

Subject: Docket 11-71, Maritime

Date: Friday, November 7, 2014 12:53:02 PM PT

From: eitt líf koma nú griðastaðir <warren.havens@sbcglobal.net>

To: Pamela Kane <Pamela.Kane@fcc.gov>, 'JStenger@chadbourn.com' <JStenger@chadbourn.com>, 'Matthew.Plache@PlacheLaw.com' <Matthew.Plache@PlacheLaw.com>, 'czdebski@eckertseamans.com' <czdebski@eckertseamans.com>, 'feldman@fhhlaw.com' <feldman@fhhlaw.com>, 'richards@khlaw.com' <richards@khlaw.com>, 'Bob Keller' <rjk@telcomlaw.com>, 'Sheldon, Jeffrey' <jsheldon@lb3law.com>, 'rkirk@wbklaw.com' <rkirk@wbklaw.com>, 'wright@khlaw.com' (wright@khlaw.com) <wright@khlaw.com>, 'Jimmy Stobaugh (jstobaugh@telesaurus.com)' <jstobaugh@telesaurus.com>, 'Catalano, Albert J.' <catalano@khlaw.com>

CC: Austin Randazzo <Austin.Randazzo@fcc.gov>, Richard Sippel <Richard.Sippel@fcc.gov>, Mary Gosse <Mary.Gosse@fcc.gov>, Michael Engel <Michael.Engel@fcc.gov>, travis.leblanc@fcc.gov <travis.leblanc@fcc.gov>

Enclosed is a filing I submitted as a party pro se today, along with the ECFS confirmation. It was submitted prior to 3 pm eastern time, 12 noon Pacific time where I am at, as shown in the confirmation.

I use a caption for the attached filing that includes docket 13-85 and related applications since I believe those matters are involved in docket 11-71 and vice versa, for example, as the Commission indicated in its caption in FCC 14M-133. Also, for a further example, unlawful warehousing of licenses nationwide, that Maritime admitted to in 11-71 -- (and even the Enforcement Bureau appears to have finally conceded is at least booboo, but will not act against to enforce the relevant law, under Ms. Kane's alleged "prosecutorial privilege") -- clearly causes licensee disqualification in my view, as I argued in Skytel groups' petitions for reconsideration of FCC 14-133, and if Maritime is disqualified, then I do not believe *any* of the Maritime licenses can escape revocation and be used for assignments or leases (or mysterious undefined "fill-in stations") including in any assignment to SCRRA under any extraordinary-relief mechanism including FN7 of the HDO FCC 11-64.

The attached filing will thus be timely filed in those other matters, in addition to the 11-71 filing already timely made.

For the above reasons, the certificate of service in the attached filing includes parties in said other matters as well as parties in 11-71.

I am using the same email list here that P. Kane used for her filing of today.

I am not including in this email past counsel to parties in this hearing, but will do so if instructed by the office of ALJ Sippel and if that instruction applies to all other parties and is consistent. (The ALJ office keeps doing that fairly often with no explanation of the reason under law or otherwise, even after my inquiries and objections.)

I include Mr. Lablanc on this, since in the attached filing I assert that the Enforcement Bureau cannot lawfully attempt another (the 4th or 5th, and with Choctaw the 5th or 6th) motion for summary decision --and to do so would be additionally frivolous, abusive and damaging, a discredit to his Bureau-- and other matters of which I believe he should be aware.

A copy of this email will be filed in docket 11-71 and the other matters noted above.

Submitted,
W. B.C. Havens