

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term 2006

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER,

Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

**To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court
of the United States and Circuit Justice for the District of Columbia:**

STATE OF NEW YORK)
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER) ss.:

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the petitioner *pro se* and bring this motion for a 60-day extension of time to file my petition to this Court for a writ of certiorari, up to and including August 17, 2007.

2. By Memorandum Opinion and Judgment dated December 20, 2006 (Exhibit A), a three-judge panel of the D.C. Court of Appeals affirmed my conviction and sentence for “disruption of Congress”. By Order dated March 20, 2007 (Exhibit B), my petition for rehearing and rehearing *en banc* was denied, without mention of the incorporated motion

to vacate the Opinion and Judgment for fraud, lack of jurisdiction, disqualification of the judges, transfer of the appeals, and, if denied, disclosure.

3. My time to petition for a writ of certiorari expires on June 18, 2007. I am filing this motion more than ten days before that date.

4. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1257(b).

5. This extension is requested as I am not a lawyer, am acting *pro se*, and am swamped with personal and professional commitments beyond my control. I require time for further legal research, to secure the guidance of experts in Supreme Court procedure and constitutional law in developing and finalizing my petition for a writ of certiorari, and to solicit *amicus curiae* briefs.

6. The serious and substantial constitutional issues I intend to raise before this Court may be gleaned from my final submission in the D.C. Court of Appeals: my petition for rehearing, rehearing *en banc*, motion to vacate for fraud & lack of jurisdiction, disqualification/disclosure & transfer (Exhibit C). Its introduction identifies the Memorandum Opinion and Judgment as “a judicial fraud, being insupportable factually, legally, and knowingly so”, which it summarizes as follows:

“It affirms Sassower’s conviction and sentence for ‘disruption of Congress’ by materially falsifying her four appellate issues^[fn] and then disposes of each by false factual and legal assertions that are completely conclusory and which ignore ALL the contrary specific facts, law and legal argument she presented, because they are dispositive of her rights. This is accompanied by the panel’s own fictionalized account of the ‘disruption of Congress’ incident – for which it provides no record reference and whose fraudulence is verifiable from the videotape of the incident, in the possession of the Court. The dispositive nature of the videotape in establishing that what Sassower did at the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee’s May 22, 2003 judicial confirmation hearing could not constitute ‘disruption of Congress’, *as a matter of law*, and that she was prosecuted on materially false and misleading prosecution documents – which any fair and impartial tribunal would have thrown out, ‘on the papers’ – was centrally presented by

petitioner's appeal, but is concealed, without adjudication, by the Opinion and Judgment.

Such Opinion and Judgment, making NO claim that Sassower had due process either before [D.C. Superior Court] Judge Holeman or before this Court in any of the prior related proceedings is the latest unconstitutional manifestation of the actual bias and interest of the panel, whose disqualification Sassower sought by an October 16, 2006 letter-application – the existence of which the Opinion and Judgment also conceals, without adjudication. Consequently, Sassower combines with this petition a motion to vacate the Opinion and Judgment for fraud and lack of jurisdiction. She additionally reiterates and renews her October 16, 2006 letter-application for disqualification of the panel and the Court, for transfer of these consolidated appeals to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for disclosure, if such are denied.” (pp. 1-2, underlining & capitalization in the original).

7. The appended footnote pertaining to my four appellate issues is as follows:

“The ‘exceptional legal and constitutional importance’ of these four appellate issues – each of ‘first impression’, as to which the Court had the obligation to ‘make law’ – was the basis for Sassower’s August 4, 2005 petition for *en banc* initial hearing of the appeals.”


8. The actual four appellate issues I had presented to the D.C. Court of Appeals may be seen from the first page of my appellant’s brief – a copy of which is annexed (Exhibit D).

9. There is no prejudice to respondent by the granting of this request, which would serve justice and the public interest.

WHEREFORE, petitioner respectfully prays for an order extending her time to petition for a writ of certiorari, up to and including August 17, 2007.


ELENA RUTH SASSOWER

Sworn to before me this
21st of May 2007


Notary Public

PATRICIA M. PRICE
Notary Public, State of New York
Registration #01PR6040763
Qualified in Westchester County
My Commission Expires May 1, 2010

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A: D.C. Court of Appeals Memorandum Opinion and Judgment, dated December 20, 2006
- Exhibit B: D.C. Court of Appeals Order, dated March 20, 2007
- Exhibit C: Petition for Rehearing, Rehearing *En Banc*, Vacatur for Fraud & Lack of Jurisdiction, Disqualification/Disclosure & Transfer, dated January 2, 2007
- Exhibit D: Appellant's Brief: "Issues Presented for Review"