

NO. _____ ~~THIS USE &~~

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES CONERLY, MARILYN TILLMAN-CONERLY, CARINA CONERLY, AND MINOR
M.T., IN PRO SE

– PETITIONERS

V.

MICHELLE COOKSEY, KERRY HOUSE, STEPHANIE SCHULZKUMP, NATOMAS
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, MELISSA CLARK, TIMOTHY HAMMONS, REGENCY
PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, TWIN RIVERS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
SACRAMENTO POLICE DEPARTMENT,
ENRIKA JONES, COLLEEN M. GRAY, MICHELLE JETT, VEDA LYMOSE AKA VEDA
SORRELL AKA VEDA LABEET, RUDY PUENTE, KATHERINE LESTER, OFFICER A.
THOMPSON, ALY, OFFICER L. CHIRBAS, SHARIF TARPIN, KARA UEDA, KIANA
TURNER, AND HERON SCHOOL,

– RESPONDENTS


ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION REQUEST FOR EXTENTION TO CORRECT FILING


JAMES CONERLY, MARILYN TILLMAN-CONERLY, CARINA CONERLY, AND MINOR
M.T.

1501 AMAZON AVENUE
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95835-1929
(916) 595-2210



REQUEST FOR ATTENTION TO CORRECT FILING


PETITIONERS ARE IN NEED OF MORE TIME FOR FILING. We need the extra time due to
Our having interference with our filing these documents and the unusual document need to file
And finances to complete. If we are granted more time, we can definitely correct our filing
Requirements.



James Conerly
December 22, 2024



Carina Conerly



Marilyn Tillman-Conerly

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

SEP 23 2024

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

CARINA CONERLY; JAMES CONERLY;
MARILYN TILLMAN-CONERLY; M. T., a
minor,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

SHARIF R. TARPIN, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-15297

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-01525-TLN-CKD

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Troy L. Nunley, District Judge, Presiding
Submitted September 17, 2024**

Before: WARDLAW, BADE, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Carina Conerly, James Conerly, and Marilyn Tillman-Conerly appeal pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing their action alleging federal claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Puri v. Khalsa*, 844 F.3d 1152, 1157 (9th Cir. 2017) (dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil

* 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).

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**