



**Harrang  
Long P.C.**

**ALYSON E. SNEIDER**

*Admitted in Oregon*

111 SW Columbia St., Suite 950

Portland, OR 97201

alyson.sneider@harrang.com

(503) 242-0000

(541) 686-6564 (FAX)

June 24, 2025

**VIA EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL**

Scott S. Harris,  
Clerk of the Court  
Supreme Court of the United States  
1 First St., N.E.  
Washington, D.C., 20543

Re: *Real Property Commonly Known As: 11475 NW Pike Road, Yamhill Oregon, Yamhill County and any Residence Buildings, or storage Facilities Thereon and Sheryl Lynn Sublet, v. Yamhill County, et al.*  
U.S. Supreme Court Case No. 24-1252

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am counsel for Respondent Yamhill County ("Respondent") in this case.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner filed her petition on June 4, 2025. Respondent's response currently is due on July 7, 2025. Pursuant to Rule 30.4, Respondent respectfully requests that the time for filing a response be extended by thirty days. Such an extension would make Respondent's response due on August 6, 2025. Petitioner does not oppose the extension.

This request for an extension is Respondent's first. Good cause exists for the requested extension. Respondent anticipates that one or more amicus briefs may be filed in support of Petitioner's petition. The deadline for any such brief is July 7, 2025, the same day as the deadline for Respondent's response. Amicus support for the petition would affect whether Respondent chooses to file a response and the content of any response it does file. The requested extension is thus necessary to ensure that Respondent and its counsel have adequate opportunity to review and consider both the petition and any amicus briefs. Additionally, there are no circumstances that necessitate a speedy ruling on the Petition.

Accordingly, Respondent requests a thirty-day extension of time, to and including August 6, 2025, to file its brief in opposition to the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. Before submitting this

---

<sup>1</sup> I am not currently a member of the Supreme Court of the United States Bar. Respondent understands that, at the time that the response is due, an attorney who is a member of the Supreme Court of the United States Bar will need to file it. Multiple members of Harrang Long P.C. are members of the requisite Bar.

June 24, 2025

Page 2

---

letter, my co-counsel informed Petitioner's counsel—Zachary Stern of Stern Law, Salem, Oregon—of Respondent's intent to request a thirty-day extension. Mr. Stern kindly informed us that Petitioner does not object to the requested thirty-day extension.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Alyson E. Schneider

AES:tl