



1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700
Arlington, VA 22209
703.243.9423
www.consovoymccarthy.com

November 13, 2025

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

Re: *Littlejohn v. Sch. Bd. of Leon Cnty., Fla.*, No. 25-259

Dear Mr. Harris:

I represent petitioners in this case, who write to oppose respondents' request for an additional thirty days to file their brief in opposition. That extension could prejudice the Court and petitioners by decoupling this petition from the related petition in *Foote* (No. 25-77) and by pushing this petition to the next Term.

Respondents have already received nearly 90 days to respond to the petition. Petitioners filed it on September 3, 2025. Respondents' BIO was due on October 6. When respondents' counsel emailed petitioners' counsel about a 60-day extension, petitioners said they would agree to a 30-day extension. But respondents filed nothing—not a request for an extension, not a brief in opposition, and not even a waiver of their BIO. The Court called for a response by November 28, 2025.

An extension to December 29 would prejudice petitioners. It would likely guarantee that this case could not be heard until October Term 2026. Even if petitioners waived the 14-day reply period on December 30, the petition would likely be distributed for a conference in late January or early February—past the traditional time for cases to be heard in the current Term. That extension would also prevent the Court from considering this petition with the related petition in *Foote v. Ludlow School Committee*, No. 25-77, which has already been distributed for the November 21, 2025, conference.

Petitioners respectfully ask the Court to deny the requested extension.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Cameron T. Norris
cam@consovoymccarthy.com

Counsel for Petitioners