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By the Chief, Media Bureau:

# INTRODUCTION

1. The Media Bureau (Bureau) has before it the Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) filed on June 7, 2017, by Holston Valley Broadcasting Corporation (Holston) relating to the above-captioned renewal, transfer of control, and license applications (Renewal Application, Transfer Application, and License Application, respectively; Applications, collectively) filed by Continental Media Group, LLC (Continental), licensee of Station WXMY(AM), Saltville, Virginia (Station); and related responsive pleadings.[[1]](#footnote-3) Holston seeks reconsideration of a Commission decision denying its November 26, 2016, Application for Review (AFR) of the Bureau’s grant of the unopposed Renewal Application and Transfer Application, and the concurrent grant of the License Application, to which Holston had filed an Informal Objection.[[2]](#footnote-4) For the reasons set forth below, we dismiss the Petition pursuant to Section 1.106(p) of the Commission’s rules (Rules).[[3]](#footnote-5)

# BACKGROUND

1. On review, the Commission affirmed the Bureau’s prior determination that Holston’s failure to file a petition to deny or otherwise oppose the Transfer Application and Renewal Application during their near five-year pendency precluded it from later seeking reconsideration of the staff’s grant of those applications.[[4]](#footnote-6) The Commission also found that Holston failed to demonstrate “extraordinary circumstances” which would justify revocation of the contested License Application under Section 319(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act). [[5]](#footnote-7)
2. In the subject Petition, Holston argues that “Continental Media Group, LLC” has not existed as a Virginia Limited Liability Company since at least December 31, 2013, and avers that all Continental’s filings to the Commission since then “must be stricken as sham and false pursuant to Section 1.52 of the [] Rules.”[[6]](#footnote-8) Holston also asserts that Continental’s “apparent failure to notify the FCC of consummation” of the Transfer Application necessitates a hearing to determine whether the Renewal Application could be granted.[[7]](#footnote-9) Finally, Holston alleges that Continental’s license may have expired pursuant to Section 312(g) of the Act because “it appears that [the Station] may not have been broadcasting any programming, as the [S]tation’s transmitter has been turned on, but no programming is being broadcast.”[[8]](#footnote-10)
3. In its Opposition, Continental first argues that Holston did not did not contest the Transfer Application or Renewal Application prior to grant and is procedurally barred by both prior Bureau and Commission actions from challenging either of those applications in its Petition.[[9]](#footnote-11) It also claims that the Petition raises new matters, none of which pertain to any issues previously raised in this proceeding.[[10]](#footnote-12) Substantively, Continental argues that Holston has presented no facts demonstrating that it did not timely resume Station operations (including audio programming material) on March 19, 2017. Continental also rejects as irrelevant to Commission consideration of the Renewal Application both the allegation that it broadcast with “carrier only” at times between “May 18 and June 5, 2017,” and the allegation that it failed to timely file a consummation notice and ownership report following the grant of the Transfer Application.[[11]](#footnote-13) Continental also indicates that: (1) it has now filed both a consummation notice and an ownership report *vis-à-vis* the Transfer Application; (2) Continental’s lapse of official status in Virginia was inadvertent, and it is again in good standing with the Commonwealth; and (3) regarding Holston’s claim of “sham and false pleadings,” Holston has presented no evidence that Continental ever presented information with an intent to deceive the Commission.[[12]](#footnote-14)
4. In its “Comments” on the *First Motion*, Holston reiterates its charge that Continental was, at the time of filing, a non-existent business entity and had been so since December 31, 2002. Thus, argues Holston, (1) any filing made on behalf of that non-existent corporation must be considered a “sham” or “false” and constitutes a misdemeanor under Virginia law; (2) as a “purged” corporation, Continental under Virginia law will never be able to get its charter reinstated, and applications and pleadings cannot lawfully be filed with the Commission on behalf of a nonexistent LLC applicant.[[13]](#footnote-15) Holston reasserts these arguments again in its July 20, 2017, Reply to Continental’s Opposition.[[14]](#footnote-16)
5. On November 29, 2017, the Bureau issued a Letter of Inquiry to Continental requesting that it clarify whether the Station broadcasted with programming between March 19, 2017, and March 21, 2017.[[15]](#footnote-17) Continental filed a response on December 12, 2017 (LOI Response). In the LOI Response, Wendy Raynor states that the Station “returned to the air on March 19, 2017, with classic country music programming.”[[16]](#footnote-18) The LOI Response is supported by program logs showing that the Station aired programming from March 19, 2017, to March 21, 2017.

# DISCUSSION

1. We dismiss Holston’s petition for the reasons set forth below. Section 1.106(b)(2) of the Rules specifies limited circumstances under which a party may seek reconsideration of a Commission denial of an application for review. Such a petition for reconsideration will be entertained only if the petition: (i) “relies on facts or arguments which relate to events which have occurred or circumstances which have changed since the last opportunity to present such matters to the Commission”; and/or (ii) “relies on facts or arguments unknown to petitioner until after his last opportunity to present them to the Commission, and he could not through the exercise of ordinary diligence have learned of the facts or arguments in question prior to such opportunity.”[[17]](#footnote-19) Section 1.106(p) provides that “[p]etitions for reconsideration of a Commission action that plainly do not warrant consideration by the Commission may be dismissed or denied by the relevant bureau(s) or office(s).”[[18]](#footnote-20)  Petitions that plainly do not warrant Commission consideration include those that “fail to identify any material error, omission, or reason warranting reconsideration”[[19]](#footnote-21) as well as those which do not meet the requirements of Section 1.106(b)(2).[[20]](#footnote-22)
2. In this case, Continental’s corporate status at the time it filed the Applications is neither a new fact nor changed circumstance, and Holston provides no explanation for why it could not previously have raised this claim. Additionally, on June 6, 2017, Continental informed the Commission that it had consummated the transfer of control from Jeffrey Raynor to Wendy Raynor as 100 percent owner[[21]](#footnote-23) on February 12, 2016, obviating any need for an evidentiary hearing to determine whether the transfer had occurred and renewal could be granted. Thus, to the extent that the Petition relies on these two arguments, it “plainly [does] not warrant consideration by the Commission,” and we exercise our authority under Section 1.106(p)(1) to dismiss it.
3. Additionally, Section 1.106(p)(5) of the Rules provides that the Bureau may dismiss petitions for reconsideration that “[r]elate to matters outside the scope of the order for which reconsideration is sought.”[[22]](#footnote-24) Holston’s argument that Continental’s license for the Station expired pursuant to Section 312(g) of the Act in March of 2017 is well outside the scope of this proceeding, which centers on whether the Bureau properly granted the captioned Applications. We thus dismiss this argument as well.[[23]](#footnote-25)

# ORDERING CLAUSE

1. For the reasons set forth above, IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration filed by Holston Valley Broadcasting Corporation on June 7, 2017, IS DISMISSED pursuant to Section 1.106(p) of the Commission’s Rules.

 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

 Michelle M. Carey

 Chief, Media Bureau
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19. 47 CFR § 1.106(p)(1). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
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22. 47 CFR § 1.106(p)(5). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
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