

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
WASHINGTON, D.C.

In the Matter of)	
)	
Applications of Comcast Corporation,)	MB Docket No. 10-56
General Electric Company)	
And NBC Universal, Inc.)	
)	
For Consent to Assign Licenses and)	
Transfer Control of Licenses)	

**Objection of Comcast Corporation to Consolidated Reply
of the National Association of African American-Owned Media
and Entertainment Studios, Inc.**

Comcast Corporation (“Comcast”) objects to the untimely “Consolidated Reply to Responses of Comcast, Revolt and Aspire” filed on April 15, 2016 by the National Association of African American-Owned Media (“NAAAOM”) and Entertainment Studios, Inc. (“ESI”).

NAAAOM and ESI filed their petition on March 24, 2016. The petition did not state any rule pursuant to which it was filed, so Comcast construed it to be an “[i]nformal request[] for Commission action” filed under 47 C.F.R § 1.41. In compliance with 47 C.F.R. § 1.45(b)’s ten-day deadline for filing “[o]ppositions to any . . . petition,” Comcast timely filed its opposition on April 4, 2016.¹ Under 47 C.F.R. § 1.45(c)’s five-day deadline for filing a “reply to oppositions,” Petitioners had until April 11, 2016 to file a reply.² They waited, however, to file their reply until April 15, 2016. Because Petitioners have violated 47 C.F.R. § 1.45(c), the Commission should not consider their reply.

¹ The tenth day fell on Sunday, April 3, 2016, which made the opposition deadline Monday, April 4, 2016 under 45 C.F.R. § 1.4(e)(1).

² The fifth day fell on Saturday, April 9, 2016, which made the reply deadline Monday, April 11, 2016 under 45 C.F.R. § 1.4(e)(1).

Even if the Commission were to excuse Petitioners' violation of the rules, their reply confirms that the petition is based on rank speculation about the ownership and independence of Aspire and Revolt. Comcast, Aspire, and Revolt have rebutted Petitioners' false allegations, and Petitioners offer no contrary evidence. Yet they nonetheless make the offensive claim that "the information generally available strongly indicates" that Comcast's African American partners "make mere cameo appearances as necessary to maintain the illusion and pick up the occasional check." Reply at 8. Furthermore, while Comcast has shown that it complied with its MOU commitments concerning the launch of African-American owned channels, the condition that the Commission made enforceable in the *NBCUniversal Order* related solely to the launch of *independent* channels. See Opp. at 2-3, 5-6. Petitioners' reply makes no serious effort to rebut Comcast's showing that Revolt and Aspire are entirely independent from Comcast. Compare Opp. at 10-12, with Reply at 10-11.³

³ Petitioners are correct that ESI made a formal application during the 2011-2012 solicitation process that ultimately resulted in the selection of Aspire and Revolt. Comcast inadvertently missed ESI's application when reviewing its records in the course of preparing its opposition. In any event, as Comcast made clear in its opposition, ESI was in fact considered for carriage under that process. See Opp. at 7 n.3; Gaiski Decl. ¶ 8.

Miguel A. Estrada
Michael R. Huston
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5306

Douglas Fuchs
Jesse A. Cripps
Bradley J. Hamburger
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

James L. Casserly
Michael D. Hurwitz
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
1875 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

April 21, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kathryn A. Zachem
Kathryn A. Zachem
Jordan B. Goldstein
Regulatory Affairs

Lynn R. Charytan
Julie P. Laine
Frank La Fontaine
*Comcast NBCUniversal Transaction
Compliance*

Francis M. Buono
Ryan G. Wallach
Legal Regulatory Affairs

COMCAST CORPORATION
300 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001

Counsel for Comcast Corporation