



moving party are filed, so that Plaintiff could have responded to their arguments in Plaintiff's response brief.

3. As a result of the amicus group filing its brief as a reply brief instead of when the moving party filed its opening brief, Plaintiff did not have an opportunity to respond to the arguments made by the amicus group. The proposed Surreply Brief responds to the late filed brief of the amicus group.

4. The issues raised in this case and briefed by the parties and amici are important and significant. Plaintiff would be happy to participate in oral argument on these issues if the Court believes oral argument would be helpful.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc., respectfully requests leave to file the accompanying Surreply Brief in order to respond to the arguments made by the amicus group.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stephen D. Libowsky

Stephen D. Libowsky  
Wm. Bradford Reynolds  
Louis A. Crisostomo  
Howrey LLP  
321 North Clark Street, Suite 3400  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 595-1239

Laurie Wardell  
Elyssa Balingit Winslow  
Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights  
Under Law, Inc.  
100 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
(312) 630-9744

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights  
Under Law, Inc.

Dated: June 29, 2006