

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

CITIZENS ALLIANCE FOR GOVERNMENT INTEGRITY,

Applicant,

v.

YORK COUNTY, BY AND THROUGH ITS MANAGER JOSHUA EDWARDS;
JOSH REINHARDT, MANAGER OF YORK COUNTY DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES DEPARTMENT; and JONATHAN BUONO,
DIRECTOR OF YORK COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT,

Respondents.

**APPLICATION TO CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS
FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT**

Lauren Joseph Wolongevicz
Counsel of Record
Appellate Counsel, PC
One Boston Place, Suite 2600
Boston, MA 02108
(855) 941-5796
lauren@appellatecounsel.law

March 5, 2026

Counsel for Applicant

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, Applicant CITIZENS ALLIANCE FOR GOVERNMENT INTEGRITY states that it is a nonprofit corporation with no outstanding shares of stock. Accordingly, there is no parent corporation, and no publicly held company owns 10% or more of its stock.

APPLICATION TO CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States and Circuit Justice for the Fourth Circuit:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.2, Applicant CITIZENS ALLIANCE FOR GOVERNMENT INTEGRITY (“CAGI”) respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time, to and including May 15, 2026, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari. Applicant seeks review of the Order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina entered on December 16, 2025, in *Citizens Alliance for Government Integrity v. York County, et al.*, Appellate Case No. 2025-002174. Absent an extension of time, the petition would be due March 16, 2026. This Application is being filed at least ten days in advance of that date. The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a). The petition below invoked issues under the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. The Order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina is a final judgment of the highest court of a state in which a decision could be had. *See Rescue Army v. Mun. Ct. of City of Los Angeles*, 331 U.S. 549, 568, 67 S. Ct. 1409, 91 L. Ed. 1666

(1947) (state court order finally disposing of an independent prohibition proceeding is a final judgment for purposes of this Court’s jurisdiction).

BACKGROUND

Applicant CAGI is a nonprofit organization representing approximately 7,500 residents in upper York County, South Carolina. Its members reside near an 840,000-square-foot warehouse that is being converted into a chemical manufacturing facility by Silfab Solar Inc., a Canadian corporation.

The facility utilizes hazardous, pyrophoric chemicals—including trimethyl-aluminum (which ignites on contact with air), hydrofluoric acid, and silane—and is located next to an elementary and middle school, within a three-mile radius that includes more than 53,000 residents. On May 30, 2024, the York County Board of Zoning Appeals (“BZA”) voted 5-0 to reverse the zoning administrator’s interpretation that solar panel manufacturing is a permitted use at the site.

Despite this unanimous legislative determination, York County administrative officials have issued all necessary construction permits to Silfab. Administrative officials effectively accomplished through permitting what the legislative body refused to authorize—raising concerns of arbitrary government action in violation of federal due process.

The facility is now substantially complete and, according to corporate announcements, operational.

On October 28, 2025, Applicant filed a Verified Complaint and Petition for Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition in the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

of South Carolina, seeking to halt further permitting and compel compliance with zoning law. The petition invoked federal substantive due process standards, citing *Nectow v. City of Cambridge*, 277 U.S. 183, 48 S. Ct. 447, 72 L. Ed. 842 (1928), and alleging that the County’s conduct “has no foundation in reason and no substantial relation to public health, public safety, or welfare.”

On December 16, 2025, the South Carolina Supreme Court, after construing the petition to include a request for injunctive relief, declined to exercise original jurisdiction. With the facility now operational and executive officials continuing to issue permits in defiance of the BZA’s unanimous determination, Applicant contends that the delay inherent in alternative forums will render any relief meaningless. The intended petition will raise issues of national importance concerning this Court’s jurisdiction to review such a refusal under the circumstances presented here.

REASONS FOR GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

Good cause exists for an extension of time for the following specific reasons:

Undersigned counsel was retained on March 3, 2026, only thirteen days before the original filing deadline. Applicant required time for its board of directors to confer, seek input from its membership, authorize retention, and make the necessary arrangements to engage counsel. The recent engagement of counsel did not allow adequate time to review the record and procedural history, research and analyze the complex and significant federal and jurisdictional issues presented and prepare a petition that satisfies this Court’s standards. Counsel requires additional time to analyze the applicable precedents and frame the questions appropriately.

Respondents will suffer no prejudice if the Application is granted. No stay of the judgment below is in place or being sought, and Respondents remain free to enforce their right. A brief extension of time to file the petition will cause no delay to any ongoing proceedings and imposes no burden on Respondents.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicant requests that the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-captioned matter be extended 60 days to and including May 15, 2026.

Dated this 5th day of March, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Lauren Joseph Wolongevicz

Lauren Joseph Wolongevicz

Counsel of Record

Appellate Counsel, PC

One Boston Place, Suite 2600

Boston, MA 02108

(855) 941-5796

lauren@appellatecounsel.law