

WH

U.S. District Court for
the Northern District of KC

KC FILED

MAR 14 2005

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Case # 1:04-cv-07072

More
v

Obama et al

Plaintiff (ROM's) Motion For Extension of Time

When which to file notice of appeal, Filed
as verified on 3/14/05 and Upon Proposal

That this Court Grant leave to ROM to file it
in a Multi-Component Format

Now comes the Plaintiff to move this Honorable
Court to ~~grant ROM~~ to obtain grant ROM
leave to file the notice of appeal as regard
to the case such appeal would concern one
day after the 30 day deadline will have expired
and/or to grant an extension of time when
which ROM may file such notice of appeal &
in support of which petition ROM avers &
explains as follows or ~~is~~ the alternative to
② permit ROM to present multiple components of
this motion so as to ensure the Court does not
make any decision in regard to this matter
on something other than what can be identified
to constitute a minimally adequate understanding of
the hardship to which ROM has been subjected
during the last 30 days that resulted in this missing
the appeal deadline.

Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider
64:CV-07072

- ① Plaintiff ROR is filing this motion w/o the benefit of a printer & will remain on type if it is not adequately legible.
- ② Plaintiff was without his computer for 18 days up until 3/13/05 due to its having to be repaired & the repeated failure of Compaq to accomplish such objective.
- ③ Assuming that per se, Plaintiff fell behind on all of his legal affairs & did not recall that the notice of appeal was due or in short measure.
- ④ Plaintiff erroneously understood that he was obliged to file the notice of appeal with the appellate court for the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, based upon the procedure he has followed in the court of appeals for the State of Ill in the First District.
- ⑤ The U.S.C.A. for the Seventh Circuit maintains a "transom rule" whereby a litigant can get a document filed before 9:00 am (presented to the court before 9:00 am) file stamped with stamp from the previous day.
- ⑥ It was not until 3/13/05, that ROR realized that the notice of appeal must be filed with the District Court Clerk.
- ⑦ That this document is stamped before 9:00 am demonstrates the truthfulness of this claim.

Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment
P. 3

04cv07072

② Rather than lying about reception of the Court's order of 2/9/05 in this case, which N. On. could not morally justify doing, but which many people would do, N. On. has truthfully explained how his broken computer (not to mention several other problems that accompany poverty - lack of reliable transportation - subjected to an unjustified written proceeding) & many other factors which will be explained if necessary (in later filings) & other problems caused him to inadvertently rely on a rule not actually applicable in this case (i.e. the "transom" rule of the T.M.C.A. that does not apply to a notice of appeal).

Wherefore, N. On. moves this Court to grant him an extension of time in which to file the notice of appeal & to accept the notice of appeal stamped 3/14/05 in regard to case # 04cv07072 or in the alternative to grant N. On. leave to further demonstrate reversible neglect on this matter.

Respectfully,
Robert J. Moore