

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 93-25

From: William Mantz <wmantz@netcarrier.com>
To: A7.A7(NETMSGs)
Date: 11/9/98 9:14pm
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

William Mantz (wmantz@netcarrier.com) writes:

Re: Satellite TV services (DirecTV, Dish Networks). 2 Issues: One, I don't think it is fair competition to allow the cable company to re-broadcast the local channels to the convenience on one media(cable) where Satellite owners don't have that choice. I need to revert to other means to pull in the same signal.

2) another matter where in Philadelphia, Comcast Specatacor has monopolized their OWN sports channel and only made this channel available to cable operators and has not permitted satellite operators the opportunity to send this channel, even though sponsored by commercials, to their customers. The result, is that many cable customers won't switch to satellite competition because they would lose 45% of the Philadelphia sporting events. My understanding is that they refuse to sell their channel to satellite services. Since they are a Cable Supplire, my opinion is that they are doing this to keep control of their customer base, and unfair business practice.

Thank You in advance for my comments.
William Mantz

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.140.168.9
Remote IP address: 209.140.168.9

RECEIVED

NOV 10 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

93-24

From: Teresa J. Baysden <terbay@eastky.net>
To: A7.A7(NETMSG)
Date: 11/9/98 10:51pm
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Teresa J. Baysden (terbay@eastky.net) writes:

Commissioner Ness;

I live in a rural area that does not have access to ANY broadcast signal. It is not my first choice, (I am a medical student and can ill afford extra expense) but I found no choice but to purchase a satellite in hopes of getting broadcast tv. Now, I find out that I may not be able to get that done. This is ridiculous. These providers are trying to compete with a needed and valuable service and are not being allowed to, even in areas where the can be no conceivable threat to the "competition" of the local networks. Well, there ARE no local networks here, and I still have to spend money to get either a signal test, or beg the nearest affiliate for a broadcast waiver. I cannot think of a better way to squelch free enterprise than this.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 208.159.223.248
Remote IP address: 208.159.223.248

RECEIVED

NOV 10 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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