MAR 2 6 2019

FORM 3

COMBINED NOTICE OF APPEAL AND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Jon Welenc *	NOTICE OF APPEAL AND
V. Matyszcryk * MOTI	ON FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
Jon Welenc * V. Matyszcryk * et al *	18-CV-6087 (PKC) (RLM)
*	Docket No.
	I Circuit from the decision entered in this action CONSIDER MY COMPLAINT ed in the Clerk's Office within the required time
TAN WELEKE respectfully requests the (party) accordance with FRAP 4(a)(5) for the following reas "good cause" (state reasons): AM CURRENTLY STAYING OU	ons which constitute "excusable neglect" or
WHERE I AM LOOKING AFTER B	Y MY BLIND WIFE
a. In further support of this request, $\frac{1}{20}$ Court's decision was received on $\frac{03/01/20}{(\text{date})}$ court on $\frac{03-08-2019}{(\text{date})}$	states that this (party) and that this form was mailed to the
	Signature Belenc
	Printed Name PAN WELENC Address
	96-500 Sochaczew W. Królowy Jadwigi (46)-862 - 9866
	(46) - 862 - 9 866 Telephone No. (with area code)

Case 1:18-cv-06087-PKC-RLM Document 34 Filed 03/26/19 Page 2 of 5 PageID #: 57

20 20 19 way

Certificate of Acknowledgment of Execution of an Instrument

FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

★ MAR 2 6 2019

*

REPUBLIC OF POLAND CITY OF WARSAW EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BROOKLYN OFFICE

I, Nicklaus R. Laverty, Vice Consul of the United States of America at Warsaw, Poland duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that on this 8th day of March 2019, before me personally appeared Jan Welenc and acknowledged to me that the attached instrument was

EASTERN	DISTRICT	OF NEW	YORK
---------	----------	--------	------

JAN WELENC

Plaintiff,

AMENDED COMPLAINT

18 CV 6087 (PKC) (RLA)

-against-

PSFCU DIRECTORS

Matyrcryk et al Defendants.

In my complaint to the Court, I put the address of PSFCU New York office of the defendant Directors, which was the nearest to my place of residence. However, PSFCU has two branches in New York and New Jersey in which defendants have also their offices. In Fairfield (NJ) there is a modern PSFCU Operating Center, where directors handle the most important financial matters. High Court, when making decision to dismiss Plaintiff's case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and diversity jurisdiction, did not take into account this fact. Because the defendants have their offices in two different states of NY and NJ, this fact undermines Court's argument about lack of diversity jurisdiction. Therefore, I think that there is a basis for reconsideration of my case by the Court of Appeals.

By the way, I would like to refer to the precedent of the case of Mielczarek v. PSFCU (Case # 2: 12-cv-05162). As a result of the judgment of the US District Court of New Jersey Dir. Mielczarek as a result of the settlement received a large compensation.

Jan Delenc





