

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY,	)	
L.P.	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 05-2433-JWL
	)	
VONAGE HOLDINGS, CORP.,	)	
VONAGE AMERICA, INC.	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, L.P.'S RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Plaintiff, Sprint Communications Company L.P. hereby provides its response to the Court's Order to Show Cause (Doc. No. 221).

As noted in the Court's Order, the time period for responding to Vonage's Objections is governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. Order, at 1. Because Vonage's Objections refer to dispositive issues, Sprint calculated its deadline for responding pursuant to the time period set forth in Rule 72(b), which provides that "[a] party may respond to another party's objections within 10 days after being served with a copy thereof." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). In calculating this 10 day period, Sprint relied on Rule 6, which governs the computation of time prescribed by Rule 72. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a). Because "the period of time prescribed or allowed [in Rule 72] is less than 11 days, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays shall be excluded in the computation." *Id.* Additionally, because Sprint believed that Vonage's service fell under Rule 5(b)(2)(D), Rule 6(e) provides that "3 days are added after the prescribed period would otherwise expire under subdivision (a)." *Id.* at 6(e).

Calculating its 10 day deadline to respond under Rules 6(a) and 72, Sprint determined that the Rule 6(a) time to respond was June 12, 2007. Pursuant to Rule 6(e), Sprint added 3 additional days to this deadline, which resulted in the calculation of a final deadline of June 15, 2007. Sprint docketed this deadline immediately upon receipt of Vonage's Objections and, pursuant to its docketed deadline, is filing concurrently herewith its Response to Vonage's Objections.

Sprint apologizes for any confusion or delay its calculation of the deadline may have caused, and appreciates the opportunity to file its Response to Vonage's Objections.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 15, 2007

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

/s/ Adam P. Seitz

B. Trent Webb, KS Bar No. 15965  
Adam P. Seitz, KS Bar No. 21059  
Eric A. Buresh, KS Bar No. 19895  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613  
816-474-6550 Telephone  
816-421-5547 Facsimile

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 15th day of June 2007, a copy of the above and foregoing was e-filed with the Court using the CM/ECF system which sent notification to the following:

Don R. Lolli  
Patrick J. Kaine  
Dysart Taylor Lay Cotter & McMonigle P.C.  
4420 Madison Avenue  
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

Patrick D. McPherson  
Patrick C. Muldoon  
Barry Golob  
Duane Morris LLP  
1667 K. Street N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006-1608

Attorneys for Defendants  
Vonage Holdings Corp. and  
Vonage America, Inc.

/s/ Adam P. Seitz  
Attorney for Sprint Communications Company L.P.