

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Applications Filed for the Transfer of Certain)	
Spectrum Licenses and Section 214)	WC Docket No. 07-22
Authorizations in the States of Maine, New)	
Hampshire, and Vermont from Verizon)	
Communications Inc. and its Subsidiaries to)	
FairPoint Communications, Inc.)	

ORDER

Adopted: April 11, 2007

Released: April 11, 2007

By the Acting Associate Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

1. On March 14, 2007, the Commission released a Public Notice establishing a pleading cycle for Verizon Communications Inc. and its subsidiaries (collectively, Verizon) – Verizon New England Inc., NYNEX Long Distance Company, Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc., Verizon Select Services Inc., Northern New England Spinco Inc., and Northern New England Telephone Operations Inc. – and FairPoint Communications, Inc.’s (FairPoint) applications seeking Commission approval of the transfer of certain spectrum licenses and section 214 authorizations in the states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont from Verizon to FairPoint.¹ On April 5, 2007, the Communications Workers of America and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (collectively, Movants) filed a motion to extend the pleading cycle deadlines by two weeks (*i.e.*, extending the filing date for Comments/Petitions to Deny to April 27, 2007, for Responses/Oppositions to May 7, 2007, and for Replies to May 14, 2007).²

2. The Movants state that they need additional time to properly prepare meaningful comment on the applications. Among other things, they state they require additional time to obtain relevant information, and to review a 421-page draft registration and proxy statement containing previously undisclosed details of the transaction.³ We note that it is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time shall not be routinely granted. However, we agree that providing additional time to file in the docket will facilitate the development of a more substantive and complete record in this

¹ See *Applications filed for the Transfer of Certain Spectrum Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont from Verizon Communications Inc. and its Subsidiaries to FairPoint Communications, Inc.*, WC Docket No. 07-22, Public Notice, DA 07-1314 (rel. Mar. 14, 2007).

² See Motion of the Communications Workers of America and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers for an Extension of Time (filed Apr. 5, 2007).

³ *Id.* at 1-2. The Movants also cite the need to accommodate the schedules of parties interested in commenting. *Id.* at 2.

proceeding, without hardship to the applicants.⁴ We thus find that good cause exists to provide parties a brief two-week extension of time for filing in this proceeding.⁵

3. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the request of the Communications Workers of America and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers for an Extension of Time is GRANTED, as set forth herein.

4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), and 5(c) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 155(c), and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, 1.46, the pleading cycle established in this matter shall be modified as follows:

Comments/Petitions to Deny Due: April 27, 2007

Responses/Oppositions Due: May 7, 2007

Replies Due: May 14, 2007

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marcus Maher
Acting Associate Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau

⁴ Verizon and FairPoint state that, to the extent an extension of time is granted to file comments/petitions to deny, they should be entitled to a corresponding extension of time to respond. *See* Letter from Robin E. Tuttle, FairPoint, and Karen Zacharia, Verizon, to Marlene Dortch, Secretary, FCC, WC Docket No. 07-22 at 1 (filed Apr. 10, 2007). We note that we also extend the deadlines for responses/oppositions and replies by two weeks.

⁵ Verizon and FairPoint state that they do not believe a two-week extension is appropriate, but that they would not object to a one-week extension. *See id.* at 1-3. We do not believe that the two-week extension we grant here will interfere with the Commission's ability to consider this application in a timely manner.