

RECEIVED

RM9335

SEP 1 1998

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

August 7, 1998

F. ~~ECC~~ MAIL ROOM  
Washington D.C. 20515

Dear F.C.C.,

I am writing to you in regards to the Preliminary Injunction issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida (Case No. 96-3650-CIV-NESBTT, on July 10, 1998.

My understanding is that this Preliminary Injunction is to have network satellite service discontinued. I am a subscriber to that service both in my home and at our cottage. I believe that if this takes place that my rights to choose are being violated.

There has been constant drives to allow competition into all markets. Therefore, discontinuing customers from having networks on their satellite TV's is violating the privilege of making my choice of a provider.

There are many areas where people do not receive network coverage and they have purchased their own satellite systems to receive networks, we are one of them in the upper part of Michigan. We could not get coverage without our satellite.

Please take whatever action is necessary to stop this action to force companies to discontinue their satellite users from the networks.

Sincerely,



Sidney Sue Shank

49962 C.R. 653  
Paw Paw, Michigan 49079  
616-657-4551

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E CCB

RM9335

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Larry Jackson <jackhome@cin.net>  
**To:** J1.J1 (RKEENEY) , A7.A7 (MPOWELL, SNESS) , FCCMAIL.SMTPNL...  
**Date:** 9/1/98 1:44am  
**Subject:** Unfair Satellite Rules

I do not get cable and can barely see (snow) antenna TV. I invested in a satellite dish so that I could get the best that technology offers. Why should I be penalized because I have a round antenna instead of one forked one. This cannot easily be understood by your average private citizen (me) unless there are some under table dealings in Washington that have nothing to do with the public interest. The networks get their revenue from the advertisers (and we have to suffer through the endless interruptions in programs because of it.). They have no more right to squeeze more revenue from me when I use a round antenna than when I use a forked one. Unbelievable!

RECEIVED

SEP - 1 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List A B C D E CCB

RM9335

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Farrell McGoohan <fmcgoohan@NETdelivery.com>  
**To:** J1.J1(RKEENEY)  
**Date:** 9/1/98 2:37pm  
**subject:** Denial of service

RECEIVED  
SEP - 1 1998  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Regina Keeney,

I am writing to you today to ask you to support my right to high quality broadcast network signals via DBS service. Specifically, I have recently learned that my ability to receive broadcast network channels is gravely threatened due to recent court rulings. I believe that this is an unfair denial of service as well as a blow to the free enterprise system that this country is built upon. Therefore, I ask that you do all that is within your power to assure that subscribers to Satellite-based broadcast networks be allowed to continue to receive those signals. DBS programming providers are the only currently viable competitors to cable television companies. For the sake of competition and the benefits it brings, please do not allow them to be unfairly hindered by antiquated rules and regulations.

Thank You  
Farrell H. McGoohan

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List A B C D E CCB

RM 9335

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "RONALD BERNARD" <rbernard@tpi.net>  
To: B4.B4 (COMPLAINTS-ENF)  
Date: 8/31/98 7:05pm  
Subject: Fw: West Coast Network feeds.

RECEIVED

SEP - 1 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

-----Original Message-----

From: RONALD BERNARD <rbernard@tpi.net>  
Cc: charliechat@dishnetwork.com <charliechat@dishnetwork.com>  
Date: Sunday, August 31, 2098 3:35 PM  
Subject: West Coast Network feeds.

>Gentlemen:

>August  
>31, 1998

>We purchased receiving equipment and programming service from Dish Network  
>over a year ago thinking it would serve our needs as we are retired and  
>travel in our motorhome 5 to 6 months a year and when we are home we cannot  
>receive television from an outside antennae due to our location and CC&Rs  
>of

>our subdivision. We heard there could be no restrictions for a small dish  
>other than where it is placed on the property. Dish Network provided us  
>with West Coast network feeds from Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle.  
>This was ideal for us as often we travel in areas where TV and radio  
>signals

>are very poor or non existent with an ordinary antennae. We could get  
>weather, traffic and local news for the areas we travel most in addition to  
>our home base. We paid \$4.99 per month for this service.

>All of a sudden we found all three network feeds emanating from Los  
>Angeles,  
>a place we avoid and has little local interest to us. I'm sure we are of  
>no  
>interest to their advertisers either. We contacted Dish Network and they  
>told us that San Francisco and Seattle feeds would be reinstated in  
>August.

>On a recent call we were told that these channels had been taken away from  
>Dish Network and that there were no plans for reinstating the service.

>We purchased our equipment in good faith and had good service until this  
>arbitrary cutoff occurred. Should a cable company have so much government  
>protection? Whose needs are being served? The basic tenants of democracy  
>are competition and consumer choice. Los Angeles stations do not serve the  
>satellite customers in San Francisco or Seattle areas. We want what we  
>contracted for. We want our old service back. What is going on here?  
>about this?

>Ron and Dot Bernard  
>2266 Gladwin Drive  
>Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
>  
>rbernard@tpi.net

SEP 1 8 30 AM '98  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
ENFORCEMENT  
COMPLAINTS &  
INVESTIGATION

RECEIVED

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

1  
OCB