ANN BAVENDER\* ANNE GOODWIN CRUMP VINCENT J. CURTIS, JR. PAUL J. FELDMAN FRANK R. JAZZO ANDREW S. KERSTING EUGENE M. LAWSON, JR SUSAN A. MARSHALL HARRY C. MARTIN RAYMOND J. QUIANZON LEONARD R. RAISH JAMES P. RILEY ALISON J. SHAPIRO KATHLEEN VICTORY JENNIFER DINE WAGNER\* HOWARD M. WEISS ZHAO XIAOHUA\* NOT ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA

## FLETCHER, HEALD & HILDRETHOOKET FILE COPY CHICHAELS

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 11th FLOOR, 1300 NORTH 17th STREE ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209-3801

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMUNICATIONS (703) 812-0400

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

TELECOPIER (703) 812-0486

INTERNET www.fhh-telcomlaw.com CONSULTANT FOR INTERNATIONAL AND SHELDON J. KRYS

OF COUNSEL EDWARD A. CAINE\* MITCHELL LAZARUS EDWARD S. O'NEILL\*

WRITER'S DIRECT

703-812-0440 lazarus@fhh-telcomlaw.com

February 17, 2000

## HAND DELIVERED

Ms. Magalie Salas, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Room TW-B204 Washington DC 20554

> WT Docket No. 97-12 Re:

Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Provide for Greater Use

of Spread Spectrum Communication Technologies

Dear Ms. Salas:

Clearwire Technologies, Inc. (Clearwire) withdraws the Petition for Reconsideration it filed in this proceeding on October 25, 1999.1

In taking this action, Clearwire expressly reserves its position that a Part 15 user, such as Clearwire, is entitled to seek protection from an Amateur station that operates unlawfully. The applicable rule states that a Part 15 user must accept interference "that may be caused by the operation of an authorized radio station . . . . "2 By definition, a station operating outside the terms of its authorization is not an authorized station. Such a station therefore is not one from which Part 15 must accept interference.

No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE

Public notice of the Clearwire petition appeared in the Federal Register on January 21, 2000. 65 Fed. Reg. 3451 (Jan. 21, 2000).

<sup>47</sup> C.F.R. § 15.5(b) (emphasis added).

Magalie R. Salas, Esquire February 17, 2000 Page 2

The National Association for Amateur Radio (ARRL) disagrees.<sup>3</sup> Misstating the rule, it argues that "Part 15 devices are entitled to no protection from *allocated services*."<sup>4</sup> Nothing in the rules supports that view. ARRL contends that Part 15 devices "have no interest in the operation of amateur stations, whether those stations happen to be in compliance with Part 97 rules or not."<sup>5</sup> ARRL even states that "it is irrelevant whether the station is operating lawfully or otherwise, as long as it is authorized to operate by the Commission."<sup>6</sup>

ARRL seems to say that a station's operation is "authorized" even when its operation is illegal. This position is self-contradictory, and self-evidently incorrect. Clearwire has every right to ask the Commission to enforce its rules.

Although the issue of Clearwire's standing is moot in the context of the present proceeding, Clearwire does not waive its right to seek relief from unlawful Amateur operation in the future.

Please accept the original and four copies of this letter for filing in the above-referenced docket, and date-stamp and return the extra copy provided for that purpose.

If there are any questions about this filing, please call me at the number above.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Lazarus

Counsel for Clearwire Technologies, Inc.

Thomas Sugrue, Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
D'Wana Terry, Chief, Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
William Cross, Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Christopher D. Imlay, Counsel for ARRL, the National Association for Amateur Radio

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> ARRL filed an opposition to Clearwire's Petition for Reconsideration on January 31, 2000 (Opposition).

Opposition at 3 (emphasis added).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Opposition at 3.

<sup>6</sup> Opposition at 4.