

LANKLER SIFFERT & WOHL LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

500 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10110-3398  
WWW.LSWLAW.COM

TELEPHONE (212) 921-8399  
TELEFAX (212) 764-3701

May 2, 2017

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

**Re: Town of East Hampton v. Friends of the East Hampton Airport, Inc., et al.,  
No. 16-1070**

Dear Mr. Harris:

We write on behalf of the nine Respondents in the above-captioned case.

On April 19, 2017, the Court requested that Respondents file a response to the petition for certiorari on or before May 19, 2017. The requested response will also address the arguments that have been made in three briefs that have been submitted in support of the petition by various *amici curiae*. Respondents respectfully request a three-week extension of time, through and including Friday, June 9, 2017, to file their brief in opposition.

The primary reason for this request is the press of other business. During the time allotted for a brief in opposition, counsel of record for Respondents has been, and will continue to be, required to devote substantial time and attention to several other clients in active, non-public regulatory matters, the scheduling of which is outside of counsel's control. Respondents' requested extension is further justified by the need to afford the nine Respondents, several of whom are also advised by individual counsel, adequate time to review and comment on the brief in opposition.

In making this request, we are cognizant that granting anything more than an extension of a few days would cause the petition to be considered in the next Term. We note, however, that even if the petition were considered on the current schedule and were to be granted, the case could not in any event be calendared for argument until the next Term. We further note that Petitioner requested and received a 30-day extension of the time in which to file its petition. As a result, Respondents' requested extension cannot be characterized as having an adverse impact on this Court's calendar or as otherwise inappropriate.


LANGLER SIFFERT & WOHL LLP

Hon. Scott S. Harris  
May 2, 2017  
Page 2

We have consulted with counsel for Petitioner concerning our requested extension and have been informed that Petitioner does not consent to the extension. It is our further understanding, based upon our colloquy with counsel for the Petitioner, that even if the requested extension were shortened by several days so that, with a waiver of the waiting period specified in Rule 15.5, the petition could be distributed in time for the Court's June 22, 2017 Conference, Petitioner still would not consent to the extension.

For the reasons stated, Respondents' proposed three-week extension is both reasonable and appropriate, and we respectfully request that the extension be granted.

Respectfully,



Charles T. Spada

cc: See Attached Service List

## Service List

Kathleen M. Sullivan  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP  
51 Madison Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10010  
[kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com)  
*Counsel for Petitioner*

Zachary W. Carter  
Corporation Counsel for the City of New York  
100 Church Street  
New York, New York 10007  
[rdearing@law.nyc.gov](mailto:rdearing@law.nyc.gov)  
*Counsel for The City of New York as Amicus Curiae*

Brendan J. Crimmins  
Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick P.L.L.C.  
1615 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
[bcrimmins@kellogghansen.com](mailto:bcrimmins@kellogghansen.com)  
*Counsel for Committee to Stop Airport Expansion and International Municipal Lawyers' Association as Amici Curiae*

James D. Harmon, Jr.  
William Duffy  
Town of Southold  
53095 Route 25  
P.O. Box 1179  
Southold, New York 11971  
[bill.duffy@town.southold.ny.gov](mailto:bill.duffy@town.southold.ny.gov)  
*Counsel for The Town of Southold, New York as Amicus Curiae*