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By the Chief, Enforcement Bureau:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In this Memorandum Opinion and Order(Order), we deny a Petition for Reconsideration filed by Saga Radio Networks, LLC (Saga),[[1]](#footnote-2) licensee of satellite earth station E872070, Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan. Saga seeks reconsideration of a *Forfeiture Order*[[2]](#footnote-3) issued by the Spectrum Enforcement Division (Division) of the Enforcement Bureau (Bureau) in the amount of five thousand two hundred dollars ($5,200) for the willful and repeated violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act), and Section 25.102(a) of the Commission’s rules (Rules), and for the willful violation of Section 25.121(e) of the Rules.[[3]](#footnote-4) The noted violations involve Saga’s operation of earth station E872070 without Commission authority, and the failure to file a timely application for authority to continue operation of the earth station.

**II. BACKGROUND**

1. On August 15, 1997, Saga was granted a renewal of its license to operate a Ku-band fixed satellite earth station under call sign E872070. Under the terms of its license, Saga’s authorization for the earth station expired on August 28, 2007.[[4]](#footnote-5) Saga did not file a timely application to renew its earth station license. On May 28, 2008, Saga filed a request with the International Bureau for special temporary authority (STA) to operate earth station E872070 pending grant of an application for a new earth station license.[[5]](#footnote-6) On June 13, 2008, Saga submitted its application for a new earth station license, and on July 29, 2008, the International Bureau granted Saga a new license for earth station E872070[[6]](#footnote-7) and dismissed the STA request as moot.
2. Because it appeared that Saga may have operated earth station E872070 without authority after the expiration of its license, the International Bureau referred this matter to the Enforcement Bureau for investigation and possible enforcement action. On June 11, 2008, the Division issued a letter of inquiry to Saga.[[7]](#footnote-8)
3. In its July 11, 2008 response to the LOI, Saga stated that it first became aware that the license for earth station E872070 had expired on May 14, 2008 during a review of Saga’s authorizations database.[[8]](#footnote-9) Saga claimed that its Business Manager immediately notified Saga’s Director of Engineering who, according to Saga, promptly contacted the appropriate parties to remedy the situation.[[9]](#footnote-10) In addition, Saga acknowledged that it operated earth station E872070 without authority after the license’s August 28, 2007 expiration date.[[10]](#footnote-11)
4. On July 30, 2008, the Division released a *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture* against Saga, finding that Saga operated earth station E872070 without Commission authority and failed to file a timely renewal application for the station in apparent willful and repeated violation of Section 301 of the Act and Sections 25.102(a) and 25.121(e) of the Rules.[[11]](#footnote-12) Consistent with Bureau precedent at that time, the Division reduced the base forfeiture for Saga’s unauthorized operation of the earth station from $10,000 to $5,000, and reduced the base forfeiture for Saga’s failure to file a timely renewal application from $3,000 to $1,500.[[12]](#footnote-13) The Division further reduced the aggregate forfeiture from $6,500 to $5,200 based on Saga’s voluntary disclosure of the violation and corrective measures taken prior to any Commission inquiry or initiation of enforcement action.[[13]](#footnote-14)
5. In its response to the *NAL*,[[14]](#footnote-15) Saga sought cancellation or reduction of the proposed forfeiture amount, contending that its failure to file a timely renewal application was neither willful nor repeated,[[15]](#footnote-16) and that even the reduced forfeiture proposed for that violation was excessive in light of prior Commission precedent.[[16]](#footnote-17) In addition, Saga argued that imposing the proposed forfeiture for operation of its earth station without a license would be contrary to the public interest.[[17]](#footnote-18)
6. On April 1, 2009, the Division released the *Forfeiture Order*, which generally affirmed the *NAL* and imposed the $5,200 forfeiture against Saga for its willful and repeated violation of Section 301 of the Act and Section 25.102(a) of the Rules, and for its willful violation of Section 25.121(e) of the Rules.[[18]](#footnote-19) The *Forfeiture Order* rejected Saga’s assertions that its failure to file a timely renewal application was not willful,[[19]](#footnote-20) that the proposed forfeiture for failure to file a timely renewal application is inconsistent with prior Commission precedent,[[20]](#footnote-21) and that the proposed forfeiture for its unauthorized operation of the earth station should be cancelled on public interest grounds.[[21]](#footnote-22)
7. On May 1, 2009, Saga filed the instant Petition seeking cancellation of the forfeiture. In its Petition, Saga repeats arguments previously raised: its failure to file a timely renewal application was not willful;[[22]](#footnote-23) the forfeiture assessed for that violation is inconsistent with prior Commission precedent;[[23]](#footnote-24) and the forfeiture imposed for its unauthorized operation of the earth station should be cancelled on public interest grounds.[[24]](#footnote-25)

**III. DISCUSSION**

1. The arguments raised by Saga in its Petition are merely reiterative of the arguments presented in its NAL Response that the Division fully considered and properly rejected in the *Forfeiture Order.*[[25]](#footnote-26) We therefore uphold the Division’s finding that Saga willfully and repeatedly violated Section 301 of the Act[[26]](#footnote-27) and Section 25.102(a) of the Rules,[[27]](#footnote-28) and willfully violated Section 25.121(e) of the Rules,[[28]](#footnote-29) and decline to further reduce the forfeiture amount.[[29]](#footnote-30) In this regard, we note that for the reasons described above the proposed forfeiture has already been significantly reduced, from $13,000 to $5,200—a 40 percent reduction of the base forfeiture amount.

**IV. ORDERING CLAUSES**

1. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 405 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Sections 0.111, 0.311, and 1.106 of the Commission’s rules,[[30]](#footnote-31) the Petition for Reconsideration of the *Forfeiture Order* filed on May 1, 2009 by Saga Radio Networks, LLC is hereby **DENIED** and the *Forfeiture Order* **IS AFFIRMED.**
2. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Section 503(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Sections 0.111, 0.311 and 1.80(f) of the Commission’s rules,[[31]](#footnote-32) Saga Radio Networks, LLC **IS LIABLE FOR A MONETARY FORFEITURE** in the amount of five thousand two hundred dollars ($5,200) for willful and repeated violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 25.102(a) of the Commission’s rules, and willful violation of Section 25.121(e) of the Commission’s rules.[[32]](#footnote-33)
3. Payment of the forfeiture shall be made in the manner provided for in Section 1.80 of the Rules within ten (10) calendar days after the release date of this Memorandum Opinion and Order.[[33]](#footnote-34)  If the forfeiture is not paid within the period specified, the case may be referred to the U.S. Department of Justice for enforcement of the forfeiture pursuant to Section 504(a) of the Act.[[34]](#footnote-35)  Saga Radio Networks, LLC shall send electronic notification of payment to Ricardo Durham at Ricardo.Durham@fcc.gov, Kathy Harvey at Kathy.Harvey@fcc.gov, and Samantha Peoples at Sam.Peoples@fcc.gov on the date said payment is made.
4. The payment must be made by check or similar instrument, wire transfer, or credit card, and must include the NAL/Account number and FRN referenced above. Regardless of the form of payment, a completed FCC Form 159 (Remittance Advice) must be submitted.[[35]](#footnote-36) 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.

1. Any request for full payment 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.[[36]](#footnote-37)  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.
2. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Ordershall be sent by First Class and Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested to Gary Smithwick, Esq., Counsel for Saga Radio Networks, LLC, Smithwick & Belendiuk, P.C., 5028 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Suite 301, Washington, DC 20016, and to Mr. Gregory Urbiel, Saga Radio Networks, LLC, 73 Kercheval Avenue, Grosse Pointe Farms, MI 48236.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

P. Michele Ellison

Chief
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