth Circuit on March 19, 2026, and the docket reflects entry of that change on March 20, 2026.
3. I did not receive the Ninth Circuit's April 28, 2026 order denying my request for a certificate of appealability when it was entered.
4. I did not know that the Court had entered the April 28 order until I later received notice in the mail in August 2026.
5. I actually received the denial notice at my General Delivery address on August 10, 2026.
6. After learning of the denial, I promptly sought confirmation from the Clerk concerning when and how the April 28 order was served. I am filing this motion while awaiting that information so that I do not further delay seeking relief.
7. I am not claiming that the rehearing deadline automatically restarted. I am asking the Court to consider the lack of notice and the circumstances surrounding service when deciding whether to permit this filing.

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

Executed on August 18, 2026, at Oroville, California.



LISA MARIE PEREZ

Petitioner–Appellant, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on August 18, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Accept Petition for Panel Rehearing Out of Time and Petition for Panel Rehearing, together with any attachments, on counsel for Respondents by the method permitted by the Ninth Circuit and reflected in the attached proof of service.



LISA MARIE PEREZ

Petitioner–Appellant, Pro Se

EXHIBIT

E

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

LISA MARIE PEREZ,

Case No.: 25-5877

Petitioner,

v.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Respondents.

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE OF APRIL 28, 2026
ORDER**

To the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit:

I am the pro se Petitioner in the above-captioned matter. I am writing to request information concerning the Court's April 28, 2026 Order denying my request for a Certificate of Appealability.

The docket in this case reflects that on March 19, 2026, I filed a Notice of Change of Address, which was entered by the Court on March 20, 2026. The docket thereafter reflects that on April 28, 2026, the Court entered an Order denying my request for a certificate of appealability and denying the pending motions as moot.

I did not receive a copy of the April 28, 2026 Order when it was entered. I did not receive notice from the Court that my request for a Certificate of Appealability had been denied.

I have only recently learned that the April 28, 2026 Order had been entered.

Because I did not receive the Court's notice of the April 28, 2026 Order, I respectfully request that the Clerk's Office provide me with the following information:

- 1.The date on which the April 28, 2026 Order was served on me.
- 2.The method by which the April 28, 2026 Order was served on me, including whether it was mailed, electronically served, or served by another method.
- 3.The mailing address or electronic address to which the April 28, 2026 Order was sent.
- 4.A copy of any notice of entry, certificate of service, mailing record, or other record showing service of the April 28, 2026 Order upon me.
- 5.Whether the April 28, 2026 Order was returned to the Court as undeliverable or otherwise returned by the postal service.
- 6.If the Order was mailed, the date on which it was mailed and, if available, any record identifying the address to which it was mailed.
- 7.Whether the Court's docket contains a separate service entry or notation concerning service of the April 28, 2026 Order that is not

reflected in the docket report currently available to me.

8. Whether a mandate has issued in Case No. 25-5877 and, if so, the date on which the mandate issued.

I am making this request because I did not receive notice of the April 28, 2026 Order at the time it was entered, and I need to determine when and how the Order was served so that I can understand the status of my case and determine what procedural steps may be available to me.

I respectfully ask that the Clerk's Office provide the requested service information and copies of any available records relating to service of the April 28, 2026 Order.

Thank you for your assistance.

Date: August 18, 2026

Respectfully submitted,



LISA MARIE PEREZ

Pro Se Petitioner

General Delivery

Oroville, CA 95965

Case No. 25-5877