


Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

FCC-  
RECEIVED

DEC 5 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of )  
)  
Amendment of Parts 2 and 90 of the )  
Commission's Rules to Provide for the )  
Use of 200 Channels Outside the )  
Designated Filing Areas in the )  
896-901 MHz and the 935-940 MHz Bands )  
Allotted to the Specialized Mobile Radio Pool )  
)  
Implementation of Section 309(j) )  
of the Communications Act -- )  
Competitive Bidding )  
)  
Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 322 )  
of the Communications Act )

PR Docket No. 89-553

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

PP Docket No. 93-253

GN Docket No. 93-252

To: The Commission

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Pittencrieff Communications, Inc. ("PCI"), by its attorneys, hereby requests an extension of time up to and including December 15, 1995, to submit an Opposition to the Application for Review filed by RAM Mobile Data USA Limited Partnership ("RAM") in response to the "Second Erratum" issued on November 8, 1995, by the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (the "Bureau") in the above-referenced proceeding.

Section 1.115(d) of the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission (the "Commission") provides that applications for review of action taken pursuant to delegated authority must be filed within 30 days of public notice of such action. 47 C.F.R. §

1.115(d). The rule further provides that oppositions to the application for review shall be filed within 15 days after the application is filed. Id.

In the instant case, RAM filed its Application for Review on November 20, 1995, even though it was not due until December 8, 1995, under Section 1.115(d) of the Rules. Had RAM filed its Application for Review on December 8, 1995, PCI's Opposition would not have been due until December 26, 1995. Other parties may yet file applications for review of the Commission's action on December 8, 1995. PCI wishes to have the option to file a consolidated Opposition. Accordingly, PCI seeks this extension of time to file its Opposition to RAM's Application for Review. Counsel for RAM has indicated that it does not object to this request for additional time.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, for the foregoing reasons, Pittencrieff Communications, Inc. respectfully requests an extension of time up to and including December 15, 1995, to file an Opposition to RAM's Application for Review.

Respectfully Submitted,

**PITTENCRIEFF COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

By: Lauren S. Drake

Russell H. Fox  
Lauren S. Drake  
GARDNER, CARTON & DOUGLAS  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 900, East Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-7100

Dated: December 5, 1995

---


<sup>1</sup> PCI actually seeks an abbreviated period for response to any subsequently submitted Application for Review. If such Applications are filed on December 8, a response would ordinarily be required by December 26. However, PCI is willing to submit a consolidated Opposition by December 15.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Judith K. Harris, a secretary in the law firm of Gardner, Carton & Douglas, certify that I have this 5th day of December, 1995, caused to be sent by first-class U.S. mail, postage-prepaid, a copy of the foregoing Motion for Extension of Time to the following:

Henry Goldberg  
Jonathan Wiener  
W. Kenneth Ferree  
Goldberg, Godles, Wiener & Wright  
1229 Nineteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Counsel for RAM Mobile Data USA Limited Partnership



Judith K. Harris