

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO.
(202) 538-8308

WRITER'S EMAIL ADDRESS
christophermichel@quinnemanuel.com

November 14, 2025

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

Re: *Express Scripts, Inc. v. California*, No. 25-327

Dear Mr. Harris:

Petitioners respectfully oppose respondent's request for a 45-day extension of time to respond to the certiorari petition in this case, but petitioners do not object to a shorter extension (e.g., to December 9, 2025) that ensures the Court can decide the case this Term if it grants the petition. As elaborated in the petition and accompanying motion to expedite, petitioners seek review of the denial of a stay pending appeal. Given that requested relief and the ongoing harm to petitioners from the absence of a stay, it is particularly appropriate to maintain a schedule that permits resolution of the case this Term if the petition is granted.

Maintaining that schedule would not prejudice respondent. The petition in this case was filed on September 16, 2025. Respondent waived its right to respond on October 16, 2025. This Court called for a response on October 30, 2025. With an extension of time to December 9, 2025, respondent will have had 84 days since the filing of petition to prepare a response. Petitioners respectfully submit that an 84-day response period is adequate, particularly given that respondent answered the Ninth Circuit's call for a response to the rehearing petition within 21 days.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher G. Michel

Counsel for Petitioners

cc: Counsel of Record