

September 22, 2026

dzimmer@zimmercitronclarke.com
617.676.9421

VIA ELECTRONIC CASE FILING AND U.S. MAIL

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

Re: *Rey v. LCMC Health Care Partners, LLC*, No. 26A381

Dear Mr. Harris:

I write in response to Respondents' letter of September 21, 2026, opposing Petitioners' application for a 30-day extension of time in which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respondents write that a 30-day extension would interfere with the scheduled trial date in March 2027. That is wrong. Respondents merely assume the trial would be delayed if certiorari is granted. But that is by no means guaranteed, not least because the question presented concerns the rejection of Petitioners' request for injunctive relief. The trial is set to proceed only on Petitioners' damages claim.

Moreover, even if granting the Petition could delay trial, granting the requested extension of time to file the Petition will have no effect on the March 2027 trial. If the Court grants certiorari, the trial date may be pushed back, but that would happen even if the Court denied the extension, as it is exceedingly unlikely any merits decision would issue before March 2027 even on the current schedule (and, even if the Court issued a merits decision before March 2027, that jurisdictional ruling would not resolve whether the injunctive claims should be revived on the merits). If the Court denies certiorari, it will likely do so well before the March 2027 trial even with the requested extension such that the trial can proceed as planned.

Finally, it bears emphasizing that nothing about the status quo interferes with "Respondents' life-saving operations." Respondents are not currently subject to any injunction or other court order that impairs their operations. And to the extent they suffer from "uncertainty," that is because the Fifth Circuit erroneously denied an interlocutory appeal concerning the injunctive claim—the very error Petitioners challenge now.

| Zimmer, Citron & Clarke

For these reasons, the Court should grant the extension. At the very least, Respondents identify no reason not to grant an extension of at least 21 days.

Respectfully submitted,

David Zimmer

Cc: Lisa Blatt, Counsel for Respondents