

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

CHICAGO COKE CO., INC., an Illinois corporation,)	
)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	PCB 10-75
)	(Permit Appeal--Air)
)	
THE ILLINOIS ENVIROMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,)	
)	
)	
Respondent.)	

NOTICE OF FILING

To: Andrew B. Armstrong Assistant Attorney General Environmental Bureau 69 West Washington Street 18 th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60602	Bradley P. Halloran, Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board James R. Thompson Center 100 West Randolph Street Suite 11-500 Chicago, Illinois 60601
---	---

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on this 6th day of July 2010, the following was filed electronically with the Illinois Pollution Control Board, which is attached and herewith served upon you: **Petitioner's Response to Motion for Leave to File Reply and Motion to File a Surreply.**

CHICAGO COKE CO., INC.

By: s/Elizabeth S. Harvey
One of its attorneys

Michael J. Maher
Elizabeth Harvey
Erin E. Wright
SWANSON, MARTIN & BELL, LLP
330 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Telephone: (312) 321-9100

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned non-attorney, state that I served a copy of the foregoing to counsel of record via U.S. Mail at 330 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, IL 60611, at or before 5:00 p.m. on July 6, 2010.



Jeanette Podlin

[x] Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I certify that the statements set forth herein are true and correct.

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

CHICAGO COKE CO., INC., an Illinois corporation,)	
)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	PCB 10-75
)	(Permit Appeal--Air)
)	
THE ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,)	
)	
)	
Respondent.)	

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY AND MOTION TO FILE A SURREPLY

Petitioner, CHICAGO COKE, INC. ("petitioner"), by its attorneys Swanson, Martin & Bell, LLP, responds to respondent ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY's ("IEPA") motion for leave to file a reply. Petitioner also moves for leave to file a surreply, if necessary.

1. On June 30, 2010, IEPA filed a motion for leave to file a reply to petitioner's response in opposition to IEPA's motion to dismiss. Petitioner received that motion for leave to file a reply on July 2, 2010.

2. IEPA claims it needs to reply in order to respond to petitioner's alleged mischaracterizations of IEPA's arguments. Petitioner denies it has mischaracterized any of IEPA's arguments.

3. However, petitioner does not object to IEPA's request for leave to file a reply, if petitioner is allowed to file a surreply to the reply. Because IEPA asserts that petitioner has mischaracterized arguments, which petitioner denies, petitioner may need to file a surreply in order to respond to IEPA's assertions.

4. Without an opportunity to file a surreply, petitioner will be prejudiced because IEPA's allegations will go without response. It is impossible for petitioner to have anticipated whatever claims IEPA may make in its reply. A surreply may be necessary to allow petitioner to dispute IEPA's claims.

5. Thus, if IEPA's motion to reply is granted, petitioner moves the Board to allow petitioner to file a surreply. In order to allow for definite deadlines for the reply and surreply, if the Board grants IEPA's motion, petitioner suggests that IEPA's reply be due on July 14, 2010, and petitioner's surreply be due on July 28, 2010.

WHEREFORE, if the Board grants IEPA's motion for leave to file a reply, petitioner moves to be allowed to file a surreply, and for such other relief as Board finds appropriate.

CHICAGO COKE CO., INC.

By: s/Elizabeth S. Harvey
One of its attorneys

Michael J. Maher
Elizabeth S. Harvey
Erin E. Wright
SWANSON, MARTIN & BELL, LLP
330 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Telephone: (312) 321-9100