



Michelle C. Doolin
+1 858 550 6043
mdoolin@cooley.com

May 10, 2019

Hon. Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
Supreme Court of the United States
One First Street NE
Washington, DC 20543

Re: *Perryman v. Romero*, No. 18-1074

Dear Mr. Harris:

Respondent Provide Commerce, Inc. ("Provide Commerce") writes to correct certain inaccuracies set forth in Petitioner's opposition to Respondents' joint request for a 30-day extension of time to file responses.

First, Provide Commerce has not received any prior extension of time to file a response. Second, Petitioner's assertion that Respondents are somehow acting in bad faith is unwarranted. The above-captioned matter fundamentally differs from *Frank v. Gaos*, No. 17-961. Underscoring the point, the Ninth Circuit denied Petitioner's October 10, 2018 motion to stay issuance of the mandate pending disposition of *Gaos*. Further, Petitioner himself received a lengthy extension of time to file the petition, which Respondents did not oppose. Third, a different coalition of attorneys general provided *amicus* briefing below on completely different issues, and the Center for Individual Rights did not file any *amicus* briefing below. Respondents have had no prior opportunity to consider their positions regarding the petition.

Accordingly, Provide Commerce respectfully requests a 30-day extension of time to file its response.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY LLP

s/Michelle C. Doolin

Michelle C. Doolin
Attorneys for Respondent
PROVIDE COMMERCE, INC.

cc: Counsel of Record