

January 21, 2026

VIA E-FILING, ELECTRONIC & U.S. MAIL

The Honorable Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: *Abbott v. League of United Latin American Citizens, et al.*, No. 25-845.

Dear Clerk Harris:

I write on behalf of the Gonzales Appellees¹ in the above referenced appeal to request a 30-day extension of the time to respond to Appellants' jurisdictional statement, from February 17 to March 19. This motion is brought under Rule 30(4). The other Appellees join in this motion.² Appellants do not oppose it.

There is good cause for the extension. Among other professional obligations, the current deadline falls in the middle of counsel of record for the Gonzales Appellees' two-week federal trial in *New Hampshire Youth Movement v. Scanlan*, No. 1:24-cv-291 (D.N.H.), which begins on February 9, and in the midst of merits briefing in *Watson v. Republican National Committee*, No. 24-1260 (U.S.). In addition, counsel of record for the LULAC Appellees has a petition for certiorari due January 22 in *Arkansas United v. Thurston*, No. 22-2918 (8th Cir.), an evidentiary hearing set for January 28 in *Pena Rios v. Driscoll*, No. 2025-DCV-0153 (448th Jud. Dist., El Paso Cnty.), and a petition for rehearing en banc due February 4 in *La Union del Pueblo Entero v. Nelson*, No. 22-50775 (5th Cir.).

¹ The Gonzales Appellees are the plaintiffs in consolidated case number 1:21-CV-965 (W.D. Tex.): Agustin Loredo, Jana Lynne Sanchez, Jerry Shafer, Debbie Lynn Solis, Charles Johnson Jr., Vincent Sanders, Rogelio Nuñez, Marci Madla, Mercedes Salinas, Heidi Cruz, Sylvia Bruni, and Gwendolyn Collins.

² The other Appellees are the plaintiffs in consolidated cases: the LULAC Plaintiffs (Case No. 3:21-cv-259); the Brooks Plaintiffs (Case No. 1:21-cv-991); the Mexican American Legislative Caucus (MALC) (Case No. 3:21-cv-988); the Texas State Conference of the NAACP (Case No. 1:21-cv-1006), and intervenor-plaintiffs Jasmine Crockett and Alexander Green.

The Honorable Scott Harris
January 21, 2026
Page 2

The extension sought would not as a practical matter delay the Court's adjudication of this appeal. Even without an extension, the Court would not consider the jurisdictional statement until the March 20 conference—too late for the Court to hear the appeal this term after an ordinary briefing schedule. And given the Court's grant of a stay pending appeal, the extension will not prejudice Appellants.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ David R. Fox

Counsel of Record for the Gonzales Appellees

cc: All counsel of record