

App. No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOHN DOE 1; JOHN DOE 2,

Applicants,

v.

TWITTER, INC.; X CORP.,

Respondents.

**APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO
FILE A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Paul G. Cassell
Utah Appellate Project
S.J. Quinney College of Law
383 South University St.
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
(801) 585-5202

Lisa D. Haba
Adam A. Haba
The Haba Law Firm, P.A.
1220 Commerce Park Dr.
Ste. 207
Longwood, FL 32779
(844) 422-2529

Paul A. Matiasic
The Matiasic Firm, P.C.
One Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94111

Thomas R. McCarthy
Taylor A.R. Meehan
Tiffany H. Bates
ANTONIN SCALIA LAW SCHOOL
SUPREME COURT CLINIC
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Blvd.
Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
tom@consovoymccarthy.com

Benjamin W. Bull
Peter A. Gentala
Danielle Bianculli Pinter
Christen M. Price
National Center on Sexual
Exploitation
1201 F St. NW, Ste. 200
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 393-7245

Counsel for Applicants John Doe 1 and John Doe 2

To the Honorable Elena Kagan, as Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13.5, Applicants John Doe 1 and John Doe 2 respectfully request an additional 60-day extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this case, to and including February 6, 2025.

In support of this request, Applicants states as follows:

1. The Ninth Circuit entered judgment on August 1, 2025, *see* Ex. 1, and denied a petition for rehearing en banc on September 9, 2025, *see* Ex. 2. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

2. This case involves the important issue of whether Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act shields internet platforms from liability for knowingly possessing child pornography and knowingly benefiting from a sex-trafficking venture.

3. Applicants John Doe 1 and John Doe 2 were just 13 and 14 years old when they fell prey to traffickers masquerading as a teenage girl. The traffickers manipulated the minors into sending nude photos and videos of themselves and then extorted them into producing and sending additional child pornography or child sex abuse material (CSAM) to the traffickers in exchange for the traffickers not distributing the existing photos and videos to their community.

4. But John Doe 1's and John Doe 2's worst nightmare became a reality when a compilation video posted on Twitter depicting all their CSAM circulated among their peers at schools.

5. John Doe 1 and his mother contacted Twitter and asked them to remove the CSAM. But Twitter refused to remove the CSAM despite verifying the victims' identities. It informed the victims that "it reviewed the posts, found no policy violations, and would take no further action." Ex. 1 at 8. Twitter later removed the CSAM only once an agent at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security submitted a formal request.

6. Applicants sued Twitter, alleging (among other things) that Twitter knowingly benefited from sex trafficking in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1591, giving rise to civil liability under 18 U.S.C. §1595.

7. The district court dismissed the claims, primarily based on Section 230 immunity. The Ninth Circuit affirmed in large part. It held that any "activity that can be boiled down to deciding whether to exclude material that third parties seek to post online" is "perforce immune under §230," absent the exception set forth in the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, which the court held did not apply here. Ex. 1 at 9-10 (citations omitted).

8. Good cause exists for granting Applicants' request for an extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari. Applicants have retained new counsel with Supreme Court expertise to serve as counsel of record in this Court. Additional time is necessary and warranted for counsel to review the record in the case, research relevant case law, and prepare a clear and concise petition for certiorari for the Court's review. Additionally, counsel of record has multiple other deadlines during this period, including oral argument over six motions to dismiss in *Weinberg v. NSJP*,

No. 25-cv-3714 (C.D. Cal) on December 15, 2025, and briefing in *NIFLA v. Treto*, Nos. 25-1603, 25-1659, 25-1655 & 25-1657 (7th Cir.) on December 26, 2025. Counsel also has a long-planned holiday travel during this period.

Conclusion

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Court extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this to and including February 6, 2025.

Dated: November 25, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

Paul G. Cassell
Utah Appellate Project
S.J. Quinney College of Law
383 South University St.
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
(801) 585-5202

Lisa D. Haba
Adam A. Haba
The Haba Law Firm, P.A.
1220 Commerce Park Dr.
Ste. 207
Longwood, FL 32779
(844) 422-2529

Paul A. Matiasic
The Matiasic Firm, P.C.
One Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94111

/s/ Thomas R. McCarthy
Thomas R. McCarthy
Taylor A.R. Meehan
Tiffany H. Bates
ANTONIN SCALIA LAW SCHOOL
SUPREME COURT CLINIC
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Blvd.
Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
tom@consovoymccarthy.com

Benjamin W. Bull
Peter A. Gentala
Danielle Bianculli Pinter
Christen M. Price
National Center on Sexual
Exploitation
1201 F St. NW, Ste. 200
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 393-7245

Certificate of Service

A copy of this application was served by email and by mail to the counsel listed below in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 22.2 and 29.3:

Derek L. Shaffer
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
1300 I St. NW, #900
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 538-8000

/s/ Thomas R. McCarthy