

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

United States Telecom Association,	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 15-1063 (and
	)	consolidated cases)
Federal Communications Commission	)	
and United States of America,	)	
Respondents.	)	

**REPLY OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
TO JOINT OPPOSITION OF USTELECOM AND ALAMO  
TO MOTION TO DISMISS CASE NOS. 15-1063 AND 15-1078**

On May 8, 2015, the Federal Communications Commission filed a motion to dismiss Case Nos. 15-1063 and 15-1078. The Commission argued that those cases should be dismissed because they were filed prematurely (*i.e.*, before the challenged FCC order was published in the Federal Register). On May 21, 2015, the United States Telecom Association (“USTelecom”) and Alamo Broadband Inc. (“Alamo”) filed a joint opposition to the motion to dismiss. The Commission respectfully submits this reply to the joint opposition. For the reasons discussed below, while we disagree with petitioners’ reading of FCC rules, we do not object to petitioners’ proposal that the Court refer the motion to dismiss to the merits panel.

Petitioners’ argument against dismissal rests on a fundamental misreading of the FCC’s rules. As we explained in the motion to dismiss (at 4-5), those rules

generally provide that the period for filing petitions for review of “all [FCC] documents in notice and comment ... rulemaking proceedings” – including the order on review – does not begin until “the date of [the document’s] publication in the Federal Register.” 47 C.F.R. § 1.4(b)(1). Because USTelecom and Alamo filed their initial petitions for review before the order was published in the Federal Register, those petitions were premature.

To be sure, as petitioners note (Opp. 8), there is an exception to this rule. If parties seek to challenge “adjudicatory decisions with respect to specific parties that may be associated with or contained in rulemaking documents,” they may petition for judicial review of any such decision as soon as the FCC releases it. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.4(b)(1) Note; *id.* § 1.4(b)(2). But that exception does not apply here.

USTelecom and Alamo maintain that because the order on review included a declaratory ruling, “it was reasonable” for petitioners “to conclude that the declaratory ruling portion of the Order could be found to be an ‘adjudicatory decision[ ] with respect to specific parties.’” Opp. 9 (quoting 47 C.F.R. § 1.4(b)(1) Note). To the contrary, the declaratory ruling contained in the order on review was plainly not an “adjudicatory decision with respect to specific parties.” Rather, it was “a ruling of general applicability” (Mot. 5) that applied to a broad category of broadband service providers.

Contrary to petitioners' assertion, the mere fact that the FCC excluded from its declaratory ruling "a wide variety of providers of broadband Internet access service" did not transform that broadly applicable ruling into an "adjudicatory decision[ ] with respect to specific parties.'" See Opp. 9 (quoting 47 C.F.R. § 1.4(b)(1) Note). Petitioners appear to argue that an adjudicatory decision involves "specific parties" even if it applies to some broad subset of regulated entities. If that were true, however, the order at issue in *Verizon v. FCC*, 2011 WL 1235523 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 4, 2011), would have involved licensing decisions "with respect to specific parties" – *i.e.*, mobile broadband providers.<sup>1</sup> This Court flatly rejected that premise, holding that the FCC order in that case was "not a licensing decision 'with respect to specific parties.'" *Id.* (quoting 47 C.F.R. § 1.4(b)(1) Note).

While we disagree with petitioners' reading of the FCC's rules, we agree with USTelecom and Alamo that "this Court need not resolve" whether their initial petitions were timely filed "in order to adjudicate [their] challenges" to the order on review. Opp. 5. Both USTelecom and Alamo filed timely supplemental petitions for review after the order was published in the Federal Register.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Verizon's Consolidated Response to the FCC's Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Defer, D.C. Cir. No. 11-1014, at 5-6 (filed Jan. 31, 2011) (arguing that the challenged order concerned licensing decisions "with respect to specific parties" because it modified the licenses of all "mobile broadband providers").

Therefore, dismissal of their original petitions would in no way affect their ability to present their challenges to the FCC's order.

Furthermore, this Court has already devoted considerable resources to addressing various motions filed in this litigation. Given that dismissal of USTelecom's and Alamo's original petitions will have no effect on the ability of those petitioners to participate fully in this litigation, it might well be appropriate to defer ruling on the motion to dismiss until the case has been briefed on the merits, when the Court will be better able to assess whether a ruling on the motion is necessary.

In light of these considerations, the Commission has no objection to petitioners' proposal that the Court refer the motion to dismiss to the merits panel.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan B. Sallet  
General Counsel

David M. Gossett  
Deputy General Counsel

Jacob M. Lewis  
Associate General Counsel

/s/ James M. Carr

James M. Carr  
Counsel

Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(202) 418-1762

June 1, 2015

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES TELECOM ASSOCIATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Respondents.

No. 15-1063 *et al.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, James M. Carr, hereby certify that on June 1, 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing Reply of the Federal Communications Commission to Joint Opposition of USTelecom and Alamo to Motion to Dismiss Case Nos. 15-1063 and 15-1078 with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by using the CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system.

Michael K. Kellogg  
Scott H. Angstreich  
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd,  
Evans & Figel, PLLC  
1615 M Street, NW  
Sumner Square, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036  
*Counsel for: USTA*

Robert J. Wiggers  
Kristen C. Limarzi  
Nickolai G. Levin  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 3224  
Washington, DC 20530  
*Counsel for: USA*

Kathleen M. Sullivan  
Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart  
& Sullivan, LLP  
51 Madison Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10010  
*Counsel for: USTA*

Rick C. Chessen  
Neal M. Goldberg  
Michael S. Schooler  
25 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Suite 100  
Washington, D.C. 20026  
*Counsel for: NCTA*

Andrew G. McBride  
Brett A. Shumate  
Eve Klindera Reed  
Wiley Rein LLP  
1776 K Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
*Counsel for: Alamo Broadband*

Peter D. Keisler  
James P. Young  
C. Frederick Beckner III  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
*Counsel for: AT&T Inc.*

Jeffrey A. Lamken  
MoloLamken LLP  
The Watergate  
Suite 660  
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
*Counsel for: American Cable*

David C. Bergmann  
3293 Noreen Drive  
Columbus, OH 43221  
*Counsel for: NASCUA*

Charles A. Acquard  
NASUCA  
8380 Colesville Road  
Suite 101  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
*Counsel for: NASCUA*

Miguel A. Estrada  
Theodore B. Olson  
Jonathan C. Bond  
Gibson Dunn & Crutcher  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: NCTA*

Matthew A. Brill  
Matthew T. Murchison  
Jonathan Y. Ellis  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, N.W.  
Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
*Counsel for: NCTA*

Wayne Watts  
David R. McAtee II  
Lori A. Fink  
Gary L. Phillips  
Christopher M. Heimann  
AT&T Services, Inc.  
1120 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: AT&T Inc.*

David H. Solomon  
Russell P. Hanser  
Wilkinson Barker Knauer  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
*Counsel for: CenturyLink*

Harold Feld  
Public Knowledge  
1818 N Street, N.W.  
Suite 410  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: Public Knowledge*

Richard E. Wiley  
Bennett L. Ross  
Bret A. Shumate  
Wiley Rein LLP  
1776 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
*Counsel for: Daniel Berninger*

Marvin Ammori  
Ammori Group  
1718 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 1990  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: Tumblr, et al.*

Pantelis Michalopoulos  
Stephanie A. Roy  
Andrew W. Guhr  
Steptoe & Johnson LLP  
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: DISH, et al.*

Robert M. Cooper  
James P. Denvir III  
Scott E. Gant  
Hamish P.M. Hume  
Hershel A. Wancjer  
Boies, Schiller & Flexner  
5301 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20015  
*Counsel for: Cogent Comm.*

Stephen E. Coran  
Dennis P. Corbett  
Lerman Senter PLLC  
2000 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
*Counsel for: Wireless Internet  
Service Providers Association*

Seth D. Greenstein  
Robert S. Schwartz  
Constantine Cannon LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Suite 1300N  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
*Counsel for: Etsy, Inc., et al.*

James Bradford Ramsey  
General Counsel  
NARUC  
1101 Vermont Ave., N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
*Counsel for: NARUC*

Genevieve Morelli, Esq.  
ITTA  
1101 Vermont Ave., N.W.  
Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
*Counsel for: ITTA*

Sarah J. Morris  
Kevin S. Bankston  
Open Technology Institute  
1899 L Street, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: New America's Open  
Technology Institute*



Matthew F. Wood  
Free Press  
1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 1110  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: Free Press*

Russell M. Blau  
Joshua M. Bobeck  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius  
2020 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20016  
*Counsel for: Vonage Holdings*

Colleen Boothby  
Patrick J. Whittle  
Levine, Blaszak, Block  
& Boothby  
2001 L Street, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: Ad Hoc Telecom.*

Michael A. Cheah  
Vimeo LLC  
555 West 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10011  
*Counsel for: Vimeo*

Erick Stallman  
General Counsel  
Center for Democracy &  
Technology  
1634 I Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
*Counsel for: Center for Democracy  
& Technology*

Christopher J. Wright  
Scott B. Harris  
H. Henry Shi  
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Eight Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
*Counsel for: Akamai Technologies*

Andrew Jay Schwartzman  
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
*Counsel for: ColorOfChange.org*

Helgi C. Walker, Esq.  
Michael R. Huston  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
*Counsel for: CTIA*

/s/ James M. Carr