

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

No. _____

IN RE LIDIA M. ORREGO, Petitioner.

**CORRECTED APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
(Submitted Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 12.4)**

To the Honorable Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice of the United States and
Circuit Justice for the Second Circuit:

This Application is submitted pursuant to **Supreme Court Rule 12.4**. Petitioner Lidia M. Orrego, proceeding pro se, respectfully applies for an extension of sixty (60) days within which to file a single Petition for Writ of Certiorari seeking review of multiple judgments entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, because the underlying matters involve the same Petitioner, substantially overlapping parties, common questions of federal law, and arise from the same course of related proceedings.

Specifically, this Application pertains to the following judgments of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

1. Second Circuit No. 25-1802 (Lead).
2. Second Circuit No. 25-2399 (Consolidated with No. 25-1802).
3. Second Circuit No. 25-1808.

4. Second Circuit No. 25-1810.

Copies of the lower-court judgments and related orders for each docket identified above are appended hereto, organized by docket number, pursuant to **Supreme Court Rule 13.5**. See Appendix A (Nos. 25-1802 / 25-2399), Appendix B (No. 25-1808), and Appendix C (No. 25-1810).

ORDERS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED

Petitioner seeks review of the following orders entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

A. November 21, 2025 Orders denying the petitions for writs of mandamus in Second Circuit Nos. 25-1802, 25-2399, 25-1808, and 25-1810.

B. February 2, 2026 Orders denying Petitioner's motions for a stay and denying Petitioner's request for leave to attach exhibits to the motions for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc. Petitioner identifies these as separate orders that will be presented for review in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari and not merely as procedural history.

Petitioner intends to seek certiorari review of the February 2, 2026 orders as separate orders of the Court of Appeals. Accordingly, those orders are identified separately from the November 21, 2025 mandamus orders and are not included merely to describe the procedural history or to establish the applicable deadline under Supreme Court Rule 13.3.

C. Orders denying rehearing, entered March 11, 2026, in Second Circuit Nos. 25-1802, 25-2399, and 25-1810, and March 5, 2026, in Second Circuit No. 25-1808.

The rehearing denial orders were entered on March 11, 2026, in Second Circuit Nos. 25-1802, 25-2399, and 25-1810, and on March 5, 2026, in Second Circuit No. 25-1808. This Application is timely under Supreme Court Rule 13.3, with the applicable deadline determined by the rehearing denial entered in each respective docket.

TIMELINESS OF THIS CORRECTED APPLICATION

Petitioner's original Application for Extension of Time was deposited in the United States mail, postage prepaid, on June 3, 2026 — six days before the June 9, 2026, deadline — and was timely filed under **Supreme Court Rule 30.1**, which deems a document filed on the date of mailing where first-class mail is used and a Certificate of Service in compliance with Rule 29 accompanies the filing, as it did here.

By letters dated June 18, 2026, and July 8, 2026, the Clerk's Office identified procedural deficiencies concerning the identification of the judgments and operative dates. This Corrected Application is submitted in response to those instructions and is intended to clarify the orders for which review will be sought and the applicable rehearing dates. The Clerk's letter did not reject the Application on the merits and expressly invited correction. This Corrected Application cures the procedural deficiencies identified in both Clerk's letters and is submitted at the earliest practicable opportunity following receipt of the July 8, 2026 correspondence. Petitioner respectfully submits that the original, timely mailing should be treated as

the operative filing date for purposes of this Application, with this corrected submission relating back to that date.

GOOD CAUSE FOR THE REQUESTED EXTENSION

Good cause exists for the requested sixty (60)-day extension because:

1. The matters involve extensive records, multiple related proceedings, and numerous orders issued across overlapping federal actions and appellate proceedings;

2. Petitioner intends to raise substantial federal questions concerning due process, judicial recusal, evidentiary exclusion, and procedural irregularities arising from the proceedings below;

3. Petitioner is reviewing newly obtained records and materials that may materially affect the issues intended to be presented to this Court;

4. Petitioner contends that certain findings and characterizations contained in District Court Docket Entry 244 were unsupported by the evidentiary record and resulted in substantial prejudice to Petitioner's due process rights, issues that require careful presentation and organization before submission to this Court; and

5. Petitioner proceeds pro se and in forma pauperis and requires additional time to prepare a proper petition and appendix consistent with the Rules of this Court, including the consolidated, multi-judgment presentation required by Rule 12.4.

Petitioner respectfully submits that this Corrected Application is made in good faith and not for purposes of delay, but to permit adequate presentation of substantial federal issues arising from the proceedings below, and to comply fully with the Clerk's instructions.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that the time to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari as to Second Circuit Nos. 25-1802 (Lead), 25-2399 (Consolidated), 25-1808, and 25-1810 be extended for sixty (60) days from the applicable deadline under Supreme Court Rule 13.3, as determined by the rehearing denial date applicable to each docket, or for such other time as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



Lidia M. Orrego
Petitioner Pro Se
95-08 Queens Blvd. Apt. 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
Phone: (347) 453-2234
Email: orregoprose@gmail.com

Date: July 14, 2026

**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 11th day of March, two thousand twenty-six.

In Re: Lidia M. Orrego,

Petitioner.

Lidia M. Orrego,

Petitioner,

v.

Kevin Knipfing, AKA Kevin James, Stephanieanna
James-Knipfing, AKA Steffiana de la Cruz, Old
Westbury Eddie LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve
Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua,

Respondents.

ORDER

Docket Nos: 25-1802 (Lead),
25-2399 (Con)

Petitioner, Lidia M. Orrego, 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

A circular official seal of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is positioned over the signature. The seal features the text "UNITED STATES" at the top, "SECOND CIRCUIT" in the center, and "COURT OF APPEALS" at the bottom, separated by small stars.

**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 5th day of March, two thousand twenty-six.

In Re: Lidia M. Orrego,

Petitioner.

Lidia M. Orrego,

Petitioner,

v.

Steve Savitsky, Old Westbury LLC, John Doe, Jane Doe,

Respondents.

ORDER

Docket No: 25-1808

Petitioner, Lidia M. Orrego, 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

A circular official seal of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is placed over the signature. The seal contains the text "UNITED STATES", "SECOND CIRCUIT", and "COURT OF APPEALS".

**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 11th day of March, two thousand twenty-six.

Lidia M. Orrego,

Petitioner.

Lidia M. Orrego,

Petitioner,

ORDER

Docket No: 25-1810

v.

Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP,
Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, First Choice
Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder, MD, John Doe, Jane
Doe, Ginu Jacob, Esq., Associate, Sam Cohen, Esq.,
Associate, Joseph Mercurio, Esq., Associate, Andrew
Ziemianski, Esq., Associate, Matthew Funk, Esq.,
Associate, Mariana Vizuete, Paralegal-Associate, Lewis
Heller, Associate,

Respondents.

Petitioner, Lidia M. Orrego, 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


Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

