

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

RICHARD RYNN,

Applicant Petitioner


V.

FIRST TRANSIT INC, AN Ohio
Corporation, ABC CORPORATION
I-X; AND BLACK AND WHITE
PARTNERSHIPS, AND/OR SOLE
PROPRIETORSHIPS I-X

Respondents

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Richard Rynn
1299 E. Marlin Drive
Chandler, AZ 85286
(520)510-6370
richardrynn@yahoo.com
Petitioner/Plaintiff
Pro Se



Petitioner Richard Rynn requests a 60-day extension of time within which to file petition for writ of certiorari, in accordance to Supreme court Rule 30.4 and from the disposition of appeal from the Ninth Circuit of Appeals on April 22, 2024. Petition for certiorari, was due by July 21, 2024. Petitioner requests an extension of sixty days until September 19, 2024, to file petition for a writ of certiorari.

Petitioner emailed all respondents on July 2, 2024 for their position on the sixty-day extension to file certiorari. Respondent First Transit replied opposing the extension without reason. Petitioner required to file in Ninth circuit first for motion to vacate per U.S. Supreme court rule 23.3 but is restricted by failure of Ninth circuit to address Rule 23.3.

Petitioner requires additional time due to fraud infecting Ninth Circuit court and district court. A dispute between Petitioner and Ninth circuit remains not addressed due to failure of Ninth circuit failing to respond to Petitioner motion to vacate causing a delay in Applicant filing a certiorari without a final ruling from Ninth circuit. Petitioner filed motion to vacate and motion to expedite ruling and Ninth circuit

failed to respond to violations of constitutional rights, violation of due process and failed to address evidence and Rule 60 motion for fraud on the court.

Additionally, the Ninth circuit and district court judges illegally ordered the court on multiple cases of Rynn to not accept further filings from petitioner Rynn in violation of due process, and fraudulent concealment in disrespect to the law.

Petitioner has multiple cases at the same time in state and U.S. district court related to this Appeal that void the judgements of district and Ninth circuit court and require additional briefing to resolve. Petitioner is requesting an extension of time to file certiorari. It will take more time than allotted in the rules for filing certiorari for the multiple respondents on multiple cases as Petitioner is overburdened by being required to file multiple briefs and multiple certioraris in this court. Petitioner needs more time to read, analyze and make cross references to complete certiorari. This motion is not filed for purposes of delay.

1. Ninth Circuit Opinion (copy attached).
2. Jurisdiction exists in this court under 28 U.S.C 1254(1)

Ninth Circuit court of appeals affirmed district courts rulings without addressing merits of petitioners Opening brief, motion to reconsider, motion to amend and failed to respond to Plaintiff motion to vacate.

Wherefore, petitioner prays that this court find good cause to extend the time to file a writ of certiorari, to this court to September 19, 2024 and to enter such orders as are just and proper in these premises.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

this 2nd day of July 2024

By: 
RICHARD RYNN

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of this application was served by U.S. mail to Defendants listed below in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 22.2 and 29.3, or 33.2.

R. Shawn Oller
Kimberly Marie Shappley
Little Mendelson PC - Phoenix, AZ
2425 E Camelback Rd., Ste. 900
Phoenix, AZ 85016-2907
602-474-3600, 949-705-3000
Email: kshappley@littler.com
Attorney for Defendant First Transit

this 2nd day of July 2024

By: 
RICHARD RYNN

APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
Denial of rehearing, April. 22, 2024

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
Summary affirmance Oct..23, 2023

District Court Filed May. 26, 2023
Order Docket No. 176

District Court Order Filed April 14, 2023
Docket No. 174

District Court Order Filed July 29, 2021
Docket No. 116

Avondale city court case No. P02019000235
workplace injunction May 13, 2019

Arizona Supreme Court Case No CV-24-0032
May 14, 2024

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 22 2024

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

RICHARD RYNN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FIRST TRANSIT INCORPORATED, an
Ohio Corporation; UNKNOWN PARTIES,
named as: ABC Corporation I-X, and Black
and White Partnerships, and/or Sole
Proprietorships I-X,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-15869

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-01309-JJT
District of Arizona,
Phoenix

ORDER

Before: W. FLETCHER, CALLAHAN, and BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

Appellant's motion for reconsideration (Docket Entry No. 16) is denied. *See*
9th Cir. R. 27-10.

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

Accordingly, the motion to dismiss (Docket Entry No. 4) is treated as a motion for summary affirmance and is granted.

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

OCT 23 2023

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

RICHARD RYNN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FIRST TRANSIT INCORPORATED, an
Ohio Corporation; UNKNOWN PARTIES,
named as: ABC Corporation I-X, and Black
and White Partnerships, and/or Sole
Proprietorships I-X,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-15869

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-01309-JJT
District of Arizona,
Phoenix

ORDER

Before: W. FLETCHER, CALLAHAN, and BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

The motion to correct the opening brief (Docket Entry No. 8) is granted.

The motion for judicial notice (Docket Entry No. 5) is denied as
unnecessary.

Appellant's motion for an extension of time (Docket Entry No. 7) to file a
response to the motion to dismiss is granted. The response has been filed.

A review of the record, the opening brief submitted on September 12, 2023,
and the parties' briefing on the motion to dismiss demonstrates that the questions
raised in this appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See*
United States v. Hooton, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (stating standard).

Accordingly, the motion to dismiss (Docket Entry No. 4) is treated as a motion for summary affirmance and is granted.

AFFIRMED.