

**ARRINGTON LAW FIRM**  
4195 Wadsworth Boulevard  
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033

Barry K. Arrington  
(303) 205-7870  
barry@arringtonpc.com

December 1, 2025

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

Re: *National Association for Gun Rights, et al. v. Lamont, et al.* No. 25-421

Dear Mr. Harris:

Petitioners oppose Respondents' second motion for extension of time to file a brief in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari and state as follows:

The Court docketed the petition in this case on October 3, 2025. The response was originally due on November 6, 2025. Respondents moved for an extension of time on October 23, 2025, and the Court extended the response date to December 8, 2025.

Respondents have now filed a second motion for extension of time. The Court's guidance concerning motions to extend the time to file a brief in opposition to a petition for certiorari states in pertinent part:

If a respondent seeks an extension of more than 30 days, or a further extension after receiving a 30-day extension, respondent should include in the letter to the Clerk whether the petitioner(s) oppose the extension. Extensions beyond 30 days are possible but depend on the circumstances and the views of the other parties to the case. . . . If a petitioner opposes an extension request, and their opposition is not noted in the request, counsel for petitioner should contact the Clerk's Office promptly, since these motions are routinely acted upon very quickly.<sup>1</sup>

Pursuant to the Court's guidance, the undersigned contacted the Clerk's Office shortly after receiving Respondents' motion and left a voicemail stating that this opposition to the motion would be forthcoming.

In their first motion for extension of time, Respondents stated that they needed more time because their counsel had scheduling conflicts. Petitioners did not oppose that motion. Now, Respondents say they need still more time because their counsel continues to have scheduling conflicts. But on December 8, 2025,

---

<sup>1</sup> January 2023 Memorandum Concerning the Deadlines for Cert Stage Pleadings and the Scheduling of Cases for Conference (available at <https://www.supremecourt.gov/casehand/Guidance-on-Scheduling-2023.pdf>).

Respondents will have had 66 days in which to submit their opposition to the petition for certiorari. Nothing in Respondents' motion supports the proposition that their brief in opposition cannot be drafted and filed within the 66 days available. The asserted scheduling conflicts appear to be ordinary professional commitments that do not constitute good cause for a second extension of time. Respondents' desire to coordinate this matter with a petition in a separate case also does not constitute good cause.

Accordingly, a further extension of time is not warranted, and Petitioners respectfully request that Respondents' second motion for extension of time be denied. If the Court is inclined to grant a further extension of time, Petitioners request that it be limited to no more than 10 days (i.e., no later than December 18, 2025).

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Barry K. Arrington*

---

Barry K. Arrington

cc: Michael Kenneth Skold  
Respondents' counsel of record (by email)