



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

October 18, 2012

DA 12-1673

Mr. Raul Magallanes  
The Law Office of Raul Magallanes, PLLC  
P.O. Box 1213  
Friendswood, TX 77549

Call Sign: E060157  
File No.: SES-MOD-20120509-00427

Dear Mr. Magallanes:

On May 9, 2012, Harris CapRock Communications, Inc. (Harris CapRock) filed the above-captioned modification application to add Intellian V60 and V80 antennas to its earth station license. We dismiss this application without prejudice to refiling.<sup>1</sup>

Section 25.112(a) of the Commission's rules, requires the Commission to return, as unacceptable for filing, any earth station application that is not substantially complete, contains internal inconsistencies, or does not substantially comply with the Commission's rules<sup>2</sup>. The application is defective for the following reasons:

The values submitted in FCC Form 312 Schedule B (Schedule B) for antenna model Intellian V60 are inconsistent. The EIRP densities entered in Item E49 in the Schedule B, for emission designators 3M00G7W and 567KG7W, -22.30 dBW/4kHz, are inconsistent with the maximum EIRP per carrier values of 44.29 dBW for the 3M00G7W and 37.22 dBW for the 567KG7W emission designators. Our calculations indicate that EIRP density per carrier should be 15.5 dBW/4kHz and 15.71 dBW/4kHz respectively.

The values submitted in the Schedule B for antenna model V80 are also inconsistent. The EIRP densities entered in Item E49 in the Schedule B, for emission designators 1M50G7W and 284KG7W, -20.13 dBW/4kHz, are inconsistent with the maximum EIRP per carrier values of 44.78 for the 1M50G7W and 37.80 for the 284KG7W emission designators. Our calculations indicate that EIRP density per carrier should be 19.33 dBW/4kHz and 19.28 dBW/4kHz respectively.

Furthermore, the above inconsistencies negate the off axis EIRP compliance certifications that Harris CapRock provided in Exhibits C through D of your application. Given these inconsistencies, we cannot accept this application for filing.

---

<sup>1</sup> If Harris CapRock refiles an application in which the deficiencies identified in this letter have been corrected but otherwise identical to the one dismissed, it need not pay an application fee. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.1111(d).

<sup>2</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 25.112(a)

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 25.112(a) of the Commission's rules and Section 0.261 of the Commission's rules on delegations of authority,<sup>3</sup> we dismiss the application of Harris CapRock Communications.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Blais  
Chief, Systems Analysis Branch  
Satellite Division  
International Bureau

---

<sup>3</sup> 47.C.F.R. § 25.112(a) and 47 C.F.R. § 0.261.