

Ngcxg'tq'Hkg'I t cpwgf 12/4/24"

Via ECF

Hon. Beryl Howell, U.S.D.J.
United States District Court for the District of Columbia
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
Dgt { n'COJ qy gm'
Wpkqf "Ucvgu'F kutlev'Lwf i g"

Re: *Freeman, et al., v. Giuliani, 23-cv-3754*

Dear Judge Howell:

I am the pro se Defendant in the above-referenced action. I write to request a thirty-day extension to file a response and opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Civil Contempt, filed November 20, 2024. *See* Dkt. No. 19. If this request is granted, the response and opposition will be filed on January 2, 2025, instead of December 2, 2024, the deadline that was set by the Court. *See* November 21, 2024 Scheduling Order.

The primary reason for this requested extension is that I need more time to find an attorney to represent me in this matter, especially now that Plaintiffs are making allegations seeking civil contempt. I have spoken to four attorneys and each attorney has declined to handle this matter because they believe Your Honor is unreasonable and biased about Trump related matters and “ideological rather than logical.” One said it was “a foregone conclusion” and “a no-win proposition.” Among other numerous reasons your handling of the J6 cases is considered by many to be the most unnecessarily harsh. They also cited objections of their firm to the effect on their practice. Some were willing to assist in my other cases, but not this one. Additionally, the difficulty of finding an attorney has been exacerbated by the Thanksgiving holiday. There is no prejudice to Plaintiffs in granting this extension since I will agree to abide by their interpretation of the restrictions, on what I consider my right of free speech and to defend myself against their false statements, until the matter is heard.

To the extent that the Court is not willing to give me an extension to find an attorney, I ask for at least three weeks so that I can prepare my response on a pro se basis to properly set out before the Court that the purported comments mentioned in the Plaintiffs’ motion for contempt were to defend myself against their comments and only relate to the judicial proceedings and not to comments about the Plaintiffs.

This is the first request for the extension to oppose the motion see by the Court.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rudolph W. Giuliani
Defendant *pro se*

RECEIVED

DEC 3 2024
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Court for the District of Columbia