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ORDER

**Adopted: March 12, 2018 Released: March 12, 2018**

By the Chief, Policy and Licensing Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau:

# introduction

1. In this Order, we deny a request by License Acquisitions, Inc. (License Acquisitions) to rescind its election under the 800 MHz rebanding program to relocate to the Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio (ESMR) portion of the band.[[1]](#footnote-3)
2. The request arises from the early stages of the rebanding program,[[2]](#footnote-4) when 800 MHz incumbents that held geographic area licenses in the former interleaved portions of the band (809.75-816/854.75-861 MHz) were allowed to choose between two relocation options: (1) they could elect to remain in the interleaved portion of the band and operate high-site systems,[[3]](#footnote-5) or (2) they could elect to relocate to the ESMR band (816-824/861-869 MHz) and operate low-site cellular-architecture systems.[[4]](#footnote-6) Based on each licensee’s election, the 800 MHz Transition Administrator (TA) would then assign the licensee channels in the appropriate band, and the licensee would proceed with rebanding in accordance with its election.
3. Silver Palm Communications, Inc. (Silver Palm), the predecessor licensee to License Acquisitions, held several 800 MHz geographic-area licenses in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico.[[5]](#footnote-7) In May 2005, Silver Palm elected to relocate those licenses to the ESMR band, and so notified the TA.[[6]](#footnote-8) In October 2005, the Commission ordered that licensees that had elected to relocate to the ESMR band be given a new election window in which to either rescind or reaffirm their previous elections, and the TA opened a 20-day election window pursuant to the Commission’s directive.[[7]](#footnote-9) In February 2006, Silver Palm reaffirmed its election to relocate to the ESMR band and to construct and operate a cellular architecture system.[[8]](#footnote-10) In July 2010, License Acquisitions acquired the Silver Palm licenses, subject to Silver Palm’s ESMR election.
4. On November 28, 2017, License Acquisitions filed a letter seeking to rescind the ESMR election and requesting that it be assigned back the non-ESMR channels that were licensed to Silver Palm prior to its election. In support of its request, License Acquisitions states “events that have since transpired” make License Acquisitions’ “only course of action . . . to rescind the Election. . .”[[9]](#footnote-11) License Acquisitions does not describe the nature of these events.

# discussion

1. We treat License Acquisitions’ letter as a request for waiver to allow it to withdraw or rescind an ESMR election 12 years after the expiration of the election window in 2006. For the reasons set out below, deny the request.
2. Section 1.925 of the Commission's rules states that to obtain a waiver of the Commission's rules, a petitioner must demonstrate either that: (i) the underlying purpose of the rule(s) would not be served or would be frustrated by application to the present case, and that a grant of waiver would be in the public interest;[[10]](#footnote-12) or (ii) in view of unique or unusual factual circumstances of the instant case, application of the rule(s) would be inequitable, unduly burdensome, or contrary to the public interest, or the applicant has no reasonable alternative.[[11]](#footnote-13)
3. Under the first prong of the Commission’s waiver standard, we find that the intent of the February 2006 deadline on ESMR elections would be frustrated were we to grant the requested relief. The Commission imposed this deadline to define the spectrum landscape at the outset of the rebanding process so that the TA could develop a rebanding band plan based on a clear delineation of which licensees required frequencies in the ESMR and non-ESMR portions of the band. Allowing License Acquisitions to switch from ESMR to non-ESMR spectrum 12 years after the fact would require revisions to the band plan that would be highly disruptive to the almost-completed rebanding process and would in fact unwind progress that has already been made.
4. License Acquisitions concedes that, if its request were granted, the TA would need to identify new non-ESMR frequencies for License Acquisitions to the extent its licenses are within the U.S. - Mexico sharing zone.[[12]](#footnote-14) The Commission has already established a cross-border band plan agreement with its Mexico counterpart and has released a revised Mexico border band plan.[[13]](#footnote-15) Changing the band plan to accommodate License Acquisitions’ request to rescind its ESMR election would entail additional effort by the TA and delay the rebanding of both U.S. and Mexico licensees.
5. Similarly, allowing License Acquisitions to rescind the ESMR election for its licenses in non-border areas of the United States would entail reopening the rebanding process in areas where rebanding has been completed.[[14]](#footnote-16) In order to assign non-ESMR channels to License Acquisitions, the TA would have to implement a new band plan and identify vacated channels in the interleaved band. Under the 800 MHz rebanding rules, following completion of rebanding in a region, these vacated channels are to be made available for licensing to public safety for five years and to public safety and critical infrastructure industries for the last two years of the five year term.[[15]](#footnote-17) Granting License Acquisitions’ request would effectively confer it preferential access to these channels and reduce the number of vacated channels available for new licensing, with no offsetting public interest benefit.[[16]](#footnote-18)
6. With respect to the second prong of the Commission’s waiver standard, we find that License Acquisitions has failed to demonstrate the existence of unique or unusual circumstances. The case law establishes that parties “must plead with particularity the facts and circumstances that warrant a waiver.”[[17]](#footnote-19) License Acquisitions, however, fails to describe the nature of the “events that have since transpired” that allegedly compel it to seek to rescind the ESMR election.[[18]](#footnote-20) Relying on unspecified events without explaining the substance or implications of those events does not meet the particularity requirement or surmount the “high hurdle” that courts have placed before proponents of waiver requests.[[19]](#footnote-21)
7. Moreover, denial of License Acquisitions’ request is neither inequitable, unduly burdensome, nor contrary to the public interest. Prior to filing this request, License Acquisitions consistently represented to the Commission that it was fully prepared to implement an ESMR system, and that it had purchased equipment and obtained site leases in preparation for construction of such a system.[[20]](#footnote-22) License Acquisitions has not provided any justification for its eleventh-hour reversal of position or demonstrated that it would be inequitable or burdensome to require License Acquisitions to continue to abide by the ESMR election that has applied to these licenses since 2006.
8. For the reasons set out above, we deny License Acquisitions’ request to rescind its ESMR election. Our action today is limited to License Acquisitions request to rescind the ESMR election and does not affect any other pending matter relating to License Acquisitions, including the contested renewal of certain License Acquisitions licenses or other pending waiver requests by License Acquisitions.[[21]](#footnote-23)

# ordering clause

1. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Petition to Rescind Election to Relocate 800 MHz SMR EA Licenses to the ESMR Band, filed by License Acquisitions, LLC, On November 28, 2017, IS DENIED.
2. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.191, 0.392 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.191, 0.392, 1.925.
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