



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Brendan Carr
Chairman

April 29, 2025

The Honorable Yvette D. Clarke
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
2322 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: March 31, 2025 Letter to FCC

Dear Ranking Member Clarke,

Thank you for your March 31, 2025, letter to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Throughout the previous Administration, communications laws and FCC processes were repeatedly weaponized for political purposes. As Chairman, I am focused on restoring the FCC's commitment to basic fairness and even-handed treatment for all. In particular, I am working to ensure that everyone appearing before the agency gets a fair shake from their government, regardless of political affiliation.

My commitment on this front represents a departure from the years when peoples' politics often determined the answers they received from the FCC. If they were aligned with the previous Administration, then they would receive favorable and special treatment on a streamlined basis. If they were not, then they got the opposite treatment, including having previous FCC awards revoked for political reasons.

Your letter provides me with a welcome opportunity to correct some misconceptions regarding the FCC's work. Specifically, your letter suggests the FCC is treating a petition involving a CBS TV station differently than one involving a Fox TV station.¹ But that is not the case at all. Under my leadership, the FCC has merely followed agency precedent. We are putting the relevant complaint on the same procedural footing that the previous FCC found appropriate.

As you may recall, in 2023, a group filed a petition with the FCC asking the agency to take the broadcast license away from a Fox broadcast TV station in Philadelphia because the

¹ See Center for American Rights, Petition to Condition Grant by the Center for American Rights, MB Docket No. 25-73 (filed Dec. 16, 2024); The Media and Democracy Project, Milo Vassallo, John McGinty, Peter Lems, Chenjerai Kumanyika, and Bill Hartman, Petition to Deny, LMS File No. 0000213362 (filed July 3, 2023).

petitioners did not agree with the content that they argued was carried on a separate cable channel.² Despite the Fox petition failing to satisfy basic pleading requirements, the FCC chose to move forward. The previous FCC determined that it was in the public interest to entertain the filing and issued a public notice seeking comment on the Fox petition.³

The previous FCC then left the Fox proceeding open for more than a year, and it received about 200 comments from the public. The FCC did not dismiss or deny the Fox petition when the public comment cycle ended either. Instead, it waited through the entire 2024 election cycle to dismiss the petition against the Fox broadcast TV station.

However, the previous FCC took a different approach entirely when it came to the CBS petition.⁴ Unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC just summarily dismissed the CBS one. Unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC did not seek public comment on the CBS petition. And unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC did not establish a record on the CBS one before issuing its decision. Instead, at the eleventh hour, the Biden FCC simply dismissed the CBS petition. It is not clear why previous FCC leadership dismissed the CBS complaint without nearly the same level of process that it applied to the Fox petition. Under my leadership, the FCC is seeking comment on the CBS petition, just as the prior FCC did on the Fox petition. In other words, the FCC is treating like cases alike and following the precedent set by the agency. That is the very definition of even-handed treatment.

Again, this is a marked contrast from the weaponization that prevailed during the Biden years. During the previous Administration, Democrats regularly weaponized their authority against their perceived political opponents, including running a campaign to pressure cable companies into dropping what they described as “Right-wing media outlets,”⁵ pressuring the FCC to block the sale of a Spanish-language radio station in South Florida for purely political reasons,⁶ the unprecedented failure to process hundreds of routine Sinclair license renewals that came up in 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024, and a multi-month campaign to jawbone social media companies into censoring their political opponents as well as books, videos, posts, and other online content.

² The Media and Democracy Project, Milo Vassallo, John McGinty, Peter Lems, Chenjerai Kumanyika, and Bill Hartman, Petition to Deny, LMS File No. 0000213362 (filed July 3, 2023) (Petition).

³ See *Commission Announces Permit-But-Disclose Ex Parte Status and Establishes MB Docket No. 23-293 for Application for Renewal of License of WXTF-TV, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*, Public Notice, MB Docket No. 23-293, DA 23-752 (MB, Aug. 23, 2023).

⁴ See Letter from Peter S. Hyun, Acting Bureau Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Comm’n, to Daniel R. Suhr, President, Center for American Rights (Jan. 16, 2025); *Re: Preserving the First Amendment*, GN Docket No. 25-11, (GN, Jan. 16, 2025).

⁵ See Letter from Reps. Anna G. Eshoo and Jerry McNerney to John T. Stankey, CEO, AT&T, Inc. (Feb. 22, 2021), <https://web.archive.org/web/20210223052030/https://eshoo.house.gov/sites/eshoo.house.gov/files/Eshoo-McNerney-TV-Misinfo%20Letters-2.22.21.pdf>.

⁶ See Adrian Carrasquillo, *Hispanic Caucus Members Pressure FCC to Scrutinize Miami Radio Station Sale*, Newsweek, (Apr. 14, 2021), <https://www.newsweek.com/hispanic-caucus-members-pressure-fcc-scrutinize-miami-radio-station-sale-1583890>.

In doing so, the previous Administration established a two-tiered approach. Take, for example, the Biden FCC's decision to create a special Soros shortcut to expedite the acquisition of hundreds of broadcast licenses.⁷ Never before had the Commission voted to approve the transfer of a single broadcast license—let alone the transfer of broadcast licenses for over 200 radio stations across more than 40 markets—without following the requirements and procedures codified in federal law. Not once. And yet the Commission broke that new ground without seeking public comment on altering our established regulations, without actually changing the rules on the books, and without seeking the feedback of other federal agencies with relevant equities. This is not the type of relief that the Biden FCC provided to parties unconnected to Soros.

The list of Biden-era weaponization goes on and on. But at the FCC we are now putting those days in the rearview mirror. We are ensuring that everyone receives fair and even-handed treatment from the FCC.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your letter.

Sincerely,



Brendan Carr
Chairman

⁷ See *Audacy License, LLC, as Debtor-in-Possession (Assignor) and Audacy License, LLC (Assignee)*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 24-94 (rel. Sept. 30, 2024).



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Brendan Carr
Chairman

April 29, 2025

The Honorable Doris Matsui
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Communications and Technology
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
2322 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: March 31, 2025 Letter to FCC

Dear Ranking Member Matsui,

Thank you for your March 31, 2025, letter to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Throughout the previous Administration, communications laws and FCC processes were repeatedly weaponized for political purposes. As Chairman, I am focused on restoring the FCC's commitment to basic fairness and even-handed treatment for all. In particular, I am working to ensure that everyone appearing before the agency gets a fair shake from their government, regardless of political affiliation.

My commitment on this front represents a departure from the years when peoples' politics often determined the answers they received from the FCC. If they were aligned with the previous Administration, then they would receive favorable and special treatment on a streamlined basis. If they were not, then they got the opposite treatment, including having previous FCC awards revoked for political reasons.

Your letter provides me with a welcome opportunity to correct some misconceptions regarding the FCC's work. Specifically, your letter suggests the FCC is treating a petition involving a CBS TV station differently than one involving a Fox TV station.¹ But that is not the case at all. Under my leadership, the FCC has merely followed agency precedent. We are putting the relevant complaint on the same procedural footing that the previous FCC found appropriate.

As you may recall, in 2023, a group filed a petition with the FCC asking the agency to take the broadcast license away from a Fox broadcast TV station in Philadelphia because the

¹ See Center for American Rights, Petition to Condition Grant by the Center for American Rights, MB Docket No. 25-73 (filed Dec. 16, 2024); The Media and Democracy Project, Milo Vassallo, John McGinty, Peter Lems, Chenjerai Kumanyika, and Bill Hartman, Petition to Deny, LMS File No. 0000213362 (filed July 3, 2023).

petitioners did not agree with the content that they argued was carried on a separate cable channel.² Despite the Fox petition failing to satisfy basic pleading requirements, the FCC chose to move forward. The previous FCC determined that it was in the public interest to entertain the filing and issued a public notice seeking comment on the Fox petition.³

The previous FCC then left the Fox proceeding open for more than a year, and it received about 200 comments from the public. The FCC did not dismiss or deny the Fox petition when the public comment cycle ended either. Instead, it waited through the entire 2024 election cycle to dismiss the petition against the Fox broadcast TV station.

However, the previous FCC took a different approach entirely when it came to the CBS petition.⁴ Unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC just summarily dismissed the CBS one. Unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC did not seek public comment on the CBS petition. And unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC did not establish a record on the CBS one before issuing its decision. Instead, at the eleventh hour, the Biden FCC simply dismissed the CBS petition. It is not clear why previous FCC leadership dismissed the CBS complaint without nearly the same level of process that it applied to the Fox petition. Under my leadership, the FCC is seeking comment on the CBS petition, just as the prior FCC did on the Fox petition. In other words, the FCC is treating like cases alike and following the precedent set by the agency. That is the very definition of even-handed treatment.

Again, this is a marked contrast from the weaponization that prevailed during the Biden years. During the previous Administration, Democrats regularly weaponized their authority against their perceived political opponents, including running a campaign to pressure cable companies into dropping what they described as “Right-wing media outlets,”⁵ pressuring the FCC to block the sale of a Spanish-language radio station in South Florida for purely political reasons,⁶ the unprecedented failure to process hundreds of routine Sinclair license renewals that came up in 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024, and a multi-month campaign to jawbone social media companies into censoring their political opponents as well as books, videos, posts, and other online content.

² The Media and Democracy Project, Milo Vassallo, John McGinty, Peter Lems, Chenjerai Kumanyika, and Bill Hartman, Petition to Deny, LMS File No. 0000213362 (filed July 3, 2023) (Petition).

³ See *Commission Announces Permit-But-Disclose Ex Parte Status and Establishes MB Docket No. 23-293 for Application for Renewal of License of WXTF-TV, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*, Public Notice, MB Docket No. 23-293, DA 23-752 (MB, Aug. 23, 2023).

⁴ See Letter from Peter S. Hyun, Acting Bureau Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Comm’n, to Daniel R. Suhr, President, Center for American Rights (Jan. 16, 2025); *Re: Preserving the First Amendment*, GN Docket No. 25-11, (GN, Jan. 16, 2025).

⁵ See Letter from Reps. Anna G. Eshoo and Jerry McNerney to John T. Stankey, CEO, AT&T, Inc. (Feb. 22, 2021), <https://web.archive.org/web/20210223052030/https://eshoo.house.gov/sites/eshoo.house.gov/files/Eshoo-McNerney-TV-Misinfo%20Letters-2.22.21.pdf>.

⁶ See Adrian Carrasquillo, *Hispanic Caucus Members Pressure FCC to Scrutinize Miami Radio Station Sale*, Newsweek, (Apr. 14, 2021), <https://www.newsweek.com/hispanic-caucus-members-pressure-fcc-scrutinize-miami-radio-station-sale-1583890>.

In doing so, the previous Administration established a two-tiered approach. Take, for example, the Biden FCC's decision to create a special Soros shortcut to expedite the acquisition of hundreds of broadcast licenses.⁷ Never before had the Commission voted to approve the transfer of a single broadcast license—let alone the transfer of broadcast licenses for over 200 radio stations across more than 40 markets—without following the requirements and procedures codified in federal law. Not once. And yet the Commission broke that new ground without seeking public comment on altering our established regulations, without actually changing the rules on the books, and without seeking the feedback of other federal agencies with relevant equities. This is not the type of relief that the Biden FCC provided to parties unconnected to Soros.

The list of Biden-era weaponization goes on and on. But at the FCC we are now putting those days in the rearview mirror. We are ensuring that everyone receives fair and even-handed treatment from the FCC.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'B Carr', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brendan Carr
Chairman

⁷ See *Audacy License, LLC, as Debtor-in-Possession (Assignor) and Audacy License, LLC (Assignee)*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 24-94 (rel. Sept. 30, 2024).



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Brendan Carr
Chairman

April 29, 2025

The Honorable Frank Pallone
Ranking Member
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
2322 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: March 31, 2025 Letter to FCC

Dear Ranking Member Pallone,

Thank you for your March 31, 2025, letter to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Throughout the previous Administration, communications laws and FCC processes were repeatedly weaponized for political purposes. As Chairman, I am focused on restoring the FCC's commitment to basic fairness and even-handed treatment for all. In particular, I am working to ensure that everyone appearing before the agency gets a fair shake from their government, regardless of political affiliation.

My commitment on this front represents a departure from the years when peoples' politics often determined the answers they received from the FCC. If they were aligned with the previous Administration, then they would receive favorable and special treatment on a streamlined basis. If they were not, then they got the opposite treatment, including having previous FCC awards revoked for political reasons.

Your letter provides me with a welcome opportunity to correct some misconceptions regarding the FCC's work. Specifically, your letter suggests the FCC is treating a petition involving a CBS TV station differently than one involving a Fox TV station.¹ But that is not the case at all. Under my leadership, the FCC has merely followed agency precedent. We are putting the relevant complaint on the same procedural footing that the previous FCC found appropriate.

As you may recall, in 2023, a group filed a petition with the FCC asking the agency to take the broadcast license away from a Fox broadcast TV station in Philadelphia because the petitioners did not agree with the content that they argued was carried on a separate cable

¹ See Center for American Rights, Petition to Condition Grant by the Center for American Rights, MB Docket No. 25-73 (filed Dec. 16, 2024); The Media and Democracy Project, Milo Vassallo, John McGinty, Peter Lems, Chenjerai Kumanyika, and Bill Hartman, Petition to Deny, LMS File No. 0000213362 (filed July 3, 2023).

channel.² Despite the Fox petition failing to satisfy basic pleading requirements, the FCC chose to move forward. The previous FCC determined that it was in the public interest to entertain the filing and issued a public notice seeking comment on the Fox petition.³

The previous FCC then left the Fox proceeding open for more than a year, and it received about 200 comments from the public. The FCC did not dismiss or deny the Fox petition when the public comment cycle ended either. Instead, it waited through the entire 2024 election cycle to dismiss the petition against the Fox broadcast TV station.

However, the previous FCC took a different approach entirely when it came to the CBS petition.⁴ Unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC just summarily dismissed the CBS one. Unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC did not seek public comment on the CBS petition. And unlike the Fox petition, the Biden FCC did not establish a record on the CBS one before issuing its decision. Instead, at the eleventh hour, the Biden FCC simply dismissed the CBS petition. It is not clear why previous FCC leadership dismissed the CBS complaint without nearly the same level of process that it applied to the Fox petition. Under my leadership, the FCC is seeking comment on the CBS petition, just as the prior FCC did on the Fox petition. In other words, the FCC is treating like cases alike and following the precedent set by the agency. That is the very definition of even-handed treatment.

Again, this is a marked contrast from the weaponization that prevailed during the Biden years. During the previous Administration, Democrats regularly weaponized their authority against their perceived political opponents, including running a campaign to pressure cable companies into dropping what they described as “Right-wing media outlets,”⁵ pressuring the FCC to block the sale of a Spanish-language radio station in South Florida for purely political reasons,⁶ the unprecedented failure to process hundreds of routine Sinclair license renewals that came up in 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024, and a multi-month campaign to jawbone social media companies into censoring their political opponents as well as books, videos, posts, and other online content.

² The Media and Democracy Project, Milo Vassallo, John McGinty, Peter Lems, Chenjerai Kumanyika, and Bill Hartman, Petition to Deny, LMS File No. 0000213362 (filed July 3, 2023) (Petition).

³ See *Commission Announces Permit-But-Disclose Ex Parte Status and Establishes MB Docket No. 23-293 for Application for Renewal of License of WXTF-TV, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*, Public Notice, MB Docket No. 23-293, DA 23-752 (MB, Aug. 23, 2023).

⁴ See Letter from Peter S. Hyun, Acting Bureau Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Comm’n, to Daniel R. Suhr, President, Center for American Rights (Jan. 16, 2025); *Re: Preserving the First Amendment*, GN Docket No. 25-11, (GN, Jan. 16, 2025).

⁵ See Letter from Reps. Anna G. Eshoo and Jerry McNerney to John T. Stankey, CEO, AT&T, Inc. (Feb. 22, 2021), <https://web.archive.org/web/20210223052030/https://eshoo.house.gov/sites/eshoo.house.gov/files/Eshoo-McNerney-TV-Misinfo%20Letters-2.22.21.pdf>.

⁶ See Adrian Carrasquillo, *Hispanic Caucus Members Pressure FCC to Scrutinize Miami Radio Station Sale*, Newsweek, (Apr. 14, 2021), <https://www.newsweek.com/hispanic-caucus-members-pressure-fcc-scrutinize-miami-radio-station-sale-1583890>.

In doing so, the previous Administration established a two-tiered approach. Take, for example, the Biden FCC's decision to create a special Soros shortcut to expedite the acquisition of hundreds of broadcast licenses.⁷ Never before had the Commission voted to approve the transfer of a single broadcast license—let alone the transfer of broadcast licenses for over 200 radio stations across more than 40 markets—without following the requirements and procedures codified in federal law. Not once. And yet the Commission broke that new ground without seeking public comment on altering our established regulations, without actually changing the rules on the books, and without seeking the feedback of other federal agencies with relevant equities. This is not the type of relief that the Biden FCC provided to parties unconnected to Soros.

The list of Biden-era weaponization goes on and on. But at the FCC we are now putting those days in the rearview mirror. We are ensuring that everyone receives fair and even-handed treatment from the FCC.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your letter.

Sincerely,



Brendan Carr
Chairman

⁷ See *Audacy License, LLC, as Debtor-in-Possession (Assignor) and Audacy License, LLC (Assignee)*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 24-94 (rel. Sept. 30, 2024).