

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP

1440 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-2111

TEL: (202) 371-7000

FAX: (202) 393-5760

www.skadden.com

DIRECT DIAL  
202-371-7000  
EMAIL ADDRESS  
SHAY.DVORETZKY@SKADDEN.COM

FIRM/AFFILIATE OFFICES

BOSTON  
CHICAGO  
HOUSTON  
LOS ANGELES  
NEW YORK  
PALO ALTO  
WILMINGTON  
ABU DHABI  
BEIJING  
BRUSSELS  
FRANKFURT  
HONG KONG  
LONDON  
MUNICH  
PARIS  
SÃO PAULO  
SEOUL  
SHANGHAI  
SINGAPORE  
TOKYO  
TORONTO

August 28, 2025

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

RE: *National Basketball Association v. Salazar*, No. 24-994: Response to  
letter regarding this case in *Solomon v. Flipps Media*, No. 25-228

Dear Mr. Harris:

I represent the National Basketball Association in this case, *National Basketball Association v. Salazar*, No. 24-994. I write to respond to the August 27, 2025, letter from Petitioner Detrina Solomon in *Solomon v. Flipps Media*, No. 25-228, contending that the Court should delay consideration of the petition in *Salazar* to consider *Solomon* and *Salazar* at the same conference, and the related contention in the *Solomon* petition that the Court should grant review in *Solomon* and hold the petition in *Salazar*. The Court should reject that suggestion and promptly grant review in *Salazar*, where both sides agree that there is a deepening, 2–2 circuit split on an important Video Privacy Protection Act (VPPA) question, and that the pending Ninth Circuit case will soon make that split 3–2. *See* NBA Suppl. Br. 3. Solomon’s contrary, self-serving position is as shortsighted as it is aggressive.

*First*, the 2–2 (and soon to be 3–2) circuit split on the question presented in *Salazar* proves that the *Salazar* question presented is both important and outcome-determinative. Solomon says the Court should grant review in her case first and then see what happens. But the fully briefed question presented in *Salazar* is the one rapidly driving different outcomes in different courts across the country. Indeed, since the Second Circuit’s decision in *Solomon*, the D.C. Circuit has deepened the split on the question presented in *Salazar*, belying Solomon’s claim that the Court should wait to consider *Salazar* until it also can consider *Solomon*. Put differently, the courts of appeals continue to resolve online VPPA cases more frequently on the *Salazar* question presented than on the *Solomon* question presented. Solomon invokes

efficiency. But the efficient course is to promptly resolve the fully briefed petition and address the issue that has proven outcome-determinative across multiple circuits.

*Second*, and relatedly, postponing consideration of the question presented in *Salazar* and then granting review in *Solomon* and holding *Salazar* makes no sense on Solomon's own premise. The *Solomon* question (what constitutes personally identifiable information under the VPPA) and the *Salazar* question (who is a "consumer" under the VPPA) are distinct and independent questions, and each can be resolved without deciding the other (as the Second Circuit's decisions in both cases make clear). If the Court grants review in *Solomon* and Solomon prevails, the NBA's petition in *Salazar* will remain just as critically certworthy, because whether Salazar's claim can proceed will continue to turn on the question presented in *Salazar*—just as the *Salazar* question presented will remain outcome-determinative in the other circuits in the split and in many other cases, too. And if the Court grants review in *Solomon* and Solomon loses, then Salazar, as he has promised, will argue that *Solomon* doesn't control and try to plead around it. Simply put, there is no reason to think that Solomon's suggested approach will be efficient—just the opposite. To be sure, Solomon needs the Court to grant review to give her any chance of proceeding with her suit, but that doesn't mean everybody whose case turns on an important question on which the courts have split 2–2 should have to wait for her.

*Third*, the proper and efficient course in *Solomon* is percolation anyway. No court of appeals has had the opportunity to consider the Second Circuit's reasoning in *Solomon*, and the opportunity to do so could resolve Solomon's alleged split. Solomon claims that there is a 3–1 split, with the First Circuit as the outlier. *See* Pet. at i, *Solomon*, No. 25-228. There is every reason to believe that the First Circuit, which issued the first, and outlier, decision in the alleged split almost a decade ago, would reassess its reasoning when confronted with the more recent decisions of three other courts of appeals. What's more, if this Court grants review and reverses in *Salazar*, resolving the deepening circuit split and determining the outcome of many cases, the *Solomon* issue will also diminish in importance. There is no reason to delay review in *Salazar* when, as noted, the question presented here has proven outcome-determinative in a deepening split.

The Court should promptly grant review in *Salazar*.

Respectfully submitted,



Shay Dvoretzky

*Counsel for Petitioner*

*National Basketball Association*

cc: see attached service list

Service List for *National Basketball Association v. Salazar*, No. 24-994

Joshua Ian Hammack  
BAILEY & GLASSER, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-463-2101  
jhammack@baileyglasser.com  
*Counsel for Respondent*  
*Michael Salazar*