

No. ____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Donnie Lowe,
Applicant,

v.

Rick Raemisch & Travis Trani,
Respondents.

**APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

DANIEL GREENFIELD
Counsel of Record
RODERICK & SOLANGE
MACARTHUR JUSTICE CENTER
NORTHWESTERN PRITZKER SCHOOL
OF LAW
375 E. Chicago Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 503-0711
daniel-
greenfield@law.northwestern.edu

Counsel for Applicant
Donnie Lowe

December 15, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii
Application for an Extension of Time Within Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari	1

TABLE OF AUTHORTIES

Cases

<i>Lowe v. Raemisch</i> , No. 15-CV-01830-RBJ, 2016 WL 4091175 (D. Colo. July 18, 2016).....	3
<i>Lowe v. Raemisch</i> , 864 F.3d 1205 (10th Cir. 2017)	2, 3
<i>Smith v. Dart</i> , 803 F.3d 304 (7th Cir. 2015).....	4
<i>Thomas v. Ponder</i> , 611 F.3d 1144 (9th Cir. 2010).....	3, 4
<i>Wilson v. Seiter</i> , 501 U.S. 294 (1991)	3

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	2
42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	2

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Donnie Lowe,
Applicant,

v.

Rick Raemisch & Travis Trani,
Respondents.

**APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

To the Honorable Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice of the United States and
Circuit Justice for the Tenth Circuit:

Pursuant to this Court's Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.3, Applicant Donnie Lowe respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit in this case, to March 9, 2018. As discussed herein, this case involves an important question of federal constitutional law upon which the lower courts are divided: the right of prisoners in solitary confinement to outdoor exercise.

Mr. Lowe has not previously sought an extension of time from this Court and Respondents do not oppose this request. Mr. Lowe requests this extension because Counsel of Record, Daniel Greenfield, did not represent applicant before the district court or appellate panel and therefore requires additional time to evaluate the record developed below. Furthermore, Mr. Greenfield has a number of other substantial commitments which would prevent him from providing the sort of comprehensive

analysis that would aid this Court in determining whether to grant certiorari. Finally, co-counsel Elisabeth Owen, who represented Mr. Lowe in the courts below, has recently experienced a family medical emergency that has warranted a temporary withdrawal of her full attention from this case.

The Tenth Circuit issued its opinion on July 25, 2017. *See Lowe v. Raemisch*, 864 F.3d 1205 (10th Cir. 2017) (attached hereto as Exhibit A). On October 10, 2017, Mr. Lowe's timely petition for rehearing en banc was denied by the Tenth Circuit. *See Lowe v. Raemisch*, 864 F.3d 1205 (10th Cir. 2017) (en banc denied Oct. 10, 2017) (attached hereto as Exhibit B). As such, the time for filing a petition would expire on January 8, 2018 absent an extension. Consistent with Rule 13.5, this application has been filed at least 10 days before that date. This Court has jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

1. Mr. Lowe was confined in administrative segregation at the Colorado State Penitentiary ("CSP") for two years and one month. Throughout this time, Mr. Lowe, *like all prisoners housed in administrative segregation at CSP*, was prohibited from exercising outdoors. Exercise was permitted only within the confines of his cell or another small indoor room.

2. The blanket prohibition on outdoor exercise led Mr. Lowe to sue the prison warden, Travis Trani, and the director of the Colorado Department of Corrections, Rick Raemisch in their individual and official capacities. Mr. Lowe invoked 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and claimed the complete denial of outdoor exercise for over two years was a violation of the Eighth Amendment. *Lowe*, 864 F.3d at 1206–07.

3. The warden and director moved to dismiss on the grounds that the right to outdoor exercise was not clearly established and, accordingly, that they were entitled to qualified immunity. *Id.* The district court determined that Mr. Lowe had adequately alleged a violation of a clearly established right and therefore denied the motion to dismiss. *Lowe v. Raemisch*, No. 15-CV-01830-RBJ, 2016 WL 4091175, at *3 (D. Colo. July 18, 2016), *rev'd and remanded*, 864 F.3d 1205 (10th Cir. 2017) (attached hereto as Exhibit C).

4. Respondents appealed the district court denial of their motion to dismiss to the Tenth Circuit. The Tenth Circuit reversed and remanded “with instructions to grant the defendants’ motion to dismiss.” *Lowe*, 864 F.3d at 1212. The court concluded that “competent officials could reasonably disagree about the constitutionality of disallowing outdoor exercise for two years and one month” and, accordingly, that Respondents were entitled to qualified immunity. *Id.* at 1212.

5. This case presents this Court with an opportunity to clarify an important constitutional right, upon which the circuits are in conflict. Exercise is a basic human need that must be provided to prisoners. *See Wilson v. Seiter*, 501 U.S. 294, 304 (1991). Furthermore, “some form of regular outdoor exercise is extremely important to the psychological and physical well being of [prisoners].” *Thomas v. Ponder*, 611 F.3d 1144, 1152 (9th Cir. 2010).

6. Mr. Lowe intends to file a petition for certiorari asking this Court to clarify that prison officials may not deny prisoners access to outdoor exercise. That question satisfies this Court’s criteria for certiorari: It concerns a fundamental

question of federal constitutional law upon which the circuits are divided. Some circuits hold that withholding outdoor exercise from a prisoner constitutes a violation of the Eighth Amendment absent a compelling penological interest in its temporary denial. *See, e.g., Thomas*, 611 F.3d at 1154-55. Others hold that the denial of outdoor exercise does not violate the Eight Amendment if sufficient indoor opportunities are provided. *See, e.g., Smith v. Dart*, 803 F.3d 304, 313 (7th Cir. 2015).

7. Mr. Lowe respectfully requests additional time to file his petition for certiorari for three reasons.

8. First, Mr. Greenfield, did not represent the applicant before the district court or the appellate panel and therefore requires additional time to evaluate the record developed below in order to provide the sort of comprehensive analysis that would aid this Court in determining whether to address this fundamental constitutional issue.

9. Second, Mr. Greenfield has a number of other substantial competing commitments, including the following: pending Fourth, Seventh, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuit appeals: *Williamson v. Sterling*, No. 17-6922 (4th Cir); *Wallace v. Baldwin*, No. 17-2427 (7th Cir.); *Grissom v. Roberts*, No. 17-3185 (10th Cir.); *Quintanilla v. Stanton*. No. 17-14141 (11th Cir.).

10. Third, Ms. Owen, who represented applicant in the courts below, has recently experienced a family medical emergency that has warranted a temporary withdrawal of her full attention from this case.

11. For these reasons, Mr. Lowe respectfully requests that the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari be extended to and including March 9, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Daniel Greenfield

DANIEL GREENFIELD
Counsel of Record
RODERICK & SOLANGE
MACARTHUR JUSTICE CENTER
NORTHWESTERN PRITZKER SCHOOL
OF LAW
375 E. Chicago Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 503-0711
daniel-
greenfield@law.northwestern.edu

Counsel for Applicant
Donnie Lowe

December 15, 2017

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on this 15th day of December, 2017, I caused a copy of the foregoing Application for Extension of Time to be served on the following by first-class mail, postage pre-paid, as well as electronically:

Kathryn A. Starnella
Office of the Attorney General for the State of Colorado
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Tel: 720-508-6000
Email: kathryn.starnella@coag.gov

/s/ Daniel Greenfield
Counsel of Record for Applicant