

APP NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Aisha Wright,
Petitioner,


V.

Transportation communication Union/IAM
Respondent,

On Application for an Extension of Time to File Petition for a Writ of
Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court

PETITIONER'S APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR
WRIT OF CERTORIA

Aisha Wright
P.O. Box 11826
Houston, TX 77293
Aishawright68@gmail.com
903-630-0916



Pro Se, Aisha Wright, for Petitioner



NOW INTO COURT, comes Plaintiff, Petitioner, Pro Se, Aisha Wright, by undersigned counsel, unto this Honorable Supreme Court Justices,

In Accordance with this Court's Rules 13.5. I Petitioner Aisha Wright, Pro Se, respectfully request that the time to file its Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this matter be extended be for 60 days up to and including September 29, 2024, from the date of due date on July 29, 2024, . The Petition for Writ of Certiorari would be due on July 29, 2024. Petitioner is filing this Application more than ten days before that date. This Court would have jurisdiction over the Judgment under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1). The Undersigned Pro Se Petitioner, due to my unforeseen disability condition at times, and a major Disaster of Beryl Hurricane, of being continuous homeless, and powerless of no electric power to which involve this case involves and extensive record, complicated legal issues, the tremendous pressure of other equally urgent professional work requiring that awaiting more legal documents needs to be preparation, and Pro Se, of handling another case in The Court of Law, Southern District of Texas Houston Division, Aisha Wright v. Union Pacific Railroad, Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-0203, Pro Se, as solo, on my own of needing more time for my Writ Certiorari to be submitted on or by September 29, 2024.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aisha Wright
P.O. Box 11826
Houston, TX 77293
Aishawright68@gmail.com
903-630-0916

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing on this date, July 17, 2024 as required by Supreme Court Rule 13.5, I have served the enclosed Application for Extension Of Time To File Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari to the Transportation Communication Union/IAM Counsel parties below in the U.S. mail properly. The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Appellees: Transportation Communication Union/IAM,

Counsel for Appellees:

Transportation Communication Union/IAM;
Jeffrey Bartos of Guerrieri, Bartos &
Roma, P.C. Washington, DC,

Transportation Communication Union/IAM;
John Grunert of Guerrieri, Bartos &
Roma, P.C. Washington, DC,

Transportation Communication Union/IAM;
Patrick Flynn P.C; Houston, TX

/S/Aisha Wright

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-20379

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 29, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

AISHA WRIGHT,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

TRANSPORTATION COMMUNICATION UNION/IAM,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CV-3174

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING

Before DAVIS, HO, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for rehearing is DENIED.

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-20379
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 1, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

AISHA WRIGHT,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

TRANSPORTATION COMMUNICATION UNION/IAM,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CV-3174

Before DAVIS, HO, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff-Appellant, Aisha Wright, proceeding *pro se*, appeals the district court's judgment dismissing her claims with prejudice as barred by res judicata. The district court determined that the four elements of res judicata were met because (1) the parties in this case and in a prior action are the same; (2) the judgment in the prior action was rendered by a court of

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 23-20379

competent jurisdiction; (3) the prior action was concluded by a final judgment on the merits; and (4) the same claim or cause of action was involved in both actions. *See Test Masters Educ. Servs., Inc. v. Singh*, 428 F.3d 559, 571 (5th Cir. 2005) (setting forth the four elements for establishing res judicata). Plaintiff does not argue that the district court applied an incorrect standard or that the district court erred in determining that the standard was met.¹

Although we liberally construe *pro se* briefs, *pro se* parties must still brief the issues in order to preserve them for appellate consideration. *See Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995). Because Plaintiff fails to identify any error in the district court's judgment applying the standard for res judicata to the facts of this case, it "is the same as if [s]he had not appealed that judgment." *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987).

Based on the foregoing, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

¹ She instead argues that the prior action was erroneously dismissed due to ineffective assistance of counsel. To the extent that her argument can be construed as a challenge to the district court's finding that a final judgment "on the merits" was issued in the prior action, Plaintiff's argument is without merit. In a civil case, there is no constitutional right to effective assistance of counsel. *Sanchez v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 785 F.2d 1236, 1237 (5th Cir. 1986).

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-20379
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 1, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

AISHA WRIGHT,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

TRANSPORTATION COMMUNICATION UNION/IAM,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CV-3174

Before DAVIS, HO, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges.*

J U D G M E N T

This cause was considered on the record on appeal and the briefs on file.

IT IS ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the judgment of the District Court is AFFIRMED.

The judgment or mandate of this court shall issue 7 days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires, or 7 days after entry of an order denying a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion

for stay of mandate, whichever is later. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 41(b). The court may shorten or extend the time by order. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 41 I.O.P.



**Certified as a true copy and issued
as the mandate on May 07, 2024**

Attest: *Style W. Cayce*
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit