PAUL
HASTINGS

1(202) 551-1990
naveenmodi@paulhastings.com

November 11, 2025

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
Supreme Court of the United States
One First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: *Lynk Labs, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 25-308

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am counsel for Respondent Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("Samsung") in the above-captioned case. Although Samsung waived its right to respond to Petitioner Lynk Labs, Inc.'s petition for a writ of certiorari, the Court has requested a response. Samsung's response is currently due on December 3, 2025.

I respectfully request a 30-day extension of time, to and including January 2, 2026, within which to file Samsung's response to the petition. This extension is needed in light of counsel's competing professional commitments in other matters. The requested additional time would enable counsel to prepare a response to the petition that will be useful to the Court while accommodating these conflicting obligations.[*]

Additionally, the Court has already granted the Solicitor General's request for an extension of time, to and including January 2, 2026, for the government's response to the petition. Granting Samsung's request for a similar extension would synchronize the deadline for all responses, and would not delay the Court's consideration of the petition.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Naveen Modi

Naveen Modi
Counsel for Respondent Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.

cc: Jeffrey A. Lamken, MoloLamken LLP, *Counsel for Petitioner Lynk Labs, Inc.*
D. John Sauer, Solicitor General

[*] Samsung previously requested an extension of time for its response, which the Court granted, extending the time for a response from October 16, 2025 to November 17, 2025. Samsung did not utilize the full granted extension, instead waiving its right to respond on October 20, 2025.