1OM13506824
United States Supreme Cou
Recipient:
Clerks Office
Sender:
Cooper Kaazimasad
Processed:
10/23/2026 1:33:52 PM | 668

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KAAZIM COOPER,
Applicant,

25-3024

v.

JUDGE ANNE SWERN, DETECTIVE BRENGIE VASQUEZ, FRANK BRYANT, JEAN PRISCO, JUDGE CURTIS FARBER, and THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Respondents.

APPLICATION TO THE HONORABLE SONIA SOTOMAYOR, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT, FOR A SIXTY-DAY EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

TO THE HONORABLE SONIA SOTOMAYOR, CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c), Supreme Court Rule 13.5, and Supreme Court Rule 22, Applicant Kaazim Cooper respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time to file his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this Court, up to and including **December 28, 2026**.

In support of this application, Applicant states as follows:

1. **Judgment Below:** The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit entered a summary order dismissing Applicant's appeal on May 14, 2026, and entered a formal order denying a timely Motion for Reconsideration on **July 29, 2026** (Circuit Docket No. 25-3024). Copies of these orders are attached hereto as Exhibits.
2. **Filing Deadline:** Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.1 and Rule 13.3, the original 90-day period within which Applicant must file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari runs strictly from the denial of reconsideration and expires on **October 27, 2026**. This application is submitted on October 23, 2026.

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

EXPLANATION OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES FOR SUBMISSION WITHIN THE TEN-DAY WINDOW

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.5, an application for an extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari passed to an individual Justice less than 10 days before the final filing date will not be granted except in "extraordinary circumstances." Applicant respectfully submits that profound, unyielding extraordinary circumstances exist to justify the granting of this application within the 10-day window:

1. **Active Parallel Litigation to Exhaust Lower Court Relief:** Applicant did not sit on his rights or cause unnecessary delay. Following the July 29, 2026 denial of reconsideration, Applicant immediately initiated active, emergency parallel litigation in the court below by filing a comprehensive Motion to Recall the Mandate to correct an unconscionable procedural shortcut and manifest injustice. The Second Circuit did not officially issue its final order denying that emergency motion until **September 15, 2026**. Because Applicant was under a good-faith belief that the lower court would exercise its inherent power to correct the record and avoid a structural breakdown of due process, he exhausted all available circuit remedies before presenting this controversy to this Court.
2. **Severe Pro Se and Indigent Litigation Barriers:** Applicant is a *pro se* and indigent litigant. He has recently relocated to a new address at **Path Forward, 2020A 14th Street, Arlington, Virginia 22201**. As a direct result of this relocation and transition, Applicant has faced severe operational barriers, including lack of immediate access to comprehensive federal legal research libraries, word processing equipment, and the printing machinery necessary to comply with the booklet mandates of Supreme Court Rule 33. It was structurally impossible for Applicant to prepare a formal, complex Petition for a Writ of Certiorari while navigating a physical relocation and awaiting the lower court's September 15 final order.

REASONS JUSTIFYING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Good cause exists for the requested 60-day extension of time due to the deep constitutional magnitude of the claims:

1. **Substantial Constitutional and Precedent Conflicts:** The underlying appeal involves nine deeply technical constitutional claims under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments that require extensive preparation to present properly to this Court. These include a clear conflict between the Second Circuit's unwritten

policy of "footnote summary dismissals" (violating ***Lucas v. Miles*, 83 F.3d 584 (2d Cir. 1996)** and ***Gomez v. USAA Federal Savings Bank*, 171 F.3d 794 (2d Cir. 1999)***) and the explicit procedural screening rules enforced by the D.C. and Fifth Circuits. Furthermore, the petition will address severe errors regarding entirely unsigned, altered search warrants under ***United States v. Voustianiouk*, 685 F.3d 206 (2d Cir. 2012)** and the hostile misapplication of the ***Parratt/Hudson*** doctrine to authorized state statutory actions in direct violation of ***Zinermon v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113 (1990)**.

2. **Protection Against a Condition of Servitude:** Applicant's petition will demonstrate that the lower courts' summary processes effectively stripped an indigent citizen of his legal personhood, creating a *Dred Scott* style vacuum where a citizen on parole can be subjected to warrantless digital searches and forced cell extractions without judicial review or an active civil remedy. Additional time is required to ensure that these vital civil liberties, statutory claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1584 and 241, and color-of-law issues are framed with absolute precision.

No party will be prejudiced by the granting of this short administrative extension.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Honorable Circuit Justice find that extraordinary circumstances exist and grant a 60-day extension of time, up to and including **December 28, 2026**, within which Applicant may file his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Dated: October 23, 2026
Respectfully submitted,

Kaazim Cooper, *Pro Se*
Path Forward
2020A 14th Street
Arlington, Virginia 22201

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kaazim Cooper, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on this 23rd day of October, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Application for Extension of Time upon the attorneys representing the Respondents by placing the same in a first-class, postpaid envelope addressed to the office of the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, 100 Church Street, New York, New York 10007.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KAAZIM COOPER,
Applicant,

v.

JUDGE ANNE SWERN, DETECTIVE BRENGIE VASQUEZ, FRANK BRYANT, JEAN PRISCO, JUDGE CURTIS FARBER, and THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Respondents.

APPLICATION TO THE HONORABLE SONIA SOTOMAYOR, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT, FOR A SIXTY-DAY EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

TO THE HONORABLE SONIA SOTOMAYOR, CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c), Supreme Court Rule 13.5, and Supreme Court Rule 22, Applicant Kaazim Cooper respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time to file his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this Court, up to and including **December 28, 2026**.

In support of this application, Applicant states as follows:

1. **Judgment Below:** The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit entered a summary order dismissing Applicant's appeal on May 14, 2026, and entered a formal order denying a timely Motion for Reconsideration on **July 29, 2026** (Circuit Docket No. 25-3024). Copies of these orders are attached hereto as Exhibits.
2. **Filing Deadline:** Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.1 and Rule 13.3, the original 90-day period within which Applicant must file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari runs strictly from the denial of reconsideration and expires on **October 27, 2026**. This application is submitted on October 23, 2026.

EXPLANATION OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES FOR SUBMISSION WITHIN THE TEN-DAY WINDOW

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.5, an application for an extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari passed to an individual Justice less than 10 days before the final filing date will not be granted except in "extraordinary circumstances." Applicant respectfully submits that profound, unyielding extraordinary circumstances exist to justify the granting of this application within the 10-day window:

1. **Active Parallel Litigation to Exhaust Lower Court Relief:** Applicant did not sit on his rights or cause unnecessary delay. Following the July 29, 2026 denial of reconsideration, Applicant immediately initiated active, emergency parallel litigation in the court below by filing a comprehensive Motion to Recall the Mandate to correct an unconscionable procedural shortcut and manifest injustice. The Second Circuit did not officially issue its final order denying that emergency motion until **September 15, 2026**. Because Applicant was under a good-faith belief that the lower court would exercise its inherent power to correct the record and avoid a structural breakdown of due process, he exhausted all available circuit remedies before presenting this controversy to this Court.
2. **Severe Pro Se and Indigent Litigation Barriers:** Applicant is a *pro se* and indigent litigant. He has recently relocated to a new address at **Path Forward, 2020A 14th Street, Arlington, Virginia 22201**. As a direct result of this relocation and transition, Applicant has faced severe operational barriers, including lack of immediate access to comprehensive federal legal research libraries, word processing equipment, and the printing machinery necessary to comply with the booklet mandates of Supreme Court Rule 33. It was structurally impossible for Applicant to prepare a formal, complex Petition for a Writ of Certiorari while navigating a physical relocation and awaiting the lower court's September 15 final order.

REASONS JUSTIFYING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Good cause exists for the requested 60-day extension of time due to the deep constitutional magnitude of the claims:

1. **Substantial Constitutional and Precedent Conflicts:** The underlying appeal involves nine deeply technical constitutional claims under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments that require extensive preparation to present properly to this Court. These include a clear conflict between the Second Circuit's unwritten

policy of "footnote summary dismissals" (violating ***Lucas v. Miles*, 83 F.3d 584 (2d Cir. 1996)** and ***Gomez v. USAA Federal Savings Bank*, 171 F.3d 794 (2d Cir. 1999)***) and the explicit procedural screening rules enforced by the D.C. and Fifth Circuits. Furthermore, the petition will address severe errors regarding entirely unsigned, altered search warrants under ***United States v. Voustianiouk*, 685 F.3d 206 (2d Cir. 2012)** and the hostile misapplication of the ***Parratt/Hudson*** doctrine to authorized state statutory actions in direct violation of ***Zinermon v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113 (1990)**.

2. **Protection Against a Condition of Servitude:** Applicant's petition will demonstrate that the lower courts' summary processes effectively stripped an indigent citizen of his legal personhood, creating a *Dred Scott* style vacuum where a citizen on parole can be subjected to warrantless digital searches and forced cell extractions without judicial review or an active civil remedy. Additional time is required to ensure that these vital civil liberties, statutory claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1584 and 241, and color-of-law issues are framed with absolute precision.

No party will be prejudiced by the granting of this short administrative extension.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Honorable Circuit Justice find that extraordinary circumstances exist and grant a 60-day extension of time, up to and including **December 28, 2026**, within which Applicant may file his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Dated: October 23, 2026
Respectfully submitted,

Kaazim Cooper, *Pro Se*
Path Forward
2020A 14th Street
Arlington, Virginia 22201

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kaazim Cooper, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on this 23rd day of October, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Application for Extension of Time upon the attorneys representing the Respondents by placing the same in a first-class, postpaid envelope addressed to the office of the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, 100 Church Street, New York, New York 10007.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 29th day of July, two thousand twenty-six.

Kaazim Cooper, AKA Kaazin Cooper, AKA Kazzim Cooper,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

Judge Anne Swern, Detective Brengie Vasquez, NYPD, Frank Bryant, OSI Investigator, New York Department of Corrections and Community Supervison, John Doe, OSI Investigator, New York Department of Corrections and Community Supervison, John Doe, NYPD Police Officers, Jean Prisco, Assistant District Attorney, Judge Curtis Farber, City of New York,

Defendants - Appellees.

ORDER

Docket No: 25-3024

Appellant, Kaazim Cooper, filed a motion for panel reconsideration, or, in the alternative, for reconsideration *en banc*. The panel that determined the appeal has considered the request for reconsideration, and the active members of the Court have considered the request for reconsideration *en banc*.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is denied.

FOR THE COURT:
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk



S.D.N.Y. – N.Y.C.
24-cv-6702
Swain, C.J.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 8th day of May, two thousand twenty-six.

Present:

Myrna Pérez,
Alison J. Nathan,
Circuit Judges,
Gary S. Katzmann,
Judge.[*]

Kaazim Cooper, AKA Kaazin Cooper, AKA Kazzim Cooper,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v. 25-3024

Judge Anne Swern, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appellant, pro se, moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") and to hold his appeal in abeyance so he can file a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) motion for reconsideration in the district court. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the IFP motion is DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED because it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). It is further ORDERED that Appellant's abeyance motion is DENIED as moot. Should Appellant wish to file a reconsideration motion in the district court, which he has not yet done, he may do so in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

FOR THE COURT:
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court



---

* Judge Gary S. Katzmann, of the United States Court of International Trade, sitting by designation.