

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK;)	
RURAL COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES OF)	
CALIFORNIA; COMMUNICATIONS)	
WORKERS OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
v.)	No. 26-3946
)	
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)	
AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

MOTION TO TRANSFER

Pursuant to Rule 27 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and this Court’s Rule 27, the Federal Communications Commission asks the Court to transfer the captioned petition for review to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. As discussed below, such transfer is required by 28 U.S.C. § 2112(a)(5), because the Sixth Circuit has been designated the forum for all judicial challenges to the order that is the subject of the petition for review. Opposing counsel has authorized counsel for the FCC to state that Petitioners do not oppose this motion.

ARGUMENT

Section 2112(a) provides that if, “within 10 days after issuance” of an agency order, petitions for review are filed in multiple courts of appeals, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation “shall, by means of random selection, designate one court of appeals” in which all petitions for review of the “same order” shall be consolidated. 28 U.S.C. § 2112(a)(1) & (3). Section 2112(a) further states that the courts of appeals, other than the one so designated by the Judicial Panel, “shall transfer” their petitions for review to the designated court. *Id.* § 2112(a)(5).

Petitioners in this case seek review of an FCC Order: *Reducing Barriers to Network Improvements and Service Changes; Accelerating Network Modernization*, Report and Order, WC Docket Nos. 25-209, 25-208, FCC 26-19 (rel. March 27, 2026) (Order). On May 13, 2026, the Judicial Panel required all petitions for review of the Order to be consolidated in the Sixth Circuit pursuant to section 2112(a).¹ Because Petitioners challenge that order, this Court is statutorily required to transfer this case to the Sixth Circuit pursuant to section 2112(a)(5). Therefore, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court transfer this case to the Sixth Circuit.

¹ *In re Federal Communications Commission, Reducing Barriers to Network Improvements and Service Changes; Accelerating Network Modernization*, Consolidation Order (JPML May 13, 2026) (copy attached as Exhibit 1).

Respectfully submitted,

D. Adam Candeub
General Counsel

Sarah E. Citrin
Deputy Associate General Counsel

/s/ Maureen K. Flood

Maureen K. Flood
Counsel

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554
(202) 418-1753

June 25, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT

Certificate of Compliance With Type-Volume Limitation, Typeface Requirements and Type Style Requirements

- I. This document complies with the type-volume limit of Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2)(A) because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f):
 - this document contains 314 words, *or*
 - this document uses a monospaced typeface and contains _ lines of text.

2. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because:
 - this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in Office 365 in 14-point Times New Roman, *or*
 - this document has been prepared in a monospaced spaced typeface using _____ with _____.

/s/ Maureen K. Flood

Maureen K. Flood
Counsel

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554
(202) 418-1740