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By the Commission:

1. We have before us a December 18, 2015 Petition for Reconsideration[[1]](#footnote-2) filed by WKMJ Radio Live The People Station, Inc. (WKMJ) in response to the Commission’s denial of its Application for Review.[[2]](#footnote-3) The Commission affirmed a Media Bureau (Bureau) finding that WKMJ is, by statute, ineligible to hold a Low Power FM (LPFM) authorization because WKMJ’s Chief Executive Officer operated an unauthorized radio station from WKMJ’s address, in violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.[[3]](#footnote-4) The Commission, therefore, upheld the Bureau’s dismissal of WKMJ’s above-referenced application to construct a new LPFM station. For the reasons discussed below, we dismiss the Petition as repetitious.
2. Where the Commission has denied an application for review, it will entertain a petition for reconsideration only if the petition relies on (1) events which have occurred or circumstances which have changed since the last opportunity to present such matters; or (2) facts or arguments previously unknown, of which the petitioner could not have learned through ordinary diligence.[[4]](#footnote-5) It is well settled that a petition for reconsideration is not to be used to reargue points to which the agency has already spoken or to raise new arguments that could have been made previously.[[5]](#footnote-6) Accordingly, the Commission will dismiss a petition as repetitious if it fails to introduce relevant new facts or changed circumstances.[[6]](#footnote-7) WKMJ states that it could not have anticipated the Decision’s allegedly incorrect statement that WKMJ did not contest the underlying facts.[[7]](#footnote-8) WKMJ also argues that, after its last opportunity to present arguments, it learned of a Bureau action which allegedly demonstrates that the Bureau acts in an inconsistent and discriminatory manner by giving non-minority applicants opportunities to respond while denying such opportunities to minority-owned entities like WKMJ.[[8]](#footnote-9)
3. Although WKMJ claims to raise new matters previously unknown, it does no more than repeat, re-characterize, or expand arguments already made, considered, and rejected. WKMJ’s alleged “factual” dispute is merely a reframed presentation of its unsuccessful procedural arguments, *i.e.,* that the evidence leading to WKMJ’s disqualification was unsworn and outside of any formal adjudication.[[9]](#footnote-10) Similarly, WKMJ’s allegation of recently discovered discriminatory Bureau practices violating WKMJ’s due process rights, merely builds upon its rejected due process claims by adding an irrelevant discussion of Bureau action in an unrelated case involving different factual issues.[[10]](#footnote-11) In conclusion, because the Chief Executive Officer of WKMJ illegally operated a radio station from WKMJ’s address, WKMJ is prohibited, by statute, from obtaining the LPFM license that it seeks. Accordingly, as we concluded in the Decision, the Bureau’s dismissal of its application was appropriate.
4. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration filed by Application for Review filed by WKMJ Radio Live The People Station, Inc., on December 18, 2015, IS DISMISSED, as repetitious, pursuant to Section 405 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, [[11]](#footnote-12) and 47 CFR §§ 1.106(b)(2), (b)(3), and (j).

 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

 Marlene H. Dortch

 Secretary
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4. *See* 47 CFR § 1.106(b)(2). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. *See Knoxville Broad. Corp.,* Memorandum Opinion and Order, 87 FCC 2d 1103, 1107, para. 11 (1981). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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