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order

**Adopted: July 12, 2022 Released: July 12, 2022**

By the Chief, Media Bureau:

1. In this Order, we grant the Motion for Extension of Time to File Replies (Motion) filed by The NewsGuild-CWA (TNG-CWA), the National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians-CWA (NABET-CWA), Common Cause and United Church of Christ, OC., Inc. doing business as United Church of Christ Media Justice Ministry (UCC and, collectively, Petitioners).[[1]](#footnote-3) The deadline for filing replies for all current participants is extended to August 1, 2022. Additionally, we amend our June 3, 2022, Public Notice[[2]](#footnote-4) so all participants will have until August 1, 2022, to supplement any pleadings with information filed in response to the June 3, 2022, Information Request.[[3]](#footnote-5)
2. Petitioners cite two primary justifications for the extension. First, they contend that the timeframe to file the reply is unnecessarily short and would impede the development of a full record upon which the Commission can make a well-informed decision. They explain that the 10-day timeframe provided them would encompass two weekends; that the proceeding includes a protective order and, therefore, they would need to draft a second, redacted version of the reply; and, finally, that the issues raised by the transaction are complex and extending the deadline now would obviate the need for additional ex partes later. Second, they note that counsel for TNG-CWA and NABET-CWA has had to schedule unavoidable medical treatment.
3. In response, SGCI Holdings III LLC, TEGNA Inc., and CMG Media Corporation (collectively, Applicants) filed a Joint Opposition.[[4]](#footnote-6) Applicants note that the Petitioners were already granted an extension of the deadlines.[[5]](#footnote-7) Next, Applicants question Petitioners’ need to cite Highly Confidential Information, on the basis that the Applicants’ Opposition did not contain any redacted Confidential or Highly Confidential Information, and replies may only address matters raised in oppositions.[[6]](#footnote-8) Applicants also argue that the Applications do not present “complex” issues warranting additional time and that a grant of the Motion would bring the time between application filing and the reply deadline to above the historical average.[[7]](#footnote-9) Applicants further respond that, despite the medical procedure, there should be ample time to prepare a response on the limited issues that it is permissible for Petitioners to address on reply, and the Motion itself is indicative that Petitioners are pooling resources in this proceeding.[[8]](#footnote-10)
4. As set forth in section 1.46 of the Commission's rules,[[9]](#footnote-11) the Commission does not routinely grant extensions of time. We do find in this case that the reasons provided justify extending the time within which to file a reply in this proceeding. The public interest is served by having as complete a record as possible before final consideration of the applications. Furthermore, so as not to prejudice any of the current participants in this proceeding, we are extending this deadline for all of those entities that currently have petitions or comments on file. We do not find the Joint Opposition to be persuasive. In the context of a transaction involving review of confidential materials, representation by solo counsel and counsel’s need for medical treatment, Applicants’ interest in expediting this proceeding does not outweigh the public interest considerations supporting a two-week extension. Further, as we explained in issuing the *Information Request Public Notice*, parties are not prevented from raising new issues in this reply cycle.[[10]](#footnote-12)
5. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED, that the Motion for Extension of Time to File Replies IS GRANTED, and that all replies in this proceeding, MB Docket No. 22-162, will be due by close of business on August 1, 2022.
6. This Order is issued pursuant to Sections 4(j), 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and authority delegated under Section 0.283 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR § 0.283, and is effective upon its adoption.
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