

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

In the Matter of)	
)	IB Docket No. 08-143
Robert M. Franklin, Trustee, Inmarsat plc)	
And Stratos Global Corporation)	DA 08-1659
)	
)	FCC File Nos.:
Applications for Consent to Transfer of)	
Control of Stratos Global Corporation and)	ITC-T/C-20080618-00276
Its Subsidiaries from an Irrevocable Trust)	ITC-T/C-20080618-00275
To Inmarsat plc, and Petition for a)	SES-T/C-20080618-00818
Declaratory Ruling)	SES-T/C-20080618-00821
)	SES-T/C-20080618-00820
)	SES-T/C-20080618-00819
)	0003453455
)	ISP-PDR-20080618-00013

To: The Commission

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
OF VIZADA, INC. AND VIZADA SERVICES LLC**

Vizada, Inc. (formerly Telenor Satellite Services, Inc.) and VIZADA Services LLC (formerly FTMSC US, LLC) (hereafter together “Vizada”),¹ pursuant to Section 1.46(b) of the Commission’s rules,² respectfully request an extension of time for filing a reply to any oppositions to Vizada’s petition to deny the above-captioned Application of Robert M. Franklin, Trustee, and Inmarsat plc (“Inmarsat”) and the related Petition for Declaratory Ruling seeking Commission approval for the indirect transfer of control to Inmarsat of Stratos Global Corporation and its wholly-owned subsidiaries that hold Commission licenses and authorizations

¹ As stated previously in Vizada’s Petition to Deny, Telenor Satellite Services, Inc. changed its name to Vizada, Inc. effective, September 7, 2007. FTMSC US, LLC changed its name to VIZADA Services LLC effective June 7, 2007.

² 47 C.F.R. § 1.46(b). In accordance with Section 1.46(b) of the Commission’s rules, this request for a brief extension of time is being filed more than seven days before the established deadline for Vizada’s reply.

(“Stratos” and, together with Inmarsat, the “Applicants”). By Public Notice, the Commission established a pleading cycle in this docket providing that petitions to deny were due August 13, 2008, oppositions to petitions to deny would be due August 25, 2008, and replies to oppositions would be due September 2, 2008.³ Vizada filed a timely petition to deny on August 13, 2008 and anticipates that the Applicants will file a timely opposition on August 25, 2008. For the reasons set forth below, Vizada requests an extension of nine business days, so that its reply to the Applicants’ opposition would be due on September 15, 2008 – providing Vizada the time necessary to prepare a meaningful response.

The current pleading schedule established by the Public Notice gives Vizada only one week to evaluate and respond to arguments and new information submitted by the Applicants in their opposition. That single week includes the Labor Day holiday weekend and the final week of August, during which key Vizada personnel will be on previously-scheduled vacations and will have difficulty participating in analysis of any arguments made by the Applicants in their opposition. In addition, senior officials at Vizada who are integral to the preparation of the reply and who must approve of positions taken therein will be attending a long-scheduled annual company planning meeting on the dates of September 4th and 5th, 2008. During this time, their availability to consult on the reply will be very limited.

Accordingly, Vizada asks for a brief extension of nine business days to allow key personnel sufficient opportunity to address the arguments made by the Applicants. The Applicants will not be prejudiced by this brief extension of time, as they have made clear that they do not need Commission action until April 15, 2009 – the earliest date on which the

³ *Robert M. Franklin, Trustee, and Inmarsat plc Seek FCC Consent To the Transfer of Control of Stratos Global Corporation and Its Subsidiaries from an Irrevocable Trust To Inmarsat plc*, Public Notice, IB Docket No. 08-143, DA 08-1659 (rel. Jul. 14, 2008) (“Public Notice”).

Applicants may close on the transaction if approved.⁴ Finally, an extension of time will provide the Commission with a more complete record and thus serve the public interest.

The Commission has granted motions for an extension of time in similar circumstances. In several cases, the extensions have been granted on the basis that key personnel would be away on vacation or otherwise unavailable during a critical period in the pleading cycle, or when holidays were included in the pleading cycle.⁵ Given the complexity of the transaction and its wide-ranging implications for mobile satellite service customers, this extension would serve the public interest.⁶

⁴ *Id.* at 3.

⁵ See, e.g., *In the Matter of Leased Commercial Access, Development of Competition and Diversity in Video Programming Distribution and Carriage*, Order Granting Extension of Time for Filing Comments and Reply Comments, 22 FCC Rcd 16,103 (MB 2007); *In the Matter of Pappas Telecasting Companies*, Request for Extension of Time to File Application for Review, 19 FCC Rcd 22694 (MB 2004); *In the Matter of New England Telephone and Telegraph Company and New York Telephone Company*, Order, 11 FCC Rcd 8144 (CCB 1996); *In the Matter of Rulemaking to Amend Parts 1, 2, 21, and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5-29.5 GHz Frequency Band, to Reallocate the 29.5-30.0 GHz Frequency Band, to Establish Rules and Policies for Local Multipoint Distribution Service and for Fixed Satellite Services and Suite 12 Group Petition for Pioneer's Preference*, Order, 10 FCC Rcd 10917 (IB 1995).

⁶ *In the Matter of Applications of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless and Rural Cellular Corporation For Consent To Transfer Control of Licenses, Authorizations, and Spectrum Manager Leases and Petitions for Declaratory Ruling that the Transaction is Consistent with Section 310(b)(4) of the Communications Act*, Order, 22 FCC Rcd 19799 (WTB 2007) (granting 90 day extension based on “wide-ranging and highly significant” impact of merger).

For the foregoing reasons, Vizada urges the Commission to grant an extension of nine business days so that replies to the Applicants' opposition will be due on September 15, 2008. This extension is very brief, will not prejudice the Applicants, and will significantly improve the quality of the record on which the Commission will base its decision.

Respectfully submitted,

VIZADA, INC.
VIZADA SERVICES LLC

By: /s/ Kimberly Reindl

Peter A. Rohrbach
David J. Saylor
Karis A. Hastings
Kimberly S. Reindl

Hogan & Hartson LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004-1109
(202) 637-5600

Their Counsel

August 25, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kimberly Reindl, hereby certify that on this 25th day of August, 2008, I caused to be served a true copy of the foregoing "Motion for Extension of Time of Vizada, Inc. and VIZADA Services LLC" by electronic mail and by first-class, postage-prepaid U.S. mail upon the following:

Bruce Henoeh
Stratos Global Corporation
6901 Rockledge Drive, Suite 900
Bethesda, MD 20817
Bruce.Henoeh@stratosglobal.com

Alfred Mamlet
Steptoe & Johnson LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
amamlet@steptoe.com
Counsel to Stratos Global Corporation

Robert M. Franklin
c/o 6901 Rockledge Drive
Suite 900
Bethesda, MD 20817
Robert.Franklin@rogers.com

James D. Scarlett
Torys LLP
79 Wellington Street West
Box 270, TD Centre
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 1N2 Canada
jscarlett@torys.com
Counsel to Robert M. Franklin

Diane J. Cornell
Vice President, Government Affairs
Inmarsat Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036
Diane_Cornell@inmarsat.com

John P. Janka
Jeffrey A. Marks
Latham & Watkins LLP, Suite 1000
555 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
John.Janka@lw.com
Jeffrey.Marks@lw.com
Counsel to Inmarsat plc


