

No. 26A_____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

LORA H. REINBOLD, APPLICANT,

v.

ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., RESPONDENTS.

**APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

ALEXANDER H. HABERBUSH

Counsel of Record

LEX REX INSTITUTE

444 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 1403

Long Beach, CA 90802

(562) 435-9062

AHaberbush@LexRex.org

Counsel for Applicant

To the Honorable Elena Kagan, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit Justice for the Ninth Circuit:

Pursuant to Rules 13.5, 22, 30.2, and 30.3 of the Rules of this Court, Lora H. Reinbold, Plaintiff-Appellant below and Applicant herein (“Applicant”), respectfully requests, by this application (the “Application”), a sixty (60) day extension of time, to and including Monday, December 28, 2026, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Reinbold v. Alaska Airlines, Inc.*, No. 25-901. Applicant is the only party on whose behalf the extension is sought.

1. On May 20, 2026, the Ninth Circuit filed an unpublished memorandum disposition [Docket Entry No. 27] (the “Memorandum”) affirming the judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Alaska. The Memorandum is reproduced in the appendix to this Application (“App.”) at 1a-6a. On June 3, 2026, Applicant timely filed a Petition for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc [Docket Entry No. 31] (the “Petition for Rehearing”), which the Ninth Circuit denied by order filed on July 31, 2026 [Docket Entry No. 32] (the “Order”). App. 7a. Absent an extension, the time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari will expire on Thursday, October 29, 2026. Sup. Ct. R. 13.1, 13.3. This Application is filed at least ten days before that date. Sup. Ct. R. 13.5, 30.2. The jurisdiction of this Court would be invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

2. Applicant sued Alaska Airlines, Inc. (“Alaska Airlines”) and several of its employees (collectively, “Respondents”) for enforcing state and federal COVID-19 mask mandates, refusing to exempt her from masking, and banning her from flying

with the airline for one year for not complying with its masking requirements. App. 1a. The district court dismissed Applicant's claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on the ground that Alaska Airlines was not a state actor, denied her leave to file a Third Amended Complaint, and denied reconsideration. App. 1a-2a, 4a. The Ninth Circuit affirmed, concluding that Applicant had not alleged facts plausibly establishing that Alaska Airlines acted as a state actor in enforcing the mask mandates, such that amendment would be futile. App. 3a-4a, 6a.

3. The petition will present the question whether a private air carrier acts under color of state law when it summons government officers to the boarding gate and uses their presence to exclude a passenger under government-imposed mask mandates, a question governed by this Court's joint-action precedents. *See Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 941 (1982); *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24, 27-28 (1980); *Adickes v. S. H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 152 (1970). The question carries particular weight here. On the allegations of Applicant's pleadings, Alaska Airlines did exactly that to a sitting Alaska state senator and then banned her from its flights for a year, cutting her off from the only practical route to Juneau, Alaska's capital, a city reachable only by air or water. Petition for Rehearing at 2 [Docket Entry No. 31].

4. Good cause exists for the requested extension. Applicant represented herself in the district court and through briefing and oral argument in the Ninth Circuit. App. 5a. Undersigned counsel first appeared of record in the Ninth Circuit after the Memorandum was filed, to file the Petition for Rehearing. The record is extensive: it includes four versions of Applicant's complaint, the last of which was accompanied by more than 500 pages of exhibits and approximately 20 video

recordings. Answering Br. at 15-16 [Docket Entry No. 11]. Counsel requires additional time to review that record and to prepare a petition that presents the question cleanly and concisely.

5. Undersigned counsel also has substantial obligations in other matters over the coming weeks, including briefing and hearings in trial courts, a mediation and pretrial deadlines in adversary proceedings in bankruptcy court, and an *amicus curiae* brief in this Court.

6. The requested extension will not prejudice Respondents, who prevailed below. Applicant has not previously sought an extension of this deadline.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in this matter be extended by sixty (60) days, to and including December 28, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



ALEXANDER H. HABERBUSH

Counsel of Record

LEX REX INSTITUTE

444 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 1403

Long Beach, CA 90802

(562) 435-9062

AHaberbush@LexRex.org

Counsel for Applicant

October 16, 2026