

and Intervenor Status Pursuant to the Tunney Act and in Opposition to the United States' Motion for Entry of Final Judgments, filed May 5, 2006; and (2) ACTel's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to the United States' Motion for Entry of Final Judgments, filed May 16, 2006. Though the United States previously responded to ACTel's Motion for *Amicus Curiae* and Intervenor Status on May 15, 2006, its Response did not address the substance of ACTel's opposition to the United States' Motion for Entry of Final Judgments, because ACTel had yet to file its supplemental memorandum in accordance with this Court's minute order of May 10, 2006.¹ The United States now proposes to file a single thirty-five page Reply that will address the substance of both of ACTel's memoranda, rather than to file separate responses for each of them. Accordingly, the United States submits that its proposed Reply, while in excess of the page limits set forth in Local Rule 7(e), is not excessively lengthy.

¹See Resp. of the United States to ACTel's Motion for *Amicus Curiae* and Intervenor Status Pursuant to the Tunney Act, at 2 n.2.

