Federal Communications Commission

§ 101.45 Mutually exclusive applications.

(a) The Commission will consider applications to be mutually exclusive if their conflicts are such that the grant of one application would effectively preclude by reason of harmful electrical interference, or other practical reason, the grant of one or more of the other applications. The Commission will presume “harmful electrical interference” exists when the levels of § 101.105 are exceeded, or when there is a material impairment to service rendered to the public despite full cooperation in good faith by all applicants or parties to achieve reasonable technical adjustments which would avoid electrical conflict.

(b) A common carrier application, except in the Local Multipoint Distribution Service and in the 24 GHz Service, will be entitled to comparative consideration with one or more conflicting applications only if:

(1) The application is mutually exclusive with the other application; and

(2) The application is received by the Commission in a condition acceptable for filing by whichever “cut-off” date is earlier:

(i) Sixty (60) days after the date of the public notice listing the first of the conflicting applications as accepted for filing; or

(ii) One (1) business day preceding the day on which the Commission takes final action on the previously filed application (should the Commission act upon such application in the interval between thirty (30) and sixty (60) days after the date of its public notice).

(c) Whenever three or more applications are mutually exclusive, but not uniformly so, the earliest filed application established the date prescribed in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, regardless of whether or not subsequently filed applications are directly mutually exclusive with the first filed application. (For example, applications A, B, and C are filed in that order. A and B are directly mutually exclusive, B and C are directly mutually exclusive. In order to be considered comparatively with B, C must be filed within the “cut-off” period established by A even though C is not directly mutually exclusive with A.)

(d) Private operational fixed point-to-point microwave applications for authorization under this part will be entitled to comparative consideration with one or more conflicting applications in accordance with the provisions of § 1.227(b)(4) of this chapter.

(e) An application otherwise mutually exclusive with one or more previously filed applications, but filed after the appropriate date prescribed in paragraphs (b) or (d) 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).

(f) For 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 §1.929 of this chapter), except under any of the following circumstances:

(1) The application has been designated for comparative hearing, or for comparative evaluation (pursuant to §101.51 of this part), and the Commission or the presiding officer accepts the amendment pursuant to §1.927 of this chapter;

(2) The amendment resolves frequency conflicts with authorized stations or other pending applications which would otherwise require resolution by hearing or by comparative evaluation pursuant to §101.51 provided that the amendment does not create new or additional frequency conflicts;
§ 101.51 Comparative evaluation of mutually exclusive applications.

(a) In order to expedite action on mutually exclusive applications in services under this rules part where neither competitive bidding nor the random selection processes 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 §101.45;

(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