AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

paragraph (b)(2) of this section, will be returned without prejudice and will be eligible for refiling only after final action is taken by the Commission with respect to the previously filed application (or applications).

(e) For the purposes of this section, any application (whether mutually exclusive or not) will be considered to be a newly filed application if it is amended by a major amendment (as defined by §21.23), except under any of the following circumstances:

(1) The application has been designated for comparative hearing, or for comparative evaluation (pursuant to §21.35), and the Commission or the presiding officer accepts the amendment pursuant to §21.23(b);

(2) The amendment resolves frequency conflicts with authorized stations or other pending applications which would otherwise require resolution by hearing, by comparative evaluation pursuant to §21.35, or by random selection pursuant to §21.33 provided that the amendment does not create new or additional frequency conflicts;

(3) The amendment reflects only a change in ownership or control found by the Commission to be in the public interest, and for which a requested exemption from the ''cut-off'' requirements of this section is granted, unless the amendment is for more than a *pro forma* change of ownership or control (bankruptcy, death or legal disability) of a pending Multipoint Distribution Service application in which event the application will be dismissed;

(4) The amendment reflects only a change in ownership or control which results from an agreement under §21.29 whereby two or more applicants entitled to comparative consideration of their applications join in one (or more) of the existing applications and request dismissal of their other application (or applications) to avoid the delay and cost of comparative consideration, unless the amendment is for one (or more) pending Multipoint Distribution Service application (or applications) in which event the application (or applications) will be dismissed;

(5) The amendment corrects typographical, transcription, or similar clerical errors which are clearly demonstrated to be mistakes by reference to other parts of the application, and whose discovery does not create new or increased frequency conflicts; or

(6) The amendment does not create new or increased frequency conflicts, and is demonstrably necessitated by events which the applicant could not have reasonably foreseen at the time of filing, such as, for example:

(i) The loss of a transmitter or receiver site by condemnation, natural causes, or loss of lease or option;

(ii) Obstruction of a proposed transmission path caused by the erection of a new building or other structure; or

(iii) The discontinuance or substantial technological obsolescence of specified equipment, whenever the application has been pending before the Commission for two or more years from the date of its filing.

[44 FR 60534, Oct. 19, 1979, as amended at 45 FR 65600, Oct. 3, 1980; 45 FR 70468, Oct. 24, 1980; 50 FR 5993, Feb. 13, 1985; 52 FR 27554, July 22, 1987; 52 FR 37780, Oct. 9, 1987; 55 FR 10462, Mar. 21, 1990; 58 FR 11797, Mar. 1, 1993; 61 FR 26674, May 28, 1996; 63 FR 65101, Nov. 25, 1998; 64 FR 63730, Nov. 22, 1999; 65 FR 46617, July 31, 2000]

§21.32 Consideration of applications.

(a) Applications for an instrument of authorization will be granted if, upon examination of the application and upon consideration of such other matters as it may officially notice, the Commission finds that the grant will serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

(b) The grant shall be without a formal hearing if, upon consideration of the application, any pleadings of objections filed, or other matters which may be officially noticed, the Commission finds that:

(1) The application is acceptable for filing, and is in accordance with the Commission's rules, regulations, and other requirements;

(2) The application is not subject to comparative consideration (pursuant to §21.31) with another application (or applications), except where the competing applicants have chosen the comparative evaluation procedure of §21.35 and a grant is appropriate under that procedure;

(3) A grant of the application would not cause harmful electrical interference to an authorized station;

(4) There are no substantial and material questions of fact presented; and

(5) The applicant is legally, technically, financially and otherwise qualified, and a grant of the application would serve the public interest.

(c) If the Commission should grant without a formal hearing an application for an instrument of authorization which is subject to a petition to deny filed in accordance with § 21.30, the Commission will deny the petition by the issuance of a Memorandum Opinion and Order which will concisely report the reasons for the denial and dispose of all substantial issues raised by the petition.

(d) Whenever the Commission, without a formal hearing, grants any application in part, or subject to any terms or conditions other than those normally applied to applications of the same type, it shall inform the applicant of the reasons therefor, and the grant shall be considered final unless the Commission should revise its action (either by granting the application as originally requested, or by designating the application for a formal evidentiary hearing) in response to a petition for reconsideration which:

(1) Is filed by the applicant within thirty (30) days from the date of the letter or order giving the reasons for the partial or conditioned grant;

(2) Rejects the grant as made and explains the reasons why the application should be granted as originally requested; and

(3) Returns the instrument of authorization.

(e) The Commission will designate an application for a formal hearing, specifying with particularity the matters and things in issue, if, upon consideration of the application, any pleadings or objections filed, or other matters which may be officially noticed, the Commission determines that:

(1) A substantial and material question of fact is presented;

(2) The Commission is unable for any reason to make the findings specified in paragraph (a) of this section and the application is acceptable for filing, complete, and in accordance with the Commission's rules, regulations, and other requirements.

(3) The application is entitled to comparative consideration (under § 21.31) with another application (or applications); or

(4) The application is entitled to comparative consideration (pursuant to § 21.31) and the applicants have chosen the comparative evaluation procedure of § 21.35 but the Commission deems such procedure to be inappropriate.

(f) The Commission may grant, deny, or take other action with respect to an application designated for a formal hearing pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section or part 1 of this chapter.

(g) Whenever the public interest would be served thereby the Commission may grant one or more mutually exclusive applications expressly conditioned upon final action on the applications, and then either conduct a random section process (in specified services under this rules part), designate all of the mutually exclusive applications for a formal evidentiary hearing or (whenever so requested) follow the comparative evaluation procedures of § 21.35, as appropriate, if it appears:

(1) That some or all of the applications were not filed in good faith, but were filed for the purpose of delaying or hindering the grant of another application;

(2) That the public interest requires the prompt establishment of radio service in a particular community or area;

(3) That a delay in making a grant to any applicant until after the conclusion of a hearing or a random selection proceeding on all applications might jeopardize the rights of the United States under the provision of an international agreement to the use of the frequency in question; or

(4) That a grant of one application would be in the public interest in that it appears from an examination of the remaining applications that they cannot be granted because they are in violation of provisions of the Communications Act, other statutes, or of the provisions of this chapter.

(h) Reconsideration or review of any final action taken by the Commission

will be in accordance with subpart A of part 1 of this chapter.

[44 FR 60534, Oct. 19, 1979, as amended at 50 FR 5993, Feb. 13, 1985]

§ 21.33 Grants by random selection.

(a) If an application for an authorization for a Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service (MMDS) station or for a Multipoint Distribution Service (MDS) H-channel station is mutually exclusive with another such application, and satisfies the requirements of §§ 21.31 and 21.914, the applicant may be included in the random selection process set forth in §§ 1.821, 1.822 and 1.824 of this chapter.

(b) Renewal applications shall not be included in a random selection process.

(c) If Multipoint Distribution Service applicants enter into settlements, the applicants in the settlement must be represented by one application only and will not receive the cumulative number of chances in the random selection process that the individual applicants would have had if no settlement had been reached.

[58 FR 11798, Mar. 1, 1993, as amended at 61 FR 26674, May 28, 1996]

§ 21.34 [Reserved]

§ 21.35 Comparative evaluation of mutually exclusive applications.

(a) In order to expedite action on mutually exclusive applications in services under this rules part where the competitive bidding process or random selection process do not apply, the applicants may request the Commission to consider their applications without a formal hearing in accordance with the summary procedure outlined in paragraph (b) in this section if:

(1) The applications are entitled to comparative consideration pursuant to § 21.31;

(2) The applications have not been designated for formal evidentiary hearing; and

(3) The Commission determines, initially or at any time during the procedure outlined in paragraph (b) of this section, that such procedure is appropriate, and that, from the information submitted and consideration of such other matters as may be officially noticed, there are no substantial and material questions of fact presented (other than those relating to the comparative merits of the applications) which would preclude a grant under paragraphs (a) and (b) of § 21.32.

(b) Provided that the conditions of paragraph (a) of this section are satisfied, applicants may request the Commission to act upon their mutually exclusive applications without a formal hearing pursuant to the summary procedure outlined below:

(1) To initiate the procedure, each applicant will submit to the Commission a written statement containing:

(i) A waiver of the applicant's right to a formal hearing;

(ii) A request and agreement that, in order to avoid the delay and expense of a comparative formal hearing, the Commission should exercise its judgment to select from among the mutually exclusive applications that proposal (or proposals) which would best serve the public interest; and

(iii) The signature of a principal (and the principal's attorney if represented).

(2) After receipt of the written requests of all of the applicants the Commission (if it deems this procedure appropriate) will issue a notice designating the comparative criteria upon which the applications are to be evaluated and will request each applicant to submit, within a specified period of time, additional information concerning the applicant's proposal relative to the comparative criteria.

(3) Within thirty (30) days following the due date for filing this information, the Commission will accept concise and factual argument on the competing proposals from the rival applicants, potential customers, and other knowledgeable parties in interest.

(4) Within fifteen (15) days following the due date for the filing of comments, the Commission will accept concise and factual replies from the rival applicants.

(5) From time to time during the course of this procedure the Commission may request additional information from the applicants and hold informal conferences at which all competing applicants shall have the right to be represented.

(6) Upon evaluation of the applications, the information submitted, and