No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRENDAN RICHARDSON

Applicants,

vs.

MEGNUTT ENTERPRISES, INC., et al.

Respondent,

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

Brendan Richardson, pro se
8405 SW 182nd Terrace
Palmetto Bay, FL 33157
(323) 794-8380
Forbes@BrendanForbes.com

RECEIVED
OCT 27 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

To the Honorable Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court and Circuit Justice for the Eleventh Circuit:

Applicant-Counter-Defendant, BRENDAN RICHARDSON ("Richardson" or the "Applicant"), in *pro per,* respectfully requests an extension of time to file a petition for writ of certiorari ("Petition"). Sup. Ct. R. 13.5.

The earliest deadline for the Applicant to file his Petition is Wednesday, October 21, 2026, which is ninety days from July 23, 2026, the date when the Florida Supreme Court issued its Opinion and Order denying the Writ of Mandamus that the Applicant filed with the Florida Supreme Court that sought to compel the Florida Third District Court of Appeal (the "Third DCA") to revisit the Applicant's appeal and find that the trial court in the Eleventh Judicial Circuit Court in and for Miami-Dade County violated the Applicant's due process, among other constitutional rights.

For good cause set forth herein, the Applicant ask that this deadline be extended by sixty (60) days so that the new deadline would be Sunday, December 20, 2026, or alternatively Monday, December 21, 2026, if a Sunday deadline is invalid. This application was filed more than ten (10) days before the due date and thus is timely.

BACKGROUND AND OPINIONS BELOW

There are important questions, which were determined adversely by the Florida Supreme Court, which in essence affirmed the Third DCA's denial of the Applicant's appeal, which was based upon violations of the Applicant's due process

rights, rights to liberty, and other rights under the Constitution of the United States and the Florida Constitution.

The trial court case originally stemmed from a breach of contract claim that the Applicant filed against the Respondent but spiraled into a situation where a multi-million-dollar judgment was improperly and unjustly entered against the Applicant due to violations of his due process rights.

A flavor of this violation is as follows: on Friday, April 28, 2023, the Respondent filed a Motion for Sanctions based upon the failure of the Applicant to compel a non-party witness who was not a resident of Florida to attend a deposition, and for Entry of Default (the "Motion for Sanctions"). On Saturday, April 29, 2023, without holding a hearing on the Motion for Sanctions and without any notice to the Applicant, the Trial Court, entered an order granting the motion and the Applicant's Answer was "stricken, with prejudice," and "default [was] entered against [the Applicant] as to each count."

There are extremely important constitutional issues presented and the interplay with Fourteenth Amendment procedural and substantive due process violations involved. The validity of the claims herein involve important constitutional protections, namely due process, which were violated including the opportunity for notice and a hearing before taking away someone's life, liberty or property, and governmental interference. The Applicant's arguments to the Florida Supreme Court were primarily based upon authorities issued by the Florida Supreme Court; however, each of these cases rests on the long standing due process ideals and tenets

that have long been set forth by the United States Constitution, and the Applicant's constitutional arguments were not properly weighed by the Florida Supreme Court.

Attached hereto is a copy of the July 23, 2026, Opinion and Order from the Florida Supreme Court and the March 3, 2025 Mandate of the Third DCA.

JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

REASONS EXTENSION IS JUSTIFIED

Supreme Court Rule 13.5 provides that "[a]n application to extend the time to file shall set out the basis for jurisdiction in this Court, identify the judgment sought to be reviewed, include a copy of the opinion and any order respecting rehearing, and set out specific reasons why an extension of time is justified." Sup. Ct. R. 13.5. The specific reasons why an extension of time is justified are as follows:

1) I am currently representing myself in pro per and doing my best to properly file this application, but I have been in consultation with an attorney who I hope to be able to retain who will draft and file the actual Petition if this application is granted.

2) Even if I am unable to retain counsel, I intend to prepare the Petition on my own and I need the additional time to ensure that I familiarize myself and comply with the Rules of this Court.

3) I have been dealing with flu-like symptoms for the last few days and those

have left me feeling extremely run down, lethargic and exhausted. This state of being has not been conducive to enable me to research the issues and consult with attorneys, including the one that I hope to retain, at least not in a meaningful way.

4) The nature of my claims, while seemingly simple on their face have been convoluted and made complex due to the mass filings of the Respondent and its counsel. In order to properly layout my claims, I will need additional time to sort through the various pleadings and records.

5) Finally, there is no prejudice to the Respondent if this Application is granted; however, the Applicant shall be extremely prejudiced if it is denied.

Accordingly, good cause exists for the additional time that is needed to adequately prepare and file the Petition.

NOTICE TO OPPOSING COUNSEL

Alan Karten, attorney for respondent, has been notified of this Motion, and a copy was served on him at his address at the Law Office of Alan I. Karten, P.L.L.C., 321 Anderson Pond Road, Aiken, South Carolina 29803, on October 9, 2026, and again on October 21, 2026.

//

//

//

//

//

//

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing points and authorities, the Applicant respectfully requests that this Court grant this application for an extension of time to file a Petition.

Dated: October 9, 2026, and October 21, 2026

s/Brendan Richardson

Brendan Richardson, pro se
8405 SW 182nd Terrace
Palmetto Bay, FL 33157
(323) 794-8380
Forbes@BrendanForbes.com

Supreme Court of Florida

THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2026

Brendan Forbes, Inc., et al.,
Petitioner(s)
v.
Megnutt Enterprises, Inc., et al.,
Respondent(s)

SC2026-0350
Lower Tribunal No(s).:
3D2023-1067;
132022CA003460000001

Because Petitioners have failed to show a clear legal right to the relief requested, they are not entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, the petition for writ of mandamus is hereby denied. *See Huffman v. State*, 813 So. 2d 10, 11 (Fla. 2000). Respondent's "Motion to Dismiss the Petition for Writ of Mandamus, for Sanctions, and For Referral to The Florida Bar" is denied. Petitioners' Motion to Strike is denied. No motion for rehearing will be considered by the Court.

LABARGA, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur. TANENBAUM, J., would dismiss the petition as failing to state a preliminary basis for the requested writ.

A True Copy
Test:

SC2026-0350 7/23/2026

John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court
SC2026-0350 7/23/2026

LC

Served:
HON. BARBARA ARECES
3DCA CLERK
MIAMI-DADE CLERK
ALAN IRA KARTEN
ANDREW STEPHEN PRIESTLY WILLIAMS

M A N D A T E

from

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
THIRD DISTRICT

This cause having been brought to the Court by appeal, and after due consideration the Court having issued its Opinion,

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED that such further proceedings be had in said cause as may be in accordance with the opinion of this Court, and with the rules of procedure and laws of the State of Florida.

WITNESS the Honorable Thomas Logue, Chief Judge of the District Court of Appeal of the State of Florida, Third District, and seal of the said Court at Miami, Florida on this day.

DATE:	**March 3, 2025**
CASE NO.:	**3D2023-1067**
COUNTY OF ORIGIN:	**Miami-Dade County**
T.C. CASE NO.:	**22-3460**
STYLE:	**Brendan Forbes, Inc.,**
	Appellant(s),
	v.
	Megnutt Enterprises, Inc., et al.,
	Appellee(s).

3D2023-1067 March 3, 2025
Mercedes M. Prieto, Clerk
District Court of Appeal
Third District

ORIGINAL TO: Miami-Dade County Clerk

CC: Alan Ira Karten
Roberta Goodman Mandel
Andrew Stephen Priestly Williams