

No. 24-5666

---

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

Lidia M. Orrego - Petitioner,  
vs.  
Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh  
Stanton & Romano LLP et al. - Respondents,

---

On Application for an Extension of Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to  
the U.S. Supreme Court, subsequently the decision on Motion for Reconsideration  
to Proceed in Forma Pauperis

---

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

December 14, 2024

**Petitioner's Application for an Extension of Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court**

The Petitioner/Appellant/Plaintiff Pro Se, Lidia M, Orrego, under this Court's Rules 13.5, 30.2, 30.3, and 30.4, respectfully request for an Extension of Time to File the Petition Writ of Certiorari ("Petition") according to the annexed order dated November 25, 2024, subsequently to issue the decision on the Motion for Reconsideration for Leave to file the Petition without prepayment of cost and to proceed in forma pauperis and relief the compliance of the Supreme Court Rule 33.1 since the Petition was timely filed under Supreme Rule 33.2 on August 6, 2024. See annexed Appendices A and B.

The present Application falls into the category of extraordinary circumstances to the Supreme Rule 30 since Petitioner filed the Original Petition and 10 copies timely on April 16, 2024, under Supreme Rule 33.2, annexed with the Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis.

The Motion for Reconsideration for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis is filed simultaneously with this Application.

The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1). This request is unopposed since the Respondents failed or waived to appear in this case.

**Background**

This case presents an important question: Whether the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in the interest of justice, recognizes the mitigating effects of upholding the Constitutional Rights to Due Process and Equal Protection of the Law before the Constitutional Rights are deprived.

Whether the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit analyzes and recognizes the impact of judicial explicit bias in its decision-making to prevent a gross violation of Due Process and avoid a Miscarriage of Justice in the District Court.

Whether the U.S. Eastern District of New York Court abuses its power with explicit bias in violation of the Due Process and Equal Protection guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and this Court to benefit the Respondents who are committing fraud, perjury, and obstruction of justice due to their privileged social standing.

Respondents were engaged in vexatious litigation, committing abuse of the legal process, ethical violations, conflict of interest, fraud, perjury, filing perjured statements, spoliation of evidence, tampering with evidence and witnesses, falsification of business and insurance records (“organized crime”), among other under the District Court’s protection engaging in continuous ex-parte communications in violation to Due Process of Law and Equal Protection Clause.

This case presents a straightforward intentional deprivation from the lower Courts of the Due Process and Equal Protection of Law Clause that strikes at the heart of our legal system—unfair treatment based on race and social status.

Gross violation of the Due Process and Equal Protection of Law Clause under 18 U.S. Code § 241 “Conspiracy against rights” and 18 U.S. Code § 242 “Deprivation of rights under color of law by the lower Courts' biased proceedings.

We must acknowledge the Due Process Clause's and Equal Protection's essential significance in our legal system. Any attempt to deliberately deprive an individual of their right to Due Process is misguided and a clear violation of their

rights. The lower courts of the United States must comprehend the seriousness of their actions and uphold the fundamental principles of justice and fairness enshrined in the Constitution.

### **Reasons For Granting an Extension of Time**

On November 25, 2024, this Court issued an order denying the Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis and that the Petitioner, additionally to pay the Court's fees pursuant to Supreme Rule 38 (a), she must pay the costly "booklet" to re-file the same Petition filed by the Petitioner under Supreme Rule 33.2 on April 16, 2024. See annexed Exhibit 1.

In this case, the petitioner has already spent significant resources—\$5,938.00—simply to bring the case before this Court, a sum that represents a considerable portion of middle-class income. Furthermore, additional cases must be addressed, compounding the financial burden and creating an unmanageable strain on individuals caught between the upper middle class and poverty. This situation brings to light the stark inequity in the system: to access justice at the highest level requires financial resources that only the wealthy or those in positions of privilege can realistically afford. See annexed Appendices A, B, C.

The requirement to make a "booklet-type presentation" under these rules may not seem burdensome in the abstract, but the financial, logistical, and emotional toll on a middle-class individual is significant. Though designed for efficiency and order in the Court, these rules inadvertently serve to further isolate and marginalize those

without substantial financial means. The notion that one must go into debt to have their voice heard before this Court is an affront to the principle of justice for all.

This financial burden is due to the court fees and the expensive "booklet" required by Supreme Court Rule 28(a) and Rule 33.1. middle-class family, to choose between paying her rent or providing food for her family for at least three months in order to cover the court fees and the costly "booklet" required under Supreme Rule 28(a) and Rule 33.1. Additionally, the Petitioner must type all the Petition's appendices.

Suppose the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration to Proceed in Forma Pauperis is not Granted. In that case, the Petitioner will need time to build a fundraiser, develop campaign, and spread the information about this case through outreach, among others, to affront the expenses because with her sole income, it is impossible to pay the "booklet" to comply the Court's order. Additionally, the Petitioner needs time to type the complete appendices according to the order.

The Petitioner acknowledges that the rules are designed to maintain a certain level of formality and consistency in filings, but it is essential to balance these considerations with the recognition that, for many Americans, the cost of participating in the legal process has become prohibitively expensive. This is a direct barrier to justice, especially for individuals who are already grappling with rising costs of living and financial instability.

The right to access the courts must not be limited to the wealthy or those with financial privilege. If individuals are unable to feed themselves or their families, it

is unjust to require them to go into further debt to access their constitutional rights. The current rules, as applied, create a system in which only the financially secure can fully participate, leaving those most in need of justice without recourse.

In light of the financial realities facing millions of Americans, we respectfully request that the Court reconsider the burden of filing fees and associated costs for individuals in the Petitioner's position. Allowing for a more accessible filing process would ensure that justice is truly accessible to all, not just those with the means to afford it.

The Petitioner brings to the Court's attention a significant parallel to the situation at hand: even elected President Donald Trump, a billionaire, has sought donations to address what he refers to as "lawfare"—a term he uses to describe the legal battles he faces, which he argues are politically motivated and an abuse of legal processes. This situation is particularly relevant to the Petitioner's own circumstances, where she, as an individual without the vast financial resources of a billionaire, faces the same kind of legal challenges and abuse of power within the judicial system.

The Elected President Trump has publicly stated that his legal battles are financially draining and based on improper uses of legal processes, the Petitioner finds herself caught in a similar web of financial hardship and judicial overreach. The Petitioner's case has been subject to what can only be described as an abuse of power and discretion by the lower courts, where her attempts to seek justice have

been thwarted by procedural obstacles, excessive costs, and undue burdens that effectively block her access to the legal system.

**Conclusion**

Petitioner respectfully requests a 60-day extension to file a writ of certiorari in the above-captioned matter, including the final filing date. This extension is being sought from the day of the decision on the Motion for Reconsideration for Leave to file the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. The purpose of this extension is to raise funds and secure a review of the case, which involves Constitutional Questions.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: December 14, 2024

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. P. ...', written over a horizontal line.

(Signature)

# **EXHIBIT A**



**Supreme Court of the United States  
Office of the Clerk  
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

**Scott S. Harris**  
Clerk of the Court  
(202) 479-3011

November 25, 2024

Ms. Lidia M. Orrego  
9508 Queens Blvd.  
Apt. 3E  
Rego Park, NY 11374

Re: Lidia M. Orrego  
v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, et al.  
No. 24-5666

Dear Ms. Orrego:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until December 16, 2024, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

Sincerely,



---

**Scott S. Harris, Clerk**

# **EXHIBIT B**

No. 24-5666

*RECEIVED*

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Lidia M. Orrego — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
AUG 06 2024  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

VS.

Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh  
Stanton & Romano LLP et al. et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes:

Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the following court(s):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Petitioner has **not** previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is **not** attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and:

The appointment was made under the following provision of law: \_\_\_\_\_, or

a copy of the order of appointment is appended.

  
(Signature)

**AFFIDAVIT OR DECLARATION  
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***

I, Lidia M. Orrego, am the petitioner in the above-entitled case. In support of my motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, I state that because of my poverty I am unable to pay the costs of this case or to give security therefor, and I believe I am entitled to redress.

1. For both you and your spouse estimate the average amount of money received from each of the following sources during the past 12 months. Adjust any amount that was received weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate. Use gross amounts, that is, amounts before any deductions for taxes or otherwise.

Income source	Average monthly amount during the past 12 months		Amount expected next month	
	You	Spouse	You	Spouse
Employment	\$ <u>4,158.00-</u>	\$ <u>4,050.00-</u>	\$ <u>4,158.00-</u>	\$ <u>4,050.00-</u>
Self-employment	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Income from real property (such as rental income)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Interest and dividends	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Gifts	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Alimony	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Child Support	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Retirement (such as social security, pensions, annuities, insurance)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Disability (such as social security, insurance payments)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Unemployment payments	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Public-assistance (such as welfare)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Other (specify): _____	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
<b>Total monthly income:</b>	\$ <u>4,158.00-</u>	\$ <u>4,050.00-</u>	\$ <u>4,158.00-</u>	\$ <u>4,050.00-</u>

2. List your employment history for the past two years, most recent first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross monthly pay
DOH	47th Avenue, LIC, NY 11101	Jul. 2024 to present	\$ 4,158.00.-
LHH	77th St, NY, NY 10075	Nov.2021 to Jun. 2024	\$ 3,748.00.-
			\$

3. List your spouse's employment history for the past two years, most recent employer first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross monthly pay
FT Inc.	St. Glen Oaks, NY 11004	May. 2024 to present	\$ 4,050.00.-
DOTC	36th, Astoria NY 11106	Aug. 2021 to Apr. 2024	\$ 4,159.00.-
			\$

4. How much cash do you and your spouse have? \$ 900,00.-  
 Below, state any money you or your spouse have in bank accounts or in any other financial institution.

Type of account (e.g., checking or savings)	Amount you have	Amount your spouse has
Saving	\$ 152,93.-	\$ 1,500,00.-
Checking	\$ 837,69.-	\$ 0
		\$

5. List the assets, and their values, which you own or your spouse owns. Do not list clothing and ordinary household furnishings. N/A

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Home<br>Value _____   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other real estate<br>Value _____                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Motor Vehicle #1<br>Year, make & model _____<br>Value _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Motor Vehicle #2<br>Year, make & model _____<br>Value _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other assets<br>Description _____<br>Value _____            |  |

6. State every person, business, or organization owing you or your spouse money, and the amount owed.

Person owing you or your spouse money	Amount owed to you	Amount owed to your spouse
N/A	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____

7. State the persons who rely on you or your spouse for support. For minor children, list initials instead of names (e.g. "J.S." instead of "John Smith").

Name	Relationship	Age
T.J.	Child	11
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

8. Estimate the average monthly expenses of you and your family. Show separately the amounts paid by your spouse. Adjust any payments that are made weekly, biweekly, quarterly, or annually to show the monthly rate.

	You	Your spouse
Rent or home-mortgage payment (include lot rented for mobile home)	\$ 750	\$ 750
Are real estate taxes included? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Is property insurance included? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
Utilities (electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer, and telephone)	\$ 180,00.-	\$ 180,00.-
Home maintenance (repairs and upkeep)	\$ 0	\$ 0
Food	\$ 300,00.-	\$ 300,00.-
Clothing	\$ 200,00.-	\$ 200,00.-
Laundry and dry-cleaning	\$ 60,00.-	\$ 60,00.-
Medical and dental expenses	\$ 60,00.-	\$ 0

	<b>You</b>	<b>Your spouse</b>
Transportation (not including motor vehicle payments)	\$ 200,00.-	\$ 350,00.-
Recreation, entertainment, newspapers, magazines, etc.	\$ 0	0
Insurance (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		\$
Homeowner's or renter's	\$ 0	\$ 0
Life	\$ 153,00.-	\$ 0
Health	\$ 120,00.-	0
Motor Vehicle	\$ 0	\$ 345,00.-
Other: _____	\$ 0	\$ 0
Taxes (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
(specify): _____	\$ 0	\$ 0
Installment payments		
Motor Vehicle	\$ 392,00.-	\$ 0
Credit card(s)	\$ 1,500.00.-	\$ 1,500.00.-
Department store(s)	\$ 0	\$ 0
Other: <u>Loan</u> _____	\$ 615,00.-	\$ 250,00.-
Alimony, maintenance, and support paid to others	\$ 0	\$ 0
Regular expenses for operation of business, profession, or farm (attach detailed statement)	\$ 0	\$ 0
Other (specify): _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
<b>Total monthly expenses:</b>	<b>\$ 4,530,00.-</b>	<b>\$ 3,935,00.-</b>

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

Yes    No   If yes, describe on an attached sheet.

Petitioner's and Spouse Debts Credit Cards Total \$ 22.000,00.-

Petitioner's debts are part of accrued expenses for legal expenses (non-attorney)

10. Have you paid – or will you be paying – an attorney any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?    Yes    No

If yes, how much? between \$ 2.600,00.- and 3.200,00.- Compliance of the Rules 38 (a) and 33.1.

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

To confirm the information of the provider to comply with Rules 38 (a) and 33.1.

11. Have you paid—or will you be paying—anyone other than an attorney (such as a paralegal or a typist) any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

Yes    No

If yes, how much? \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, state the person's name, address, and telephone number:

12. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the costs of this case. See attached Supplementary Application and Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit denial the reimbursement of the Fee of \$ 505,00.- paid by the Petitioner for the Interlocutory Appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292 but improperly dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. If the Court had fulfilled its duties or returned the money, the Petitioner would pay this Fee. Undue enrichment from the lower Court. Gross Miscarriage of Justice.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: July 31, 2024



\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)



# EXHIBIT C

## Supreme Court Press

1089 Commonwealth Avenue, #283  
 Boston, MA 02215  
 Phone: (617) 505-1088 | Fax: (888) 958-5798  
 Email: [accounting@supremecourtpress.com](mailto:accounting@supremecourtpress.com)

### INVOICE PRO FORMA

<b>Client:</b> Lidia M. Orrego <b>Firm:</b> Petitioner Pro Se <b>Phone:</b> 347-453-2234 <b>Address:</b> 95-08 Queens Blvd. 3E Rego Park, NY 11374	<b>Date:</b> Nov 15, 2024 <b>Case:</b> <i>Lidia M. Orrego v. Kevin Knipfing et al.</i> <b>Type:</b> Petition for Writ of Certiorari <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:liorrego@gmail.com">liorrego@gmail.com</a> <b>Invoice #:</b> 472487
--	---

Item Description	Amount
<b>Petition for Writ of Certiorari</b> • 40 for the Court, 3 for client, and 3 for respondent. • Typesetting. You send us unformatted documents which we place into Supreme Court format. Preparation of Cover • Generation of table of contents/authorities Set Up Fee = \$1800 discounted 10 % to \$ 1620. Covers all pages of the main brief up to 50 (around 9000 word limit). Additional brief pages if any @ \$20/typeset page	\$ 1,620
<b>Est 57</b> Additional appendix pages @ \$20/typeset page discounted to \$18/typeset page. Appendix pages that are typeset, but later remove by the client are refunded at \$8/typeset page. See initial appx items on page 3.	\$ 1,026
<b>Preparation and Production Fees</b>	<b>\$ Est 2,646</b>
<b>Pass Thru and Other Costs</b>	
Service upon court and parties, certificate of service/compliance, E-File prep, E-filing (atty only)	\$ 175
<b>SCP Issuance of Filing Fee Check</b>	\$ 300
<b>Estimated Total (with filing fee check)</b>	<b>\$ Est 3,121</b>
<b>Initial Payment (Due Upfront) by Check or Wire (add \$ 31.21 for card payment)</b>	<b>\$ 1,560.50</b>
<b>Final Payment (Due Prior to Print Date)</b>	<b>\$ Est 1,560.50</b>

**Terms and Conditions:**

- We accept checks, wires, money orders, and credit/debit cards. If you mail a check, you must provide a tracking number for the shipment with a check image. There is a 2% fee on credit/debit cards to partially offset the high transaction fees. Payment of any outstanding balance is due prior to the print date or project completion date. There are no refunds.
- The Supreme Court Press (SCP) does not provide legal advice. The strategic decisions and wording choices are the sole province of the Client. SCP does not calculate filing deadlines. It is the Client's responsibility to manage to and meet their deadlines. SCP does not provide a binding guarantee that a document will print or ship on any specific day. Remember that printing is a production process requiring machinery, materials, labor, energy, and transportation, and that this process is fallible.
- Late submission, late edits, or slow Client proof review may result in additional night/weekend/early AM charges at \$150/hr.
- Limitation on liability: SCP shall not be liable for any amount in excess of that paid by the Client. If there is a physical misprint, SCP will offer to reprint the document at no additional cost to Client.

**Lidia M. Orrego v. Kevin Knipfing et al. — Petition for Writ of Certiorari  
Initial Appendix Documents**

**Opinions and Orders**

Order, Second Circuit (December 1, 2023)

Order on Motion for Certificate of Appealability, USDC, ED NY (July 28, 2023)

Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration, USDC, ED NY (July 20, 2023)

Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration in their Entirety, USDC, ED NY (July 11, 2023)

Motion Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201 Is Denied, USDC, ED NY (April 10, 2023)

Order Adopting Report and Recommendations, USDC, ED NY (March 28, 2023)

Order Denying Motion to Vacate, USDC, ED NY (March 28, 2023)

Order and Report and Recommendations, USDC, ED NY (March 9, 2023)

Memorandum and Order, USDC, ED NY (September 21, 2021)

**Rehearing Order**

Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration, Second Circuit (January 19, 2024)