Roman Martinez
Direct Dial: +1.202.637.3377
roman.martinez@lw.com

555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Tel: +1.202.637.2200 Fax: +1.202.637.2201
www.lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

FIRM / AFFILIATE OFFICES

Austin	Milan
Beijing	Munich
Boston	New York
Brussels	Orange County
Chicago	Paris
Dubai	Riyadh
Düsseldorf	San Diego
Frankfurt	San Francisco
Hamburg	Seoul
Hong Kong	Silicon Valley
Houston	Singapore
London	Tel Aviv
Los Angeles	Tokyo
Madrid	Washington, D.C.

November 2, 2026

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

Re: *Jump Trading, LLC, et al. v. Kim, et al.*, No. 26-507
Partial Opposition to Respondents' Extension Request

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am counsel of record for petitioners Jump Trading, LLC, Jump Crypto Holdings LLC, William DiSomma, and Kanav Kariya in the above-captioned case. I am writing on behalf of petitioners to oppose in part respondents' request for a 30-day extension of time to file their response to the petition for a writ of certiorari, to December 16, 2026.[1] Petitioners do not object to a 22-day extension, to December 8, 2026. That extension would give respondents a total of 61 days to prepare their response from the date they were served with the petition. It would also preserve the Court's ability to consider the petition at its January 8, 2027 conference—and thus to hear and decide the case this Term, if the petition is granted.

Petitioners filed and served the petition on respondents' counsel on October 8, 2026, and the petition was docketed on October 15, 2026. As the Clerk's Office is aware, there was a delay in docketing in this instance due to a technical error in the Seventh Circuit's formal judgment, which initially omitted petitioners DiSomma and Kariya. *See* Mot. to Amend Case Caption, Opinion, and Judgment, No. 25-1964 (7th Cir. Oct. 15, 2026), ECF No. 73; Corrected Judgment, No. 25-1964 (7th Cir. Oct. 16, 2026), ECF No. 75.

The response is currently due on November 16, 2026—*i.e.*, 39 days after the petition was filed. Respondents now seek an additional 30 days for filing the response, which would give them well over two months to draft their submission. If the full extension request is granted and the

[1] Respondents served their request on petitioners on October 30, 2026. Although the request does not yet appear on the Court's electronic docket, petitioners assume that it was submitted to the Court at or around the time it was served on petitioners.

brief in opposition is not filed until December 16, 2026, the petition would not be distributed to the Justices until December 30, 2026, for consideration at the January 15, 2027 conference. A petition first considered on January 15 is unlikely to be granted in time to be briefed, argued, and decided this Term.

Undersigned counsel appreciates the value of extensions, and ordinarily would consent to a 30-day extension as a matter of courtesy. Petitioners' partial opposition here stems entirely from the fact that the requested extension could unduly postpone this Court's resolution of the case on the merits until next Term. *See* Stephen M. Shapiro et al., *Supreme Court Practice* § 6.37(c) (11th ed. 2019) (noting that relevant circumstances bearing on whether to grant or deny an extension include "the possibility that the request comes at a late period in the term so that an extension would delay the Court's consideration of the case until the following term"); *see also, e.g.*, *A.J.T. ex rel. A.T. & G.T. v. Osseo Area Schs., Indep. Sch. Dist. No. 279*, No. 24-249 (Oct. 25, 2024) (denying extension request in part in similar circumstances).

Petitioners respectfully request that the Court grant respondents an extension to December 8, 2026, and deny respondents' request for a full 30-day extension. An extension to December 8 would ensure that respondents have 61 days from being served with the petition to prepare their response. It would also ensure that the petition can be considered at the Court's January 8, 2027 conference and, if the petition is granted, that the case can be heard and decided this Term.

Respectfully submitted,



Roman Martinez
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Counsel of Record for Petitioners

cc: Jordan Goldstein
Counsel of Record for Respondents