No. _____

FILED
NOV 18 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ANTHONY D. BELCHER, SR.,
Applicant,

v.

ROB BONTA, Attorney General of California;
LAURIE M. EARL; SEBASTIAN BRADY;
JENNIFER K. ROCKWELL,
Respondents.

ORIGINAL

APPLICATION TO THE HONORABLE ELENA KAGAN, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH 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 Rule 13.5 of the Rules of this Court, applicant Anthony D. Belcher, Sr., appearing pro se, respectfully requests a thirty-day extension of time, to and including December 30, 2026, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. In support of this application, applicant states as follows:

1. On May 27, 2026, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit entered judgment affirming the dismissal of applicant's action for want of subject matter jurisdiction in *Belcher v. Bonta*, No. 25-1657. A copy of the memorandum disposition is attached as Exhibit A.

2. On September 1, 2026, the court of appeals denied applicant's timely petition for panel rehearing. A copy of that order is attached as Exhibit B.

3. Absent an extension, a petition for a writ of certiorari would be due on November 30, 2026. This application is filed with the Clerk more than ten days before that date, as Rule 13.5 requires.

RECEIVED
NOV 20 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

4. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

5. Applicant has not previously sought an extension of time in this matter.

6. Applicant proceeds without counsel. In order to comply with the booklet-format requirements of Rule 33.1, he engaged a commercial Supreme Court brief printing service to typeset and print the petition and appendix, to effect service upon counsel for respondents under Rule 29, and to file the petition with the Clerk. Applicant approved the final printer's proof and remitted payment in full on November 11, 2026.

7. As of the date of this application, applicant has not received confirmation that service has been effected upon counsel for respondents or that the petition has been filed with the Clerk. Applicant has no independent means of verifying that those steps have been completed.

8. Applicant is a layperson unfamiliar with this Court's filing and service procedures, and the completion of those steps rests with a third party rather than with him. If the arrangement has failed, applicant cannot, within the time remaining, arrange for alternative printing, service, and filing in conformity with Rules 29 and 33.1. A thirty-day extension would permit applicant either to confirm that filing and service have been accomplished or, if they have not, to accomplish them by other means.

9. The requested extension is sought in good faith and not for purposes of delay. The petition is complete and has been printed, and applicant seeks only the time necessary to confirm that it has been properly filed and served or, if it has not, to accomplish those steps himself.

WHEREFORE, applicant respectfully requests that the time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this matter be extended thirty days, to and including December 30, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTHONY D. BELCHER, SR.
Applicant pro se
5960 South Land Park Drive #367
Sacramento, California 95822
(916) 392-2006
anthonyb@1westech.com

Dated: November 18, 2026

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

MAY 27 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ANTHONY D. BELCHER Sr., Plaintiff - Appellant, v. ROB BONTA; LAURIE M. EARL; SEBASTIAN BRADY; JENNIFER K. ROCKWELL, Defendants - Appellees.	No. 25-1657 D.C. No. 2:24-cv-00976-DAD-JDP MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Dale A. Drozd, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 26, 2026**

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

Anthony D. Belcher, Sr., appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations relating to his sex offender registry requirement, which he unsuccessfully challenged in state

* 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).

court. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Seismic Reservoir 2020, Inc. v. Paulsson*, 785 F.3d 330, 333 (9th Cir. 2015) (dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)); *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003) (dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Belcher's action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because Belcher's action is a de facto appeal of a prior state court judgment, and he raises claims that are inextricably intertwined with that judgment. *See Noel*, 341 F.3d at 1163 ("It is a forbidden de facto appeal under *Rooker-Feldman* when the plaintiff in federal district court complains of a legal wrong allegedly committed by the state court, and seeks relief from the judgment of that court."); *Cooper v. Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 782 (9th Cir. 2012) (explaining that claims are "inextricably intertwined" with state court decisions where federal adjudication "would impermissibly undercut the state ruling on the same issues" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Belcher's complaint without leave to amend because amendment would have been futile. *See Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that dismissal without leave to amend is proper when amendment would be futile).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

SEP 1 2026

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

ANTHONY D. BELCHER Sr.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ROB BONTA; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-1657

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-00976-DAD-JDP
Eastern District of California,
Sacramento

ORDER

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

The petition (Docket Entry No. 25) for panel rehearing is denied.

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Anthony D. Belcher, Sr., hereby certify that on November 18, 2026, I served the foregoing Application for an Extension of Time Within Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari upon counsel for each respondent by third-party commercial carrier for delivery within three calendar days, addressed as follows:

Sebastian Brady, Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, California 94102-7004
Counsel for Respondents

I further certify that all parties required to be served have been served.

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

Executed on November 18, 2026.



ANTHONY D. BELCHER, SR.
Applicant pro se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Anthony D. Belcher, Sr., applicant pro se, hereby certify that on November 18, 2026, I served the foregoing Application for an Extension of Time Within Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, together with Exhibits A and B, upon counsel for each respondent by United States Postal Service Priority Mail Express, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Jay Russell, Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, California 94102-7004
Counsel for respondents Rob Bonta and Sebastian Brady

Sharon M. Nagle, Esq.
Bold, Polisner, Maddow, Nelson & Judson
A Professional Corporation
2125 Oak Grove Road, Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94598
Counsel for respondents Laurie M. Earl and Jennifer K. Rockwell

I further certify that all parties required to be served have been served.

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

Executed on November 18, 2026.

ANTHONY D. BELCHER, SR.
Applicant pro se