

April 28, 2025

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

Re: *Raizel Blumberger v. Ian B. Tilley, et al.* No. 24-1072
Request for extension of time

Dear Mr. Harris:

On behalf of Respondent, Ian B. Tilley, M.D., and pursuant to Rules 15.3 and 30.4 of the Rules of this Court, we respectfully request a 30-day extension of time, to and including June 11, 2025, to oppose the petition for a writ of certiorari in this matter.


The petition, after an approved extension, was docketed on April 9, 2025. No. 24A832 (granting 30-day extension) (Kagan, J). The United States requested and received an extension to petition for a writ of certiorari but ultimately chose not to. *Blumberger v. Tilley*, No. 24A865 (granting 30-day extension) (Kagan, J.). A brief in opposition is currently due on May 12, 2025. Petitioner consents to a 21-day extension but opposes any additional time. The United States consents to the requested extension.

The extension request is due to counsel's obligations in other litigation, including briefing and argument in: *Hale v. ARcare, Inc.*, No. 24-1726 (8th Cir.), *Johnson v. Petaluma Health Ctr, Inc.*, No. 23-cv-03870 (N.D. Ca.), *Fazenbaker v. Cmty. Health Care, Inc.*, No. 24-cv-11170 (D. N.J.), *Moser v. E. Cent. Mo. Behavioral Health Servs., Inc.*, No. 25-cv-00020 (E.D. Mo.), *Gonzalez v. El Centro Del Barrio*, No. 25-50092 (5th Cir.), and *Bradford v. Asian Health Servs.*, No. 24-3702 (9th Cir.).

A 30-day extension would better enable counsel to fully consider whether to oppose and, if so, to prepare an opposition that would be most helpful to the Court.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew Sidney Freedus
Counsel of Record
Rosie Dawn Griffin

cc: Adam R. Pulver, Counsel of Record for Petitioner
D. John Sauer, Solicitor General of the United States