

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States



THE ESTATE OF CARSON BRIDE,
BY AND THROUGH HIS APPOINTED ADMINISTRATOR KRISTIN BRIDE;
A. K., BY AND THROUGH HER LEGAL GUARDIAN JANE DOE 1;
A. C., BY AND THROUGH HER LEGAL GUARDIAN JANE DOE 2;
A. O., BY AND THROUGH HER LEGAL GUARDIAN JANE DOES 3;
TYLER CLEMENTI FOUNDATION, ON BEHALF OF THEMSELVES
AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Applicants,

v.

YOLO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Respondent.

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

**APPLICATION FOR A 60-DAY EXTENSION
TO FILE A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO JUSTICE ELENA KAGAN**

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

There are no Petitioners who are corporations

EXTENSION REQUEST

To the Honorable Elena Kagan, as Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit:

Pursuant to Sup. Ct. R. 13.5 and 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c), THE ESTATE OF CARSON BRIDE ET AL. (“Applicants”), respectfully request a 60-day extension of time, to and including February 3, 2025, 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, No. 23-55134.

1. The Ninth Circuit entered its published opinion on August 22, 2024 (App.1), which affirmed the order of the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California which granted the Defendants’ motion to dismiss. (App.24). The Ninth Circuit subsequently denied a timely filed petition for rehearing on September 6, 2024. (App.38).

2. The original 90-day deadline for filing a petition for writ of certiorari is December 5, 2024. This application for extension is filed more than 10 days in advance of the original deadline.

3. A 60-day extension would fall on February 3, 2025.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California was invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2) because the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds \$5,000,000 and is a class action in which some members of the class are citizens of states different from the states where Defendants are citizens. The Ninth Circuit had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1291. The jurisdiction of this Court would be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE EXTENSION

Counsel have a number upcoming argument and briefing deadlines, including: (1) A response brief in the Western District of New York on December 2, 2024. *Crowley et al. v. URMC et al.* (No. 21-cv-1078); (2) a response brief due in the Northern District of California on December 2, 2024. *Doe et al. v. Apple Inc. et al.* (No. 24-cv-5107).

In addition, the deadline for the petition falls during the week of New Year. Our staff, including paralegals have booked big blocks of vacations from December 20, 2023 to January 4, 2024, and counsel himself has many family commitments which will detract from his ability to properly write this petition. The requested extension will ensure that counsel have time to fully brief the important issues in this case.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Petitioners request that the application for an extension be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andrew Rozynski
Andrew Rozynski
Counsel of Record
Juyoun Han
Eisenberg & Baum, LLP
24 Union Square East, Penthouse
New York, NY 10003-3201
(212) 353-8700
arozynski@eandblaw.com

November 18, 2024