

COHENMILSTEIN

88 Pine Street, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10005
T·(212) 838-7797



100 Northern Avenue
Boston, MA 02210
T: (670) 570-1000

June 4, 2026

VIA ECF


The Honorable Jennifer L. Rochon
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street, Room 1920
New York, NY 10007

Request GRANTED. The parties' briefing schedule is extended as follows:

- Plaintiffs' Opposition is due by **July 10, 2026**;
- Defendants' Reply is due by **July 24, 2026**.

Dated: June 4, 2026
New York, New York

SO ORDERED.


JENNIFER L. ROCHON
United States District Judge

Re: *Stern v. JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al.*, No. 25-cv-02097 (JLR)

Dear Judge Rochon:

Pursuant to the Court's Individual Rules and Practices (Section I.F), the parties in the above-referenced action jointly move for extension of the briefing deadlines related to Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (ECF No. 55). In support, the parties respectfully state as follows:

1. The Complaint (ECF No. 1) brings claims under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA"), regarding the pricing of prescription-drug benefits available under the JPMorgan Chase Healthcare and Insurance Program for Active Employees and its component Medical Plan.
2. Defendants moved to dismiss the Complaint, and the Court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss on March 9, 2026 (the "Motion to Dismiss Order," ECF No. 45).
3. In the Motion to Dismiss Order, the Court ordered Defendants to file an Answer to the Complaint and Plaintiffs to file a Reply to Defendants' Answer pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7(a)(7).
4. Defendants filed their Answer on April 3, 2026 and Plaintiffs filed their Reply on April 27, 2026. Defendants then filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings on June 2, 2026.
5. The parties respectfully request modest extensions of the briefing deadlines on the Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings as follows:
 - a. Plaintiffs' Opposition: July 10, 2026
 - b. Defendants' Reply Brief: July 24, 2026.
6. This request for an extension of time comports with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(d), which provides that the Court may, for good cause, grant motions for extensions

The Honorable Jennifer L. Rochon
March 11, 2026
Page 2

of time. The additional time for Plaintiffs' Opposition is necessary in light of pending obligations that Plaintiffs' counsel currently have on several other matters,¹ and is consistent with the 37-day period that Defendants had to prepare their principal brief in support of their Motion. The additional time for Defendants is modest and will allow them adequate time to prepare their Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition.

7. The parties have not previously requested an extension of time related to briefing on Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael Eisenkraft
Michael Eisenkraft
Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC
88 Pine Street, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10005
212-838-7797
meisenkraft@cohenmilstein.com

/s/ James O. Fleckner
James O. Fleckner, admitted *pro hac vice*
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
100 Northern Avenue
Boston, MA 02210
617-570-1000
jfleckner@goodwinlaw.com

¹ Plaintiffs' counsel currently have the following deadlines (among others) in other matters:

- June 12: Opposition to motion to dismiss in *Duke v. Luxottica US Holdings Corp.*, No. 2:21-cv-06072 (E.D.N.Y.);
- June 15 and June 22: Motions in limine and oppositions (and other pretrial filings) in *Sweeney v. Nationwide Mut. Inc. Co.*, No. 2:20-cv-01569 (S.D. Ohio);
- June 25: Appellate brief in *Navarro v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, No. 26-1620 (8th Cir.) and appellate brief in *Samuels v. AH Capital Mgmt., LLC*, No. 25-5701 (9th Cir.); and
- June 30: Motion for preliminary settlement approval in *Scott v. AT&T, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-07094 (N.D. Cal).