Case 1:22-cv-00284-WJ-JFR Document 27-1 Filed 05/11/22 Page 1 of 3

## **Exhibit 1**



Nikhel Sus <nsus@citizensforethics.org>

## White v. Griffin, 22cv284 (DNM)

 Nikhel Sus <nsus@citizensforethics.org>
 Tue, May 3, 2022 at 6:06 PM

 To: Nicholas Smith <nds@davidbsmithpllc.com>
 Cc: Joe Goldberg <jg@fbdlaw.com>, Amber Fayerberg <amber@fayerberglaw.com>, Christopher Dodd

 <chris@doddnm.com>, Donald Sherman <dsherman@citizensforethics.org>, Stuart McPhail
 <smcphail@citizensforethics.org>, Debbie Tope <DRT@fbdlaw.com>

Thanks for catching those. We'll add those two words and get this on file soon.

Nik

On Tue, May 3, 2022 at 6:05 PM Nicholas Smith <nds@davidbsmithpllc.com> wrote: Nik, you can add my signature. It looks like you're missing the words in red below

1. The briefing on Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand raises questions of federal jurisdiction that cannot be fully

addressed within the twelve-page limit for reply briefs set forth in D.N.M.LR-Civ. 7.5. To ensure Plaintiffs can fully

address these issues for the Court's consideration, good cause exists for a short three-page extension for Plaintiffs'

reply in support of their Motion to Remand.

On Tue, May 3, 2022 at 5:56 PM Nikhel Sus <nsus@citizensforethics.org> wrote:

Nick, we agree not to oppose a three-page extension of the page limit for Defendant's transfer reply in exchange for your agreement not to oppose our motion for a three-page extension for Plaintiffs' remand reply. Attached is our draft motion and proposed order we plan to file by tomorrow at 11am ET. If you approve of the proposed order, could you please insert your /s/ signature in the signature block or give us permission to add it? Thanks.

On Tue, May 3, 2022 at 2:28 PM Nicholas Smith <nds@davidbsmithpllc.com> wrote: Nik.

Griffin does not oppose your request for an oversized brief, provided that Plaintiffs do not object to Griffin using an equal number of pages in his reply in support of the motion to transfer to address any remand-related issues.

Nick Smith

On Tue, May 3, 2022 at 11:34 AM Nikhel Sus <nsus@citizensforethics.org> wrote: Good afternoon Nick,

Plaintiffs plan to move for a three-page extension of the page limit for our reply in support of our motion to remand, to ensure we can fully address the issues under consideration. Will Defendant consent? Happy to discuss.

Thanks, Nik

CREW

Nikhel Sus (he/his) Senior Counsel | Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington Office: (202) 408-5565 nsus@citizensforethics.org | www.citizensforethics.org 5/10/22, 12:39 PM Case 1:22-cv-002002ens/or-Besponsibility Calonetrics in Washingther a 05//bite/22:riffin, 22:00284 (10/04)



Nikhel Sus (he/him) Senior Counsel | Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington Office: (202) 408-5565 nsus@citizensforethics.org | www.citizensforethics.org



Nikhel Sus (he/him) Senior Counsel | Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington Office: (202) 408-5565 nsus@citizensforethics.org | www.citizensforethics.org