

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

In the Matter of)	
)	File No.: EB-FIELDSCR-13-00009579
Juan R. Nieves, Jr.)	NAL/Acct. No.: 201432700001
)	FRN: 0023056757
Summerfield, Florida)	

NOTICE OF APPARENT LIABILITY FOR FORFEITURE

Adopted: October 24, 2013

Released: October 25, 2013

By the District Director, Tampa Office, South Central Region, Enforcement Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In this Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture (NAL), we find that Juan R. Nieves, Jr. apparently willfully and repeatedly violated Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act),¹ by operating an unlicensed radio transmitter on the frequency 97.7 MHz in Summerfield, Florida. We conclude that Mr. Nieves is apparently liable for a forfeiture in the amount of fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000).

II. BACKGROUND

2. In response to a complaint about a possible unlicensed station operating on 97.7 MHz, agents from the Enforcement Bureau's Tampa Office (Tampa Office) used direction-finding techniques to locate the source of radio frequency transmissions on the frequency 97.7 MHz on three separate days (May 24, May 30, and June 14, 2013) to an FM transmitting antenna located at a residence in Summerfield, Florida. On each of those three days, the agents took field strength measurements of the station's signal and determined that the signals on 97.7 MHz exceeded the limits for operation under Part 15 of the Commission's rules (Rules),² and therefore required a license. The agents consulted the Commission's records and confirmed that no authorization had been issued to Mr. Nieves, or to anyone else, for the operation of an FM broadcast station in Summerfield, Florida.

3. On June 25, 2013, agents from the Tampa Office again used direction-finding techniques to confirm that the unlicensed station on 97.7 MHz was still in operation from the same location in Summerfield, Florida identified on May 24, May 30, and June 14, 2013. Agents from the Tampa Office inspected the unlicensed radio station and interviewed Mr. Nieves. He admitted renting the residence housing the station, owning the transmitter, and being the sole responsible party for the unlicensed station.

¹ 47 C.F.R. § 301.

² Part 15 of the Rules sets out the conditions and technical requirements under which certain radio transmission devices may be used without a license. In relevant part, Section 15.239 of the Rules provides that non-licensed broadcasting in the 88-108 MHz band is permitted only if the field strength of the transmission does not exceed 250 µV/m at three meters. 47 C.F.R. § 15.239.

He claimed to have operated the station on 97.7 MHz for over a year. Mr. Nieves also stated that he had been in the broadcast industry for many years, was a former officer of a low power station in Summerfield, Florida, and knew he needed a license to operate.³

III. DISCUSSION

4. Section 503(b) of the Act provides that any person who willfully or repeatedly fails to comply substantially with the terms and conditions of any license, or willfully or repeatedly fails to comply with any of the provisions of the Act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Commission thereunder, shall be liable for a forfeiture penalty.⁴ 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.⁵ The legislative history to Section 312(f)(1) of the Act clarifies that this definition of willful applies to both Sections 312 and 503(b) of the Act,⁶ and the Commission has so interpreted the term in the Section 503(b) context.⁷ The Commission may also assess a forfeiture for violations that are merely repeated, and not willful.⁸ The term “repeated” means the commission or omission of such act more than once or for more than one day.⁹

A. Unlicensed Broadcast Operations

5. Section 301 of the Act states that no person shall use or operate any apparatus for the transmission of energy or communications or signals by radio within the United States, except under and in accordance with the Act and with a license granted under the provisions of the Act.¹⁰ On May 24, May 30, June 14, and June 25, 2013, agents from the Tampa Office determined that an unlicensed radio station on the frequency 97.7 MHz was operating from a residence in Summerfield, Florida. On June 25, 2013, agents from the Tampa Office inspected the unlicensed station and interviewed Mr. Nieves, who admitted to operating the station for over a year. A review of the Commission’s records revealed that no license or

³ Mr. Nieves was an “Officer” of Station WJRN-LP in Summerfield, Florida. See File No. BON-20040825ACE.

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 503(b).

⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 312(f)(1).

⁶ H.R. Rep. No. 97-765, 97th Cong. 2d Sess. 51 (1982) (“This provision [inserted in Section 312] defines the terms ‘willful’ and ‘repeated’ for purposes of section 312, and for any other relevant section of the act (e.g., Section 503) As defined[,] . . . ‘willful’ means that the licensee knew that he was doing the act in question, regardless of whether there was an intent to violate the law. ‘Repeated’ means more than once, or where the act is continuous, for more than one day. Whether an act is considered to be ‘continuous’ would depend upon the circumstances in each case. The definitions are intended primarily to clarify the language in Sections 312 and 503, and are consistent with the Commission’s application of those terms”).

⁷ See, e.g., *Southern California Broadcasting Co.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 6 FCC Rcd 4387, 4388, para. 5 (1991), *recons. denied*, 7 FCC Rcd 3454 (1992).

⁸ See, e.g., *Callais Cablevision, Inc.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Monetary Forfeiture, 16 FCC Rcd 1359, 1362, para. 10 (2001) (*Callais Cablevision, Inc.*) (proposing a forfeiture for, *inter alia*, a cable television operator’s repeated signal leakage).

⁹ Section 312(f)(2) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 312(f)(2), which also applies to violations for which forfeitures are assessed under Section 503(b) of the Act, provides that “[t]he term ‘repeated’, when used with reference to the commission or omission of any act, means the commission or omission of such act more than once or, if such commission or omission is continuous, for more than one day.” See *Callais Cablevision, Inc.*, 16 FCC Rcd at 1362, para. 9.

¹⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 301.

authorization was issued to Mr. Nieves or to anyone else to operate a radio station on 97.7 MHz at this location. Because Mr. Nieves consciously operated the station on more than one day, the apparent violation of the Act was both willful and repeated. Based on the evidence before us, we find that Mr. Nieves apparently willfully and repeatedly violated Section 301 of the Act by operating radio transmission equipment without the required Commission authorization.

B. Proposed Forfeiture

6. Pursuant to the Commission's *Forfeiture Policy Statement* and Section 1.80 of the Rules, the base forfeiture amount for operation without an instrument of authorization is \$10,000.¹¹ In assessing the monetary forfeiture amount, we must also take into account the statutory factors set forth in Section 503(b)(2)(E) of the Act, which include the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violations, and with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, and other such matters as justice may require.¹² In doing so, we find that the violations here warrant a proposed forfeiture above the base amount. The record evidence in this case shows that Mr. Nieves was an officer of a low power FM station, and as such was familiar with the Commission's requirements. Mr. Nieves admitted that he had been in the broadcast industry for many years and knew that he was operating the radio station without a license. Nevertheless, Mr. Nieves operated the unlicensed station for over a year, in deliberate disregard for the Act and the Commission's requirements. Thus, we find that an upward adjustment of \$5,000 in the forfeiture amount is warranted.¹³ Applying the *Forfeiture Policy Statement*, Section 1.80 of the Rules, and the statutory factors to the instant case, we conclude that Mr. Nieves is apparently liable for a forfeiture in the amount of \$15,000.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

7. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to Section 503(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Sections 0.111, 0.204, 0.311, 0.314, and 1.80 of the Commission's rules, Juan R. Nieves, Jr. is hereby **NOTIFIED** of this **APPARENT LIABILITY FOR A FORFEITURE** in the amount of fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) for violations of Section 301 of the Act.¹⁴

8. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Section 1.80 of the Commission's rules, within thirty (30) calendar days of the release date of this Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, Juan R. Nieves, Jr. **SHALL PAY** the full amount of the proposed forfeiture or **SHALL FILE** a written statement seeking reduction or cancellation of the proposed forfeiture.

¹¹ *The Commission's Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines*, Report and Order, 12 FCC Rcd 17087 (1997) (*Forfeiture Policy Statement*), recons. denied, 15 FCC Rcd 303 (1999); 47 C.F.R. § 1.80.

¹² 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(2)(E).

¹³ See, e.g., *Albert R. Knighten, Jr.*, Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture, 27 FCC Rcd 6073 (Enf. Bur. 2012) (proposing \$5,000 or 50 percent upward adjustment because violator repeatedly operated an unlicensed station despite knowing that the station required a license); *Robert Brown*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 27 FCC Rcd 6975 (Enf. Bur. 2012) (upholding \$5,000 or 50 percent upward adjustment because violator received one prior warning that his actions violated Section 301 of the Act); *Loyd Morris*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 27 FCC Rcd 6979 (Enf. Bur. 2012) (upholding \$5,000 or 50 percent upward adjustment because violator received one prior warning that his actions violated Section 301 of the Act).

¹⁴ 47 U.S.C. §§ 301, 503(b); 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.111, 0.204, 0.311, 0.314, 1.80.

9. Payment of the forfeiture must be made by check or similar instrument, wire transfer, or credit card, and must include the NAL/Account Number and FRN referenced above. Juan R. Nieves, Jr. shall also send electronic notification on the date said payment is made to SCR-Response@fcc.gov. Regardless of the form of payment, a completed FCC Form 159 (Remittance Advice) must be submitted.¹⁵ When completing the FCC Form 159, enter the Account Number in block number 23A (call sign/other ID) and enter the letters “FORF” in block number 24A (payment type code). Below are additional instructions you should follow based on the form of payment you select:

- Payment by check or money order must be made payable to the order of the Federal Communications Commission. Such payments (along with the completed Form 159) must be mailed to Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 979088, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or sent via overnight mail to U.S. Bank – Government Lockbox #979088, SL-MO-C2-GL, 1005 Convention Plaza, St. Louis, MO 63101.
- Payment by wire transfer must be made to ABA Number 021030004, receiving bank TREAS/NYC, and Account Number 27000001. To complete the wire transfer and ensure appropriate crediting of the wired funds, a completed Form 159 must be faxed to U.S. Bank at (314) 418-4232 on the same business day the wire transfer is initiated.
- Payment by credit card must be made by providing the required credit card information on FCC Form 159 and signing and dating the Form 159 to authorize the credit card payment. The completed Form 159 must then be mailed to Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 979088, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or sent via overnight mail to U.S. Bank – Government Lockbox #979088, SL-MO-C2-GL, 1005 Convention Plaza, St. Louis, MO 63101.

10. Any request for making full payment over time under an installment plan should be sent to: Chief Financial Officer—Financial Operations, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room 1-A625, Washington, D.C. 20554.¹⁶ If you have questions regarding payment procedures, please contact the Financial Operations Group Help Desk by phone, 1-877-480-3201, or by e-mail, ARINQUIRIES@fcc.gov.

11. The written statement seeking reduction or cancellation of the proposed forfeiture, if any, must include a detailed factual statement supported by appropriate documentation and affidavits pursuant to Sections 1.16 and 1.80(f)(3) of the Rules.¹⁷ Mail the written statement to Federal Communications Commission, Enforcement Bureau, South Central Region, Tampa Office, 4010 W. Boy Scout Blvd., Suite 425, Tampa, FL 33607-5744, and include the NAL/Acct. No. referenced in the caption. Juan R. Nieves also shall e-mail the written response to SCR-Response@fcc.gov.

12. 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 (GAAP); 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.

¹⁵ An FCC Form 159 and detailed instructions for completing the form may be obtained at <http://www.fcc.gov/Forms/Form159/159.pdf>.

¹⁶ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.1914.

¹⁷ 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.80(f)(3).

13. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a copy of this Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture shall be sent by both Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, and First Class Mail to Juan R. Nieves, Jr. at his address of record.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Ralph M. Barlow
District Director
Tampa Office
South Central Region
Enforcement Bureau