

**§ 22.936 Dismissal of applications in cellular renewal proceedings.**

Any applicant that has filed an application in the Cellular Radiotelephone Service that is mutually exclusive with an application for renewal of a cellular authorization (competing application), and seeks to resolve the mutual exclusivity by requesting dismissal of its application, must obtain the approval of the FCC.

(a) If a competing applicant seeks to dismiss its application prior to the Initial Decision stage of the hearing on its application, it must submit to the Commission a request for approval of the dismissal of its application. This request for approval of the dismissal of its application must be submitted and must also include a copy of any agreement related to the withdrawal or dismissal, and an affidavit setting forth:

(1) A certification that neither the petitioner nor its principals has received or will receive any money or other consideration in excess of legitimate and prudent expenses in exchange for the withdrawal or dismissal of the application, except that this provision does not apply to dismissal or withdrawal of applications pursuant to *bona fide* merger agreements;

(2) The exact nature and amount of any consideration received or promised;

(3) An itemized accounting of the expenses for which it seeks reimbursement; and

(4) The terms of any oral agreement related to the withdrawal or dismissal of the application.

(b) In addition, within 5 days of the filing date of the applicant or petitioner's request for approval, each remaining party to any written or oral agreement must submit an affidavit setting forth:

(1) A certification that neither the applicant nor its principals has paid or will pay money or other consideration in excess of the legitimate and prudent expenses of the petitioner in exchange for withdrawing or dismissing the application; and

(2) The terms of any oral agreement relating to the withdrawal or dismissal of the application.

(c) For the purposes of this section:

(1) Affidavits filed pursuant to this section must be executed by the filing party, if an individual, a partner having personal knowledge of the facts, if a partnership, or an officer having personal knowledge of the facts, if a corporation or association.

(2) Applications are deemed to be pending before the FCC from the time the application is filed with the FCC until such time as an order of the FCC granting, denying or dismissing the application is no longer subject to reconsideration by the FCC or to review by any court.

(3) "Legitimate and prudent expenses" are those expenses reasonably incurred by a party in preparing to file, filing, prosecuting and/or settling its application for which reimbursement is sought.

(4) "Other consideration" consists of financial concessions, including, but not limited to, the transfer of assets or the provision of tangible pecuniary benefit, as well as non-financial concessions that confer any type of benefit on the recipient.

[59 FR 59507, Nov. 17, 1994, as amended at 63 FR 68951, Dec. 14, 1998]

**§ 22.939 Site availability requirements for applications competing with cellular renewal applications.**

In addition to the other requirements set forth in this part for initial cellular applications, any application competing against a cellular renewal application must contain, when initially filed, appropriate documentation demonstrating that its proposed antenna site(s) will be available. Competing applications that do not include such documentation will be dismissed. If the competing applicant does not own a particular site, it must, at a minimum demonstrate that the site is available to it by providing a letter from the owner of the proposed antenna site expressing the owner's intent to sell or lease the proposed site to the applicant. If any proposed antenna site is under U.S. Government control, the applicant must submit written confirmation of the site's availability from the

appropriate Government agency. Applicants which file competing applications against incumbent cellular licensees may not rely on the assumption that an incumbent licensee's antenna sites are available for their use.

**§ 22.940 Criteria for comparative cellular renewal proceedings.**

This section sets forth criteria to be used in comparative cellular renewal proceedings. The ultimate issue in comparative renewal proceedings will be to determine, in light of the evidence adduced in the proceeding, what disposition of the applications would best serve the public interest, convenience and necessity.

(a) *Renewal expectancies.* The most important comparative factor to be considered in a comparative cellular renewal proceeding is a major preference, commonly referred to as a "renewal expectancy."

(1) The cellular renewal applicant involved in a comparative renewal proceeding will receive a renewal expectancy, if its past record for the relevant license period demonstrates that:

(i) The renewal applicant has provided "substantial" service during its past license term. "Substantial" service is defined as service which is sound, favorable, and substantially above a level of mediocre service which just might minimally warrant renewal; and

(ii) The renewal applicant has substantially complied with applicable FCC rules, policies and the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

(2) In order to establish its right to a renewal expectancy, a cellular renewal applicant involved in a comparative renewal proceeding must submit a showing explaining why it should receive a renewal expectancy. At a minimum, this showing must include.

(i) A description of its current service in terms of geographic coverage and population served, as well as the system's ability to accommodate the needs of roamers;

(ii) An explanation of its record of expansion, including a timetable of the construction of new cell sites to meet changes in demand for cellular service;

(iii) A description of its investments in its cellular system; and

(iv) Copies of all FCC orders finding the licensee to have violated the Communications Act or any FCC rule or policy; and a list of any pending proceedings that relate to any matter described in this paragraph.

(3) In making its showing of entitlement to a renewal expectancy, a renewal applicant may claim credit for any system modification applications that were pending on the date it filed its renewal application. Such credit will not be allowed if the modification application is dismissed or denied.

(b) *Additional comparative issues.* The following additional comparative issues will be included in comparative cellular renewal proceedings, if a full comparative hearing is conducted pursuant to § 22.935(c).

(1) To determine on a comparative basis the geographic areas and population that each applicant proposes to serve; to determine and compare the relative demand for the services proposed in said areas; and to determine and compare the ability of each applicant's cellular system to accommodate the anticipated demand for both local and roamer service;

(2) To determine on a comparative basis each applicant's proposal for expanding its system capacity in a coordinated manner in order to meet anticipated increasing demand for both local and roamer service;

(3) To determine on a comparative basis the nature and extent of the service proposed by each applicant, including each applicant's proposed rates, charges, maintenance, personnel, practices, classifications, regulations and facilities (including switching capabilities); and

(4) To determine on a comparative basis each applicant's past performance in the cellular industry or another business of comparable type and size.

(c) *Additional showings for competing applications.* With respect to evidence introduced pursuant to paragraph (b)(3) of this section, any applicant filing a competing application against a cellular renewal application (competing applicant) who claims a preference for offering any service not currently offered by the incumbent licensee must demonstrate that there is demand for