

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-1063

September Term, 2014

FCC-15-24

Filed On: June 11, 2015

United States Telecom Association,

Petitioner

v.

Federal Communications Commission and
United States of America,

Respondents

Independent Telephone &
Telecommunications Alliance, et al.,
Intervenors

Consolidated with 15-1078, 15-1086,
15-1090, 15-1091, 15-1092, 15-1095,
15-1099, 15-1117, 15-1128, 15-1151,
15-1164

BEFORE: Griffith, Srinivasan, and Pillard, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion for stay or expedition, the responses thereto, and the reply; and the motion to dismiss Nos. 15-1063 and 15-1078, the response thereto, and the reply, it is

ORDERED that the motion for stay be denied. Petitioners have not satisfied the stringent requirements for a stay pending court review. See Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); D.C. Circuit Handbook of Practice and Internal Procedures 33 (2015). It is

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-1063

September Term, 2014

FURTHER ORDERED that the unopposed motion for expedition be granted. The parties are directed to file a proposed briefing format and schedule within 14 days of the date of this order. The parties are strongly urged to submit a joint proposal, and are reminded that the court looks with extreme disfavor on repetitious submissions and will, where appropriate, require a joint brief of aligned parties with total words not to exceed the standard allotment for a single brief. Whether the parties are aligned or have disparate interests, they must provide *detailed* justifications for any request to file separate briefs or to exceed in the aggregate the standard word allotment. Requests to exceed the standard word allotment must specify the word allotment necessary for each issue. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to dismiss be referred to the merits panel to which these petitions for review are assigned. The parties are directed to address in their briefs the issues presented in the motion to dismiss rather than incorporate those arguments by reference.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Ken Meadows
Deputy Clerk/LD