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**Federal Communications Commission**

**Washington, D.C. 20554**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In re Application of  ALLLIANCE COMMUNICATIONS GROUP  For Renewal License for Industrial/Business Pool Station WQCE473 | **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)** | File No. 0006596448 |

**ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION**

**Adopted: September 22, 2015 Released: September 23, 2015**

By the Deputy Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau:

1. *Introduction.* In this *Order on Reconsideration*, we deny a petition filed by Mobile Relay Associates (MRA) seeking reconsideration of the grant of the above-captioned application to renew the license of Alliance Communications Group (Alliance) for Industrial/Business Pool Station WQCE473, Los Angeles County, California.[[1]](#footnote-2)
2. *Background*. Alliance was initially licensed for Station WQCE473 on February 11, 2005.[[2]](#footnote-3) On December 26, 2014, Alliance filed an application to renew the license, which was granted on January 14, 2015.[[3]](#footnote-4)
3. In its petition, MRA alleges that Hector Mosquera (Mosquera) is a convicted felon and is one of the principals of Alliance.[[4]](#footnote-5) MRA states that in neither the instant application nor any previously-granted application did Alliance answer in the affirmative Question 50 on Form 601, which asks whether the applicant or any party directly or indirectly controlling the applicant has even been convicted of a felony.[[5]](#footnote-6) MRA states that because Alliance failed to disclose Mosquera’s felony conviction, the Commission should deny the instant application and revoke all of Alliance’s licenses.[[6]](#footnote-7)
4. *Discussion.* A failure to disclose in filings submitted to the Commission a felony conviction of an applicant’s principal may constitute an intentional misrepresentation of material facts, in violation of Section 1.17 of the Commission’s Rules.[[7]](#footnote-8) In this case, however, MRA has not demonstrated that Mosquera is in fact one of Alliance’s principals. The only evidence that MRA presents is that Mosquera signed some earlier Alliance applications.[[8]](#footnote-9) Alliance is a corporation. Any “duly authorized employee” may sign an application on a corporation’s behalf.[[9]](#footnote-10) Therefore, the fact that Mosquera signed applications for Alliance does not substantiate MRA’s assertion that he is a principal of the company. Speculation and conjecture are not evidence.[[10]](#footnote-11)
5. *Conclusion and Ordering Clauses*. MRA has not demonstrated that reconsideration is warranted. We therefore deny the petition. MRA may submit a substantiated complaint in the future.
6. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 405 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 405, and Section 1.106 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.106, the Petition for Reconsideration filed by Mobile Relay Associates on January 26, 2015 IS DENIED.
7. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.131 and 0.331 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0131, 0.331.
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