NO. 26A_____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

EMMANUEL ADEYINKA, APPLICANT,

v.

URBAN ALCHEMY AND CITY OF PORTLAND, RESPONDENTS.

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

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

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.5 and 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c), Applicant Emmanuel Adeyinka, appearing pro se, respectfully requests an extension of time of 30 days, up to and including December 10, 2026, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this matter.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit denied Petitioner's timely petition for panel rehearing on August 12, 2026 (Case No. 26-1073). Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, the current deadline to file the petition for a writ of certiorari is November 10, 2026. This application is being filed well in advance of that deadline.

The grounds supporting this application are as follows:

1. **Pro Se Status and Resource Constraints:** Applicant is proceeding without counsel and has faced severe operational and housing instability, limiting continuous access to legal research facilities and final document compilation.
2. **Complexity of Record:** The underlying proceeding involves intricate questions regarding municipal liability, contracted social service accountability, and procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, requiring careful assembly of the appendix and supporting records.
3. **Interests of Justice:** Granting a modest 30-day extension will ensure that the petition is fully and accurately presented for this Court's review without prejudice or undue haste.

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests that an order be entered extending the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari up to and including December 10, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

EMMANUEL ADEYINKA
Applicant Pro Se
P.O. Box 2261
Portland, Oregon 97208
Phone: 971-276-0973
Email: emmanuel.adeyinka1980@gmail.com

Date: October 31, 2026

RECEIVED
NOV - 9 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

AUG 12 2026

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

EMMANUEL ADEYINKA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

URBAN ALCHEMY; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 26-1073

D.C. No.
3:26-cv-00117-SI
District of Oregon,
Portland

ORDER

Before: LEE, DESAI, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

The petition (Docket Entry No. 36) for panel rehearing is denied.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 37) to stay the mandate is denied. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 41(b).

The mandate will issue in due course.

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

AUG 20 2026

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

EMMANUEL ADEWALE ADEYINKA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

URBAN ALCHEMY; CITY OF PORTLAND; Supervisor SURGE; Supervisor LEON; DENNIS HESTER; DESIREE SHEPHERD; CENTRAL CITY CONCERN,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 26-1073

D.C. No. 3:26-cv-00117-SI

District of Oregon, Portland

MANDATE

The judgment of this Court, entered May 13, 2026, takes effect this date.

This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

FOR THE COURT:

MOLLY C. DWYER
CLERK OF COURT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

MAY 13 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

EMMANUEL ADEYINKA, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. URBAN ALCHEMY; CITY OF PORTLAND; Supervisor SURGE; Supervisor LEON; DENNIS HESTER; DESIREE SHEPHERD; CENTRAL CITY CONCERN, Defendants - Appellees.	No. 26-1073 D.C. No. 3:26-cv-00117-SI MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Michael H. Simon, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2026**

Before: LEE, DESAI, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Emmanuel Adeyinka appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims arising from his

---

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

residence at a temporary alternative shelter site. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Adeyinka's federal Fair Housing Act ("FHA") claims because Adeyinka failed to allege facts sufficient to show discrimination or retaliation. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3604 (prohibiting housing discrimination); 42 U.S.C. § 3617 (prohibiting retaliation for exercising rights under the FHA); *Morris v. W. Hayden Ests. First Addition Homeowners Ass'n, Inc.*, 104 F.4th 1128, 1146-47 (9th Cir. 2024) (setting forth elements of a hostile housing environment claim under the FHA); *Sw. Fair Hous. Council, Inc. v. Maricopa Domestic Water Improvement Dist.*, 17 F.4th 950, 960 (9th Cir. 2021) (explaining that the FHA's disparate-impact theory prohibits actions that create a discriminatory effect upon a protected class); *San Pedro Hotel Co., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 159 F.3d 470, 477 (9th Cir. 1998) (setting forth elements of a retaliation claim under the FHA).

The district court properly dismissed Adeyinka's Fourteenth Amendment claim because Adeyinka failed to allege facts sufficient to show that defendants violated his right to procedural due process. *See Krainski v. Nev. ex rel. Bd. of Regents of Nev. Sys. of Higher Educ.*, 616 F.3d 963, 970 (9th Cir. 2010) (setting forth elements of a procedural due process claim under the Fourteenth

Amendment).

The district court properly dismissed Adeyinka's breach of contract claim because Adeyinka failed to allege facts sufficient to show the existence of a contract or detrimental reliance. *See Slover v. Or. State Bd. of Clinical Soc. Workers*, 927 P.2d 1098, 1101 (Or. Ct. App. 1996) (setting forth elements of a breach of contract claim under Oregon law); *see also Barnes v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, 570 F.3d 1096, 1106 (9th Cir. 2009), *as amended* (Sept. 28, 2009) (setting forth elements of promissory estoppel under Oregon law, including detrimental reliance).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.

Supreme Court Application for Extension of Time – Adeyinka v. Urban Alchemy & City of Portland (Ninth Circuit Case No. 26-1073)

1 message

Emmanuel . Adeyinka1980 <emmanuel.adeyinka1980@gmail.com>
To: cityattorneysoffice@portlandoregon.gov, Elliott <Elliott.Ware@portlandoregon.gov>, legal@urban-alchemy.us

Sat, Oct 31, 2026 at 1:13 PM

Dear Counsel:

Please accept this electronic transmission as formal service of the **Application for a 30-Day Extension of Time Within Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** in *Emmanuel Adeyinka v. Urban Alchemy, City of Portland, et al.* (Ninth Circuit Case No. 26-1073 / D.C. No. 3:26-cv-00117-SI), directed to the Honorable Brett Kavanaugh, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit Justice for the Ninth Circuit.

Attached to this email in PDF format, you will find:

1. **Application for Extension of Time** (dated October 31, 2026, requesting an extension up to and including December 10, 2026).
2. **Exhibits / Appended Ninth Circuit Orders:** Ninth Circuit Order denying Panel Rehearing (entered August 12, 2026) and Formal Mandate (issued August 20, 2026).

A physical copy of this application has also been deposited in the U.S. Mail with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court and counsel of record as required under Supreme Court Rule 29.

Please confirm receipt of this email and its attachments.

Respectfully submitted,

Emmanuel Adeyinka *Applicant Pro Se* P.O. Box 2261 Portland, Oregon 97208 Phone: (971) 276-0973 Email: emmanuel.adeyinka1980@gmail.com

Supreme Court Application for Extension of Time – Adeyinka v. Urban Alchemy & City of Portland (Ninth Circuit Case No. 26-1073)

1 message

Emmanuel . Adeyinka1980 <emmanuel.adeyinka1980@gmail.com> Sat, Oct 31, 2026 at 1:15 PM
To: Elliott.Ware@portlandoregon.gov, legal@urban-alchemy.us, cityattorneysoffice@portlandoregon.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Case;26-1073 urban.pdf
195 KB