

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Applications of TeleCorp PCS, Inc.,)	WT Docket No. 00-130
Tritel, Inc. and Indus, Inc. Seeking FCC)	DA 00-1589
Consent to Transfer Control of, or Assign)	
Broadband PCS and LMDS Licenses)	

OPPOSITION OF ALPINE PCS, INC. TO MOTION TO STRIKE

Alpine PCS, Inc. (“Alpine”) hereby opposes the “Motion To Strike Of Telecorp PCS, Inc., et al, Or, In the Alternative, Request For Leave To File Substantive Response To Late Filed Comments” (the “Motion”) filed by TeleCorp PCS, Inc. (“TeleCorp”) and its subsidiaries and affiliates (collectively the “Applicants”) on September 1, 2000. While Alpine understands the Applicants’ desire to avoid challenge based on technical procedural grounds, in this instance the objections based on standing and timeliness are entirely without merit. The Commission should deny the Motion and consider Alpine’s Reply Comments in this proceeding.

In its Reply Comments, Alpine provided more than sufficient basis to justify its interest in the current transaction and to satisfy any standing requirement. Notably, Applicants provide no authority for their challenge to Alpine’s standing.

In any event, if the Commission has any questions regarding Alpine’s standing, it can take official notice of the fact that both Alpine and TeleCorp have expressed their intent to participate in the upcoming C block reauction now scheduled to begin on December 12, 2000. Obviously, Alpine as a legitimate small business will be further disadvantaged if it must bid against a combined TeleCorp/Tritel corporate giant claiming to be a small business for licenses in that auction.

With respect to the timeliness of Alpine's Reply Comments, as the Applicants concede, Alpine generally supported the positions asserted by Nextel in its petition and Applicants had a full and fair opportunity to respond to those positions during course of the pleading cycle. Alpine's support for the Nextel petition does not unfairly disadvantage the Applicants in any of the ways that they imply.

For the reasons stated above and in Alpine's Reply Comments the Commission should deny the Applicants' Motion and deny the transfer of control as urged by Nextel, Alpine and other commenters.

Respectfully submitted,
ALPINE PCS, INC.

/s/ Robert F. Broz
By: Robert F. Broz
President

ALPINE, PCS, INC.
201 Calle Cesar Chavez
Suite 103
Santa Barbara, California 93103

September 14, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Opposition of Alpine PCS, Inc. to Motion to Strike" was sent by hand delivery this 14th day of September, 2000, or via U.S. mail where indicated, to the following:

International Transcription Services, Inc.
445-12th Street., SW
Room CY-B402
Washington, DC 20554

Robert L. Pettit*
Eric W. DeSilva *
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Lauren Kravetz
Commercial Wireless Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-A13
Washington, DC 20554

Terry O'Reilly *
Indus, Inc.
633 East Maston Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Jamison Prime
Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Wireless Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-A734
Washington, DC 20554

ABC Wireless, L.L.C. *
1010 North Glebe Road
Suite 800
Arlington, VA 22201

David Hu
Auctions and Industry Analysis Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-B511
Washington, DC 20554

Douglas I. Brandon *
AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC
1150 Connecticut Ave., NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

John Branscome
Commercial Wireless Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-A234
Washington, DC 20554

Thomas Gutierrez *
Lukas, Nace, Guitierrez & Sachs, Chartered
1111 19th Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036

/s/ Debra Sloan _____
Debra Sloan

* Sent Via US Mail