

NO.

24A654

ORIGINAL

---

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

---

THE INDIVIDUALS, PARTNERSHIPS, AND UNINCORPORATED  
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE A, Carl Puckett "Pro-Se" and  
Marcella Pockett "Pro-Se"

PETITIONERS,

V.

AIN JEEM INC.

RESPONDENT,

---

Application for Extension of Time Within Which to File for a Writ of Certiorari to  
the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit


---

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A  
WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

Carl Puckett "Pro-Se" Petitioner  
2170 Old Gardner Road  
Martin, Tn. 38237  
(731)446-4104  
[xfilesxfilesfan@yahoo.com](mailto:xfilesxfilesfan@yahoo.com)

Marcella Puckett "Pro-Se" Petitioner  
2170 Old Gardner Road  
Martin, Tn. 38237  
(731)446-4104  
[xfilesxfilesfan@yahoo.com](mailto:xfilesxfilesfan@yahoo.com)



## APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Petitioner.s Carl Puckett “Pro-Se” and Marcella Puckett “Pro-Se”, doing business under the fictitious business name devildogstreasure as a post transaction merchant for Etsy, Inc. were damaged in both their business and personal accounts by a wrongful seizure under 15 U.S.C. 1116 by respondent without legal standing under the Florida Long Arm Statute upon which jurisdiction was asserted, while making a fraudulent claim to trademark rights and invoking the counterfeiting statutes of the Lanham Act, before a court without subject matter jurisdiction. Defendant jurisdiction did not exist at the time of the seizure where the judge acting ultra vires and against the constitution, removed the required provision for notice and hearing pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1116 and without jurisdiction under F.R.C.P. 65. Violating the procedural due rights of the petitioners and rendering the orders null and void. Respondent concealed the evidence of the petitioners legitimate item protected under the first amendment, specifically authorized by Kareem Abdul Jabbar with a valid NBA trademark logo affixed at the time of applying for an ex parte TRO with seizure provisions by requesting the court simply use the unrelated item evidence of another unrelated defendant to secure a TRO with seizure provisions against the petitioners. Petitioners filed a F.R.C.P. 60 (b) motion to vacate the null and void orders which was denied by the District Court for the Middle District of Florida, and Petitioners filed a direct appeal to the Eleventh

Circuit Court of Appeals in part based upon the Supreme Court's precedence in Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U. S. 238 (1944), who dismissed their appeal (attached as Exhibit A). Petitioners filed a timely petition for rehearing (Attached as Exhibit B) which the appellate court denied in, Appeal Number: 23-12267-G Case Style: Ain Jeem, Inc. v. Carl Puckett, Jr., et al District Court Docket No: 8:21-cv-01331-VMC-AEP USCA11 Case: 23-12267 Document: 36-1 Date Filed: 11/13/2024 (Attached as Exhibit C). Pursuant to the United States Supreme Court Rules 13.5, 21.2c, 22, and 30, Petitioners respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time, up to and including September 14, 2022, to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit to review that court's decision in Appeal Number: 23-12267-G Case Style: Ain Jeem, Inc. v. Carl Puckett, Jr., et al District Court Docket No: 8:21-cv-01331-VMC-AEP USCA11 Case: 23-12267 Document: 36-1 Date Filed: 11/13/2024. Petitioners filed a timely motion for stay before the appellate court (attached as Exhibit D) which was denied (Attached Exhibit E).

### **JURISDICTION**

The jurisdiction of this Court will be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), and the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari will expire without an extension on February 15, 2024. This application is timely because it has been filed more than 10 days prior to the date on which the time for filing the petition is to expire.

## REASONS JUSTIFYING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Petitioners are appearing "Pro-Se" and are an elderly disabled couple with medical procedures needed during January 2024. .Currently, petitioners do not believe they would have an adequate amount of time to prepare an effective petition for writ of certiorari on their own behalf appearing "Pro-Se". A one-time extension of 60 days will allow petitioners to prepare an effective petition.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petitioner respectfully requests an order be entered extending the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari for 60 days, up to and including April 14, 2024.

Dated: December 16th, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Carl Puckett", written over a horizontal line.

Carl Puckett-Petitioner "Pro-Se"

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Macella Puckett", written over a horizontal line.

Macella Puckett-Petitioner "Pro-Se"

EXHIBIT A

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 23-12267

Non-Argument Calendar

---

AIN JEEM, INC.,

Plaintiff-Counter Defendant-Appellee,

*versus*

THE INDIVIDUALS, PARTNERSHIPS, AND  
UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS  
IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE A, et al.,

Defendants,

HALL OF FAME SPORTS MEMORABILIA, INC., et al.,

2

Opinion of the Court

23-12267

Defendants-Counter Claimants,

AKERMAN LLP ALEJANDRO J. FERNANDEZ, et al.,

Counter Defendants,

CARL ELLEN PUCKETT, JR.,

Defendant-Counter Claimant

Cross Claimant-Appellant,

MARCELLA ANDERSON PUCKETT,

Cross Claimant-Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 8:21-cv-01331-VMC-AEP

---

Before JILL PRYOR, BRASHER, and ABUDU, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

23-12267

Opinion of the Court

3

Carl and Marcella Puckett, proceeding *pro se*, appeal from the district court's June 23 and 28, 2023 orders denying their motions for reconsideration. However, those orders were not final and appealable because claims asserted between the plaintiff and defendant Hall of Fame Sports Memorabilia, Inc. remained pending at the time that the Pucketts appealed. See 28 U.S.C. § 1291; *Supreme Fuels Trading FZE v. Sargeant*, 689 F.3d 1244, 1245-46 (11th Cir. 2012); *Bogle v. Orange Cnty. Bd. of Cnty. Comm'rs*, 162 F.3d 653, 661 (11th Cir. 1998) (providing that a notice of appeal is ineffective to appeal a future order or judgment that does not exist at the time the notice of appeal is filed); *Robinson v. Tanner*, 798 F.2d 1378, 1382-83 (11th Cir. 1986) (providing that an appeal from an interlocutory order generally is not cured by the subsequent entry of final judgment).

Accordingly, this appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction. All pending motions are DENIED as moot.