

No. 23A108

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MICAH UETRICH AND JOHN KADERBEK,
Applicants,

v.

CHICAGO PARKING METERS, LLC,
Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

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

WINSTON & STRAWN
Dan K. Webb
Linda T. Coberly (counsel of record)
Joseph L. Motto
Conor Reidy
35 W. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 558-5600
DWebb@winston.com
LCoberly@winston.com
JMotto@winston.com
CReidy@winston.com

*Attorneys for Respondent Chicago
Parking Meters, LLC*

Respondent Chicago Parking Meters, LLC (“CPM”) respectfully opposes Micah Uetracht and John Kaderbek’s Application for Extension of Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Applicants have not demonstrated “good cause” for the significant 59-day extension they seek. The Application should be denied—or, at minimum, the period of extension should be reduced significantly.

Extensions of the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari are disfavored, and any request for an extension requires a showing of “good cause.” U.S. Sup. Ct. R. 13(5). “An application to extend the time to file shall . . . set out specific reasons why an extension of time is justified.” *Id.* While the Application is eleven paragraphs long, only the last paragraph attempts to provide any justification for an extension of time. And that paragraph states only that counsel “has been occupied with two emergency matters in the past ten weeks.” Appl. ¶ 11. Given that nearly five months have passed since the Seventh Circuit issued its decision—and nearly three months since it denied rehearing—this cursory explanation is not sufficient to justify extending the time to seek certiorari by another 59 days, which would inevitably push the petition off the long conference and well into next Term.

Counsel is intimately familiar with the issues in this case and is apparently well on the way toward preparing the arguments to be included in the petition. Indeed, the Application previews those arguments. CPM disagrees with counsel’s characterization of the issues, but it will reserve its response for an appropriate time, if necessary. In the meantime, CPM asks that the motion be denied—or that any extension be limited to 21 days.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Linda T. Coberly

Dan K. Webb
Linda T. Coberly (counsel of record)
Jospeh L. Motto
Conor Reidy
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 W. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 558-5600
DWebb@winston.com
LCoberly@winston.com
JMotto@winston.com
CReidy@winston.com

*Attorneys for Respondent Chicago
Parking Meters, LLC*