

January 14, 2022

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

Re: Opposition to respondent's request for 60-day extension of time to file response to petition - *Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*  
S. Ct. No. 21-788

---

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am lead counsel for petitioner in the above referenced case and write to express petitioner's objection to respondent City of Los Angeles's ("City") request for a 60-day extension on their response. Petitioners have already objected to a similar request made by intervenor-respondents. Like intervenor-respondents, on December 9, 2021, the City waived its right to respond, but now asks for a 60-day extension, for a total time of 90 days from the date of this Court's January 10<sup>th</sup> order requesting a response, and 132 days from the time the petition for writ of certiorari was docketed. We again respectfully ask the Court to deny the requested extension.

As before, good cause simply does not exist for an extension of such length. The City's reasons underlying its request are similar to those advanced by intervenor-respondents, including pre-existing professional obligations. Given the procedural posture of this case and the nature of the circumstances, a speedy resolution is necessary. Moreover, it is well understood that litigation before this Court demands the parties' utmost attention and priority. Like intervenor-respondents, the City expresses no aggravated or unavoidable reasons to triple the standard response time for filing an opposition. *See* Rule 15.3. The proposed 60-day extension is an unreasonable request and petitioners request that it be denied accordingly.

In the event the Court is inclined to extend the response date, petitioner requests the Court extend such date by no more than 15 days, for a total response time of 45 days from the date of this Court's January 10<sup>th</sup> request.

Hon. Scott S. Harris  
January 14, 2022  
Page 2

Respectfully submitted,

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP



Douglas J. Dennington

DJD:jp

cc: MARK ROSENBAUM  
KATHRYN EIDMANN  
TARA FORD  
FAIZAH MALIK  
CARA NEWLON  
ALISA RANDELL  
610 S. Ardmore Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90005  
T: (213) 385-2977  
[mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org](mailto:mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org)  
[keidmann@publiccounsel.org](mailto:keidmann@publiccounsel.org)  
[tford@publiccounsel.org](mailto:tford@publiccounsel.org)  
[fmalik@publiccounsel.org](mailto:fmalik@publiccounsel.org)  
[cnewlon@publiccounsel.org](mailto:cnewlon@publiccounsel.org)  
[arandell@publiccounsel.org](mailto:arandell@publiccounsel.org)

*Counsel for Intervenors*

ROHIT D. NATH  
MARC SELTZER  
KRYSTA KAUBLE PACHMAN  
Susman Godfrey LLP  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
T: (310) 789-3100  
[rnath@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:rnath@susmangodfrey.com)  
[mseltzer@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:mseltzer@susmangodfrey.com)  
[kpachman@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:kpachman@susmangodfrey.com)

Hon. Scott S. Harris  
January 14, 2022  
Page 3

NISHA N. VYAS  
RICHARD ROTHSCHILD  
Western Center on Law and Poverty  
3701 Wilshire Blvd, #208  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
T: (213) 235-2624  
[nvyas@wclp.org](mailto:nvyas@wclp.org)  
[rothschild@wclp.org](mailto:rothschild@wclp.org)

CRAIG DAVID CASTELLANET  
MICHAEL RAWSON  
Public Interest Law Project  
449 15th St. Suite 301  
Oakland, CA 94612  
T: (510) 891-9794  
[ccastellanet@pilpca.org](mailto:ccastellanet@pilpca.org)  
[mrawson@pilpca.org](mailto:mrawson@pilpca.org)

JONATHAN H. EISENMAN  
DEBORAH BREITHAUPT  
ELAINE ZHONG  
Office of the City Attorney  
City Hall East, Suite 800  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
T: (213) 978-2212  
[jonathan.eisenman@lacity.org](mailto:jonathan.eisenman@lacity.org)  
[deborah.breithaupt@lacity.org](mailto:deborah.breithaupt@lacity.org)  
[elaine.zhong@lacity.org](mailto:elaine.zhong@lacity.org)

*Counsel for Defendants*