

No. 24A-\_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

K.C., *et al.*,

Petitioners,

v.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE MEDICAL LICENSING  
BOARD OF INDIANA, *et al.*

Respondents.

---

**Application to the Honorable Justice Amy Coney Barrett  
for an extension of time to file  
a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit**

\* \* \*

To the Honorable Justice Amy Coney Barrett, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit Justice for the Seventh Circuit:

Under Supreme Court Rules 13.5 and 30.2, Petitioners request a sixty (60) day extension of time, from June 16, 2025 through August 15, 2025, to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Counsel for Respondents does not oppose this extension request and authorized undersigned counsel to so inform the Court.

The Court of Appeals issued its opinion on November 13, 2024 (Exhibit 1) and denied Petitioners' Petition for Rehearing En Banc on March 18, 2025. (Exhibit 2).

The petition for a writ of certiorari is therefore due on June 16, 2025. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

Supreme Court Rule 13.5 permits a Justice of this Court “for good cause” to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari for a period not exceeding sixty (60) days, as long as the Clerk receives the application at least ten (10) days before the petition is due. S. Ct. R. 30.2. This request for an extension has been filed in advance of that and, as explained herein, good cause exists.

This case arises as a challenge to Indiana laws prohibiting physicians and other medical practitioners from (a) “knowingly provid[ing] gender transition procedures to a minor,” Ind. Code § 25-1-22-13(a), and (b) “aid[ing] or abet[ting] another physician or practitioner in the provision of gender transition procedures to a minor,” Ind. Code § 25-1-22-13(b). As is relevant here, Petitioners, on behalf of certified classes, have challenged the former provision as violative of the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment and have challenged the latter provision as violative of the First Amendment. The Indiana laws challenged in this litigation are similar to statutes regulating the provision of gender-affirming care to minors that have been enacted in numerous jurisdictions, and the constitutionality of those statutes has divided the courts of appeals. A panel of the Seventh Circuit held (2-1) that the challenged statutes did not violate equal protection, due process, or the First Amendment. (Exhibit 1).

The equal protection question presented by this case is substantially identical to the question on which this Court has granted certiorari in *United States v.*

*Skrmetti*, No. 23-477. Oral argument was conducted in *Skrmetti* on December 4, 2024 and a decision is expected during the current Term. While *Skrmetti* will not directly resolve the due process or First Amendment questions presented by this case, this Court's decision may have a bearing on those questions or on Petitioners' determination as to whether to seek certiorari.

Even were it not for the pendency of *Skrmetti*, given the commitments of Petitioners' counsel, additional time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari would be appropriate in order to allow Petitioners sufficient time to prepare an adequate petition. The commitments of counsel of record, Kenneth J. Falk, include but are not limited to the following: (a) presenting oral argument in *Cordellioné v. Arnold*, Nos. 24-2838, 24-3240 & 25-1450 (7th Cir.) on May 21, 2025; (b) preparing and litigating requests for temporary restraining orders and/or preliminary injunctions in *Liu v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-00716-JPH-TAB (S.D. Ind.), and *Hu v. Noem*, No. 4:25-cv-00028-PPS-JEM (N.D. Ind.); (c) briefing a preliminary-injunction motion in *L.A. v. Braun*, No. 1:25-cv-00596-MPB-TAB (S.D. Ind.), with an opening memorandum due on May 5, 2025 and a reply memorandum due on June 26, 2025; (d) briefing to-be-filed on a summary-judgment motion in *Wirtshafter v. Whitten*, No. 1:24-cv-00754-RLY-MJD (S.D. Ind.), with an opening memorandum due on May 28, 2025 and a reply memorandum due on July 28, 2025; and (e) briefing to-be-filed in summary judgment motions in the separate but related cases of *Place of Grace, Inc. v. Indiana Department of Homeland Security*, No. 1:24-cv-1272-TWP-MKK (S.D. Ind.), *Harmony Home of Huntington, Inc. v. Indiana Department of Homeland Security*, No. 1:24-cv-

1228-TWP-MKK (S.D. Ind.), *Inspiration Ministries, Inc. v. State of Indiana*, No. 1:23-cv-2027-TWP-MKK (S.D. Ind.), *Behind the Wire Ministries, Inc. v. State of Indiana*, No. 1:24-cv-143-TWP-MKK (S.D. Ind.), *Next Step Recovery Home, Inc. v. State of Indiana*, No. 1:24-cv-353-TWP-MKK (S.D. Ind.), with opening memoranda due on June 23, 2025.

These deadlines and scheduling matters, along with the prudence of awaiting this Court's decision in *Skrmetti*, provide good cause for granting Petitioners' unopposed extension motion.

For the reasons expressed above, Petitioners request the Court grant them a sixty-day extension, to and including August 15, 2025, to file a petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth J. Falk  
*Counsel of Record*  
Gavin M. Rose  
Stevie J. Pactor  
ACLU of Indiana  
1031 E. Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
317/635-4059  
fax: 317/635-4105  
kfalk@aclu-in.org  
grose@aclu-in.org  
spactor@aclu-in.org

Cecillia D. Wang

Chase Strangio  
Harper Seldin  
American Civil Liberties Union  
125 Broad Street  
New York, NY 10004  
212/549-2500  
cwang@aclu.org  
cstrangio@aclu.org  
hseldin@aclu.org

Attorneys for Petitioners