



www.motleyrice.com

"I will stand for my client's rights.
I am a trial lawyer."
—Ron Motley (1944–2013)

401 9th St. NW, Suite 630
Washington, DC 20004
o. 202.232.5504 f. 202.386.9622

Louis M. Bograd
Licensed in DC, KY
direct: 202.386.9623
lbograd@motleyrice.com

November 14, 2025

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

Re: *Express Scripts, Inc., et al., v. People of the State of California, by and through
Los Angeles County Counsel Dawyn R. Harrison,*
Case No. 25-327

Dear Mr. Harris,

By this letter and pursuant to Rule 30.4, Plaintiff-Respondent, the People of the State of California ("Respondent"), respectfully request an extension of 45 days' time in which to file a brief in opposition to the petition for writ of *certiorari* in this case, from December 1, 2025 to January 15, 2026.

On September 16, 2025, Petitioners filed a petition for writ of *certiorari* with the Court. The petition was docketed on September 18, 2025. Although Respondent initially waived response to the petition on October 16, the Court requested that a response be filed by letter dated October 30, 2025. That letter set a deadline for response of December 1, 2025.

This is Respondent's first request for an extension of time to file a response to the petition for writ of *certiorari*. Good cause exists for the requested extension. Respondent's counsel are already committed to completing and filing at least four other briefs between now and the beginning of December, which will occupy most of the available work hours between now and the current due date. In addition, lead appellate counsel for Respondent has a long-scheduled family vacation out of the country scheduled for the week of Thanksgiving until December 4. While counsel would normally limit their request for an extension to the 30-day period contemplated by the Court's Guidance on Scheduling, in this instance such an extension would reset the due date for New Year's Eve, in the midst of the Christmas and New Year's holidays. It is for this reason that Respondent requests a 45-day extension.

Because Respondent is requesting an extension in excess of 30 days, Respondent's counsel reached out to lead counsel for Petitioners to request their consent to the request. Petitioners' counsel declined to consent to the request for a 45-day extension or, for that matter, to the standard 30-day extension. Petitioners' counsel did indicate that they could agree to an 8-day extension to December 9, 2025; however, for the reasons noted in the previous paragraph, such a limited extension would not meet Respondent's counsel's needs. Counsel for the People of the State of

November 14, 2025

Page 2

California therefore respectfully request that this Court find good cause to extend the due date for their opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari to January 15, 2026.

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely,

/s/ Louis M. Bograd

LOUIS M. BOGRAD, ESQ.

MOTLEY RICE, LLC

401 9th Street NW, Suite 630

Washington, DC 20004

(202) 386-9623

lbograd@motleyrice.com

Counsel for Plaintiff-Respondent

CC: Brian D. Boone, Esq.
Christopher G. Michel, Esq.
Matthew P. Hooker, Esq.

Counsel for Petitioners