

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	File No. EB-07-SE-284
Epic Touch Company, Inc.)	NAL/Acct. No. 200832100016
)	FRN # 0005599634

NOTICE OF APPARENT LIABILITY FOR FORFEITURE

Adopted: February 26, 2008

Released: February 28, 2008

By the Chief, Enforcement Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In this Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture (“NAL”), we find that Epic Touch Company, Inc. (“Epic Touch”) apparently willfully and repeatedly violated Section 20.19(d)(2) of the Commission’s Rules (“Rules”)¹ by failing to include in its digital wireless handset offerings at least two handset models that meet the inductive coupling standard for hearing aid compatibility by September 18, 2006. For Epic Touch’s apparent violations, we propose a forfeiture in the amount of thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000).

II. BACKGROUND

2. In the 2003 *Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, the Commission adopted several measures to enhance the ability of individuals with hearing disabilities to access digital wireless telecommunications.² The Commission established technical standards that digital wireless handsets must meet to be considered compatible with hearing aids operating in acoustic coupling and inductive coupling (telecoil) modes.³ Specifically, the Commission adopted a standard for radio frequency interference (the

¹ 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(d)(2).

² *Section 68.4(a) of the Commission’s Rules Governing Hearing Aid-Compatible Telephones*, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 16753 (2003); Erratum, 18 FCC Rcd 18047 (2003) (“*Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*”); Order on Reconsideration and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 20 FCC Rcd 11221 (2005) (“*Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*”). The Commission adopted these requirements for digital wireless telephones under the authority of the Hearing Aid Compatibility Act of 1988, codified at Section 710(b)(2)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 610(b)(2)(C).

³ See *Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 16777 ¶ 56; 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(b)(1), (2). The *Hearing Aid Compatibility Order* described the acoustic coupling and the inductive (telecoil) coupling modes as follows:

In acoustic coupling mode, the microphone picks up surrounding sounds, desired and undesired, and converts them into electrical signals. The electrical signals are amplified as needed and then converted back into electrical signals. In telecoil mode, with the microphone turned off, the telecoil picks up the audio signal-based magnetic field generated by the voice coil of a dynamic speaker in hearing aid-compatible telephones, audio loop systems, or powered neck loops. The hearing aid converts the magnetic field into electrical signals, amplifies them as needed, and converts them back into sound via the speaker. Using a telecoil avoids the feedback that often results from putting a hearing aid up against a telephone earpiece, can help prevent exposure to over amplification, and eliminates background noise, providing improved access to the telephone.

“U3” or “M3” rating) to enable acoustic coupling between digital wireless phones and hearing aids operating in acoustic coupling mode, and a separate standard (the “U3T” or “T3” rating) to enable inductive coupling with hearing aids operating in telecoil mode.⁴ The Commission further established, for each standard, deadlines by which manufacturers and service providers were required to offer specified numbers or percentages of digital wireless handsets per air interface⁵ that are compliant with the relevant standard if they did not come under the *de minimis* exception.⁶ The Commission required that manufacturers and service providers begin making commercially available at least two handset models per air interface that meet the U3 or M3 rating for radio frequency interference by September 16, 2005.⁷ The Commission also required that manufacturers and service providers make commercially available at least two handset models per air interface that meet the U3T or T3 rating for inductive coupling by September 18, 2006.⁸ In connection with the offer of hearing aid-compatible handset models, the Commission also required entities to label the handsets with the appropriate technical rating, and to explain the technical rating system in the owner’s manual or as part of the packaging material for the handset.⁹

3. In order to monitor efforts to make compliant handsets available, the Commission required manufacturers and digital wireless service providers to report every six months on efforts toward compliance with the hearing aid compatibility requirements for the first three years of implementation,

⁴ Section 20.19(b)(1) provides that a wireless handset is deemed hearing aid-compatible for radio frequency interference if, at minimum, it receives a U3 rating as set forth in “American National Standard for Methods of Measurement of Compatibility between Wireless Communications Devices and Hearing Aids, ANSI C63.19-2001.” 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(b)(1). Section 20.19(b)(2) provides that a wireless handset is deemed hearing aid-compatible for inductive coupling if, at minimum, it receives a U3T rating as set forth in ANSI C63.19-2001. 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(b)(2). On April 25, 2005, the Commission’s Office of Engineering and Technology announced that it would also certify handsets as hearing aid-compatible based on the revised version of the standard, ANSI C63.19-2005. *See OET Clarifies Use of Revised Wireless Phone Hearing Aid Compatibility Standard Measurement Procedures and Rating Nomenclature*, Public Notice, 20 FCC Rcd 8188 (OET 2005). On June 6, 2006, the Commission’s Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and Office of Engineering and Technology announced that the Commission would also certify handsets as hearing aid-compatible based on the revised version of the standard, ANSI C63.19-2006. Thus, applicants for certification may rely on either the 2001 version, the 2005 version, or the 2006 version of the ANSI C63.19 standard. *See Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and Office of Engineering and Technology Clarify Use of Revised Wireless Phone Hearing Aid Compatibility Standard*, Public Notice, 21 FCC Rcd 6384 (WTB/OET 2006). In addition, since the 2005 version, the ANSI C63.19 technical standard has used an “M” nomenclature for the radio frequency interference rating rather than a “U,” and a “T” nomenclature for the handset’s inductive coupling rating, rather than a “UT.” The Commission has approved the use of the “M” and “T” nomenclature and considers the M/T and U/UT nomenclatures as synonymous. *See Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 11238.

⁵ The term “air interface” refers to the technical protocol that ensures compatibility between mobile radio service equipment, such as handsets, and the service provider’s base stations. Currently, the leading air interfaces include Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA), Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM), Integrated Digital Enhanced Network (iDEN), and Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA).

⁶ *See Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 16780 ¶ 65; 47 C.F.R. §§ 20.19(c), (d). The *de minimis* exception provides that manufacturers or mobile service providers that offer two or fewer digital wireless handset models per air interface are exempt from the hearing aid compatibility requirements, and manufacturers or service providers that offer three digital wireless handset models per air interface must offer at least one compliant model. 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(e).

⁷ *See Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 16780 ¶ 65; *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(c).

⁸ *See Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 16780 ¶ 65; *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(d).

⁹ *See Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 16785 ¶¶ 83, 85-86; *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 20.19(f).

and then annually thereafter through the fifth year of implementation.¹⁰ Accordingly, entities were required to file their sixth semi-annual reports by November 17, 2006.

4. In its November 17, 2006 hearing aid compatibility report,¹¹ Epic Touch listed five handset models that it offered.¹² Because Epic Touch's five handsets did not meet the T3 rating for inductive coupling, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau referred the matter to the Enforcement Bureau's Spectrum Enforcement Division for investigation.¹³

5. On August 13, 2007, the Spectrum Enforcement Division issued Epic Touch a Letter of Inquiry ("LOI").¹⁴ In its Response to the LOI, Epic Touch did not deny that it failed to offer at least two handset models that meet the T3 rating for inductive coupling by September 18, 2006, as required under Section 20.19(d)(2).¹⁵ Epic Touch stated that it began offering one inductive coupling-compliant handset model in March of 2007, a second compliant handset model in July of 2007, and a third compliant handset model in September of 2007.¹⁶ Epic Touch claimed that, as a Tier III carrier, it was "extremely hard ... to acquire and release updated Handsets in a timely manner" because new handsets are the subject of exclusive arrangements between manufacturers and larger carriers.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Failure to Offer for Sale Two Hearing Aid-Compatible Handsets

6. Section 20.19(d)(2) of the Rules requires digital wireless service providers to begin offering for sale at least two handset models for each air interface that meet at least a T3 rating for inductive coupling by September 18, 2006. Epic Touch admits that it did not meet the September 18, 2006 deployment benchmark date. Specifically, Epic Touch admits that it did not offer at least two handsets that meet the T3 rating for inductive coupling until sometime in July 2007 -- approximately ten months after September 18, 2006. We thus find that Epic Touch apparently willfully¹⁷ and repeatedly¹⁸ failed to

¹⁰ See *Hearing Aid Compatibility Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 16787 ¶¶ 89-91; see also *Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Announces Hearing Aid Compatibility Reporting Dates for Wireless Carriers and Handset Manufacturers*, Public Notice, 19 FCC Rcd 4097 (WTB 2004).

¹¹ The Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions filed the report on behalf of Epic Touch.

¹² The five handsets included the following models: Motorola v555, Nokia 6230, Nokia 3100, Motorola v3 and Nokia 6061.

¹³ See *Report on the Status of Implementation of the Commission's Hearing Aid Compatibility Requirements*, Report, 22 FCC Rcd 17703 ¶ 33 (October 5, 2007) (recommending that the Commission "vigilantly monitor compliance with its hearing aid compatibility rules, and take appropriate enforcement action against parties that violate the rules) ("*2007 Report*").

¹⁴ See Letter from Kathryn S. Berthot, Chief, Spectrum Enforcement Division, Enforcement Bureau to Troy Barnett, Epic Touch (August 13, 2007).

¹⁵ See Letter from Troy Barnett, Epic Touch to Kathryn S. Berthot, Chief, Spectrum Enforcement Division, Enforcement Bureau (September 12, 2007) ("*LOI Response*").

¹⁶ According to Epic Touch, it began offering the Motorola v3i in March of 2007, the Nokia 6085 in July of 2007, and the Nokia 6126h in September of 2007. LOI Response at 1.

¹⁷ Section 312(f)(1) of the Act defines "willful" as "the conscious and deliberate commission or omission of [any] act, irrespective of any intent to violate" the law. 47 U.S.C. § 312(f)(1). The legislative history of Section 312(f)(1) of the Act clarifies that this definition of willful applies to both Sections 312 and 503(b) of the Act, H.R. Rep. No. 97-765, 97th Cong. 2d Sess. 51 (1982), and the Commission has so interpreted the term in the Section 503(b) (continued ...)

comply with the hearing aid compatibility requirements of Section 20.19(d)(2).

B. Proposed Forfeiture

7. Under Section 503(b)(1)(b) of the Act, any person who is determined by the Commission to have willfully or repeatedly failed to comply with any provision of the Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Commission shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty.¹⁹ To impose such a forfeiture penalty, the Commission must issue a notice of apparent liability and the person against whom such notice has been issued must have an opportunity to show, in writing, why no such forfeiture penalty should be imposed.²⁰ The Commission will then issue a forfeiture if it finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the person has violated the Act or a Commission rule.²¹ We conclude under this standard that Epic Touch is apparently liable for forfeiture for its apparent willful and repeated violations of Section 20.19(d)(2) of the Rules.

8. Under Section 503(b)(2)(B) of the Act,²² we may assess a common carrier a forfeiture of up to \$130,000 for each violation, or for each day of a continuing violation up to a maximum of \$1,325,000 for a single act or failure to act. In exercising such authority, we are required to take into account “the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation and, with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, and such other matters as justice may require.”²³

9. The Commission’s *Forfeiture Policy Statement*²⁴ and Section 1.80 of the Rules do not establish a base forfeiture amount for violations of the hearing aid-compatible handset requirements set forth in Section 20.19 of the Rules. The fact that the *Forfeiture Policy Statement* does not specify a base amount does not indicate that no forfeiture should be imposed. The *Forfeiture Policy Statement* states (Continued from previous page ...)

context. See *Southern California Broadcasting Co.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 6 FCC Rcd 4387, 4388 ¶ 5 (1991), *recon. denied*, 7 FCC Rcd 3454 (1992) (“*Southern California*”).

¹⁸ Section 312(f)(2) of the Act, which also applies to forfeitures assessed pursuant to Section 503(b) of the Act, provides that “[t]he term ‘repeated,’ ... means the commission or omission of such act more than once or, if such commission or omission is continuous, for more than one day.” 47 U.S.C. § 312(f)(2). See *Callais Cablevision, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 16 FCC Rcd 1359, 1362 ¶ 9 (2001); *Southern California*, 6 FCC Rcd at 4388 ¶ 5.

¹⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(1)(B); 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(a)(1).

²⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 503(b); 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(f).

²¹ See, e.g., *SBC Communications, Inc.*, Forfeiture Order, 17 FCC Rcd 7589, 7591 ¶ 4 (2002).

²² 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(2)(B). The Commission twice amended Section 1.80(b)(3) of the Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(b)(3), to increase the maxima forfeiture amounts, in accordance with the inflation adjustment requirements contained in the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, 28 U.S.C. § 2461. See *Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Commission’s Rules and Adjustment of Forfeiture Maxima to Reflect Inflation*, Order, 15 FCC Rcd 18221 (2000) (adjusting the maximum statutory amounts from \$100,000/\$1,000,000 to \$120,000/\$1,200,000); *Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Commission’s Rules and Adjustment of Forfeiture Maxima to Reflect Inflation*, Order, 19 FCC Rcd 10945 (2004) (adjusting the maximum statutory amounts from \$120,000/\$1,200,000 to \$130,000/\$1,325,000); see also 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(c).

²³ 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(2)(E). See also 47 C.F.R. § 1.80(b)(4), Note to paragraph (b)(4): Section II. Adjustment Criteria for Section 503 Forfeitures.

²⁴ See *The Commission’s Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines*, 12 FCC Rcd 17087 (1997), *recon. denied*, 15 FCC Rcd 303 (1999) (“*Forfeiture Policy Statement*”).

that “... any omission of a specific rule violation from the ... [forfeiture guidelines] ... should not signal that the Commission considers any unlisted violation as nonexistent or unimportant.”²⁵ The Commission retains the discretion, moreover, to depart from the *Forfeiture Policy Statement* and issue forfeitures on a case-by-case basis, under its general forfeiture authority contained in Section 503 of the Act.²⁶

10. In determining the appropriate forfeiture amount for violation of the hearing aid compatibility handset requirements, we take into account that these requirements serve to ensure that individuals with hearing disabilities have access to digital wireless telecommunications services. In adopting the hearing aid compatibility rules, the Commission underscored the strong and immediate need for such access, stressing that individuals with hearing impairments should not be denied the public safety and convenience benefits of digital wireless telephony.²⁷ Moreover, as the Commission has noted, the demand for hearing aid-compatible handsets is likely to increase with the growing reliance on wireless technology and with the increasing median age of our population.²⁸

11. We note that the Enforcement Bureau has established a base forfeiture amount of \$8,000 for violation of the labeling requirements for wireless hearing aid-compatible handsets.²⁹ We find that a violation of the labeling requirements, while serious because it deprives hearing aid users from making informed choices, is less egregious than a violation of the handset requirements because failure to make compliant handsets available actually deprives hearing aid users from accessing digital wireless communications. Therefore, we believe that a significantly higher base forfeiture amount is warranted for violations of the hearing aid compatibility handset requirements. Further, because providers were required to offer at least two handset models that meet at least a T3 rating for inductive coupling, we think that a proposed forfeiture for violation of these requirements should be applied on a per handset basis. Accordingly, we recently concluded that a base forfeiture amount of \$15,000 per handset is appropriate for violation of the hearing aid compatibility handset requirements.³⁰

12. Epic Touch did not offer any handsets that met a T3 rating for inductive coupling by September 18, 2006. Epic Touch did not offer a compliant handset until March of 2007, and did not come into compliance with the inductive coupling compatibility requirements by offering a second compliant handset until July of 2007. Although Epic Touch’s failure to offer two handsets that meet the FCC’s inductive coupling compatibility requirements is a continuing violation for purposes of determining an appropriate forfeiture, we exercise our prosecutorial discretion and decline to assess a

²⁵ *Forfeiture Policy Statement*, 12 FCC Rcd at 17099 ¶ 22.

²⁶ *See id.*

²⁷ *Id.* at 16755 ¶ 4.

²⁸ *Id.* at 16786 ¶ 5 (noting that approximately one in ten Americans, 28 million, have some level of hearing loss, that the proportion increases with age, and that the number of those affected will likely grow as the median age increases). *See also Report on the Status of Implementation of the Commission’s Hearing Aid Compatibility Requirements*, Report, 22 FCC Rcd 17709, 17719 ¶ 20 (2007) (noting, just four years later, that the number of individuals with hearing loss in the United States was “at an all time high of 31 million – with that number expected to reach approximately 40 million at the end of this decade”).

²⁹ *See e.g., South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 22 FCC Rcd 19251 ¶ 10 (Enf. Bur., Spectrum Enf. Div. 2007), *response pending*; *Pine Telephone Company, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 22 FCC Rcd 9205, 9210 ¶ 11 (Enf. Bur., Spectrum Enf. Div. 2007), *response pending*; *IT&E Overseas, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 22 FCC Rcd 7660, 7665 ¶ 10 (Enf. Bur., Spectrum Enf. Div. 2007), *response pending*.

³⁰ *See South Canaan Cellular Communications Company, L.P.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, DA 08-14 ¶ 11 (Enf. Bur., Spectrum Enf. Div. January 3, 2008).

forfeiture on a continuing violation basis in this case.³¹ We also note that Epic Touch is a Tier III carrier, i.e., a non-nationwide wireless radio service provider with 500,000 or fewer subscribers.³² Accordingly, Epic Touch is apparently liable for a \$30,000 forfeiture for failing to comply with the inductive coupling compatibility requirements in willful and repeated violation of Section 20.19(d)(2).³³

13. Finally, we consider Epic Touch's claim that, as a Tier III carrier, it was difficult for it to timely acquire and offer compliant hearing aid-compatible handsets. We recognize that the Commission's Office of Engineering and Technology received and approved very few applications to certify inductive coupling-compliant handsets until two months or less prior to the September 18, 2006 deadline, leaving carriers little time to purchase and begin offering such handsets in time to comply with the rules. Further, we recognize that Tier III carriers typically experience significant delays in obtaining shipping commitments from their handset suppliers because handset manufacturers fill orders first for larger carriers.³⁴ Epic Touch, however, did not seek a waiver of the September 18, 2006 deadline to begin offering at least two inductive coupling-compliant handsets, nor did it make a showing of good faith, diligent efforts to come into compliance. Moreover, many other Tier III carriers achieved full compliance within a few months of the September 18, 2006 deadline. Epic Touch, by contrast, did not offer even one compliant handset until March 2007 and did not come into full compliance until July 2007. Under the circumstances, Epic Touch has not presented mitigating circumstances that would warrant a downward adjustment of the proposed forfeiture amount.

14. In sum, we find that Epic Touch apparently willfully and repeatedly violated Section 20.19(d)(2) by failing to offer two inductive coupling-compliant handsets until approximately ten months after the deployment deadline. For Epic Touch's apparent violations, we propose an aggregate forfeiture of \$30,000.

³¹ We caution Epic Touch and other carriers that future enforcement actions may consider all failures to comply with our hearing aid compatibility rules, including the inductive coupling requirements, as continuing violations for purposes of calculating appropriate forfeiture amounts.

³² See Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, Phase II Compliance Deadlines for Non-Nationwide CMRS Carriers, *Order to Stay*, 17 FCC Rcd 14841, 14847 ¶¶ 22-24 (2002).

³³ Under Section 503(b)(6) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(6), we are prohibited from assessing a forfeiture for a violation that occurred more than a year before the issuance of a notice of apparent liability for forfeiture. Section 503(b)(6) does not, however, bar us from considering Epic Touch's prior conduct in determining the appropriate forfeiture amount for violations that occurred within the one-year statutory period. See *Behringer USA, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture and Order, 21 FCC Rcd 1820, 1827 ¶ 20 (2006), *forfeiture ordered*, 22 FCC Rcd 10451 (2007) (forfeiture paid); *Globcom, Inc. d/b/a Globcom Global Communications*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 18 FCC Rcd 19893, 19903 ¶ 23(2003), *forfeiture ordered*, Forfeiture Order, 21 FCC Rcd 4710 (2006); *Roadrunner Transportation, Inc.*, Forfeiture Order, 15 FCC Rcd 9669, 9671-71 ¶ 8 (2000); *Cate Communications Corp.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 60 RR 2d 1386, 1388 ¶ 7 (1986); *Eastern Broadcasting Corp.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 10 FCC 2d 37, 37-38 ¶ 3 (1967) *recon. denied*, 11 FCC 2d 193, 195 ¶ 6 (1967). Accordingly, while we take into account the continuous nature of the violations in determining the appropriate forfeiture amount, our proposed forfeiture relates only to Epic Touch's apparent violations that have occurred within the past year.

³⁴ The Commission has acknowledged that, "[i]n contrast to large carriers, smaller wireless carriers may be disadvantaged when they seek to acquire . . . specialized handsets" because vendors treat the largest carriers, who place the largest orders for equipment, as priority customers. See *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 11233 ¶ 22.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

15. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to Section 503(b) of the Act, and Section 1.80 of the Rules, Epic Touch Company, Inc. is **NOTIFIED** of its **APPARENT LIABILITY FOR A FORFEITURE** in the amount of thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) for willful and repeated violation of Section 20.19(d)(2) of the Rules.

16. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Section 1.80 of the Rules, within thirty days of the release date of this Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, Epic Touch Company, Inc. **SHALL PAY** the full amount of the proposed forfeiture or **SHALL FILE** a written statement seeking reduction or cancellation of the proposed forfeiture.

17. Payment of the forfeiture must be made by check or similar instrument, payable to the order of the Federal Communications Commission. The payment must include the NAL/Account Number and FRN Number referenced above. Payment by check or money order may be mailed to Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 979088, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000. Payment by overnight mail may be sent to U.S. Bank – Government Lockbox #979088, SL-MO-C2-GL, 1005 Convention Plaza, St. Louis, MO 63101. Payment by wire transfer may be made to ABA Number 021030004, receiving bank TREAS/NYC, and account number 27000001. For payment by credit card, an FCC Form 159 (Remittance Advice) must be submitted. When completing the FCC Form 159, enter the NAL/Account number in block number 23A (call sign/other ID), and enter the letters “FORF” in block number 24A (payment type code). Requests for full payment under an installment plan should be sent to: Chief Financial Officer -- Financial Operations, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room 1-A625, Washington, D.C. 20554. Please contact the Financial Operations Group Help Desk at 1-877-480-3201 or Email: ARINQUIRIES@fcc.gov with any questions regarding payment procedures.

18. The response, if any, must be mailed to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554, ATTN: Enforcement Bureau – Spectrum Enforcement Division, and must include the NAL/Acct. No. referenced in the caption.

19. The Commission will not consider reducing or canceling a forfeiture in response to a claim of inability to pay unless the petitioner submits: (1) federal tax returns for the most recent three-year period; (2) financial statements prepared according to generally accepted accounting practices; or (3) some other reliable and objective documentation that accurately reflects the petitioner’s current financial status. Any claim of inability to pay must specifically identify the basis for the claim by reference to the financial documentation submitted.

20. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a copy of this Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture shall be sent by first class mail and certified mail return receipt requested to Troy Barnett, Network Services Manager, Epic Touch Company, Inc., 610 South Cosmos, Elkhart, Kansas 67950.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kris Anne Monteith
Chief, Enforcement Bureau