



<b>Race:</b>	American Indian or Alaska Native:	Asian:	Black or African-American:	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander:	White:
<b>Ethnicity:</b>	Hispanic or Latino:	Not Hispanic or			

23) FCC Registration Number (FRN):			
4) First Name (if individual):	MI:	Last Name:	Suffix:
25) Entity Name (if not an individual):			
26) P.O. Box:	And / Or	27) Street Address:	
28) City:		29) State:	30) Zip Code:
31) Telephone Number:		32) FAX Number:	


44) The Assignee is a(n): Limited Liability Corporation			
FCC Registration Number (FRN): 0004206645			
45) First Name (if individual):	MI:	Last Name:	Suffix:
47) Entity Name (if other than Individual): BellSouth Mobility LLC			
48) Name of Real Party in Interest:			49) TIN: L00233205
50) Attention To: Kellye E. Abernathy			
51) P.O. Box:	And / Or	52) Street Address: 17330 Preston Road, Suite 100	
53) City: Dallas		54) State: TX	55) Zip Code: 75252
56) Telephone Number: (972)733-2000		57) FAX Number: (972)733-2865	
58) E-Mail Address:			

61) P.O. Box:	And / Or	62) Street Address: 5565 Glenridge Connector, Suite 1700	
63) City: Atlanta		64) State: GA	65) Zip Code: 30342
66) Telephone Number: (404)236-5543			

69) Is the Assignee or Transferee a foreign government or the representative of any foreign government?	No
70) Is the Assignee or Transferee an alien or the representative of an alien?	No
71) Is the Assignee or Transferee a corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government?	No
72) Is the Assignee or Transferee a corporation of Which more than one-fifth of the capital Stock is owned of record or voted by aliens or their representatives of by a foreign government or representative thereof or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country?	No
foreign ownership or control.	

74) Has the Assignee or Transferee or any party to this application had any FCC station aulhonization, license or construction permit revoked or had any application for an initial, modification or renewal of FCC station authorization, license, construction permit denied by the Commission? If 'Yes', attach exhibit explaining circumstances.	No
75) Has the Assignee or Transferee or any party to this application, or any party directly or indirectly controlling the Assignee or Transferee, or any party to this application ever been convicted of a felony by any state or federal court? If 'Yes', attach exhibit explaining circumstances.	No
76) Is the Assignee or Transferee or any party to this application, or any party directly or indirectly controlling the Assignee or Transferee, guilty of unlawfully monopolizing or attempting unlawfully to monopolize radio communication, directly or indirectly, through control of manufacture or sale of radio apparatus, exclusive traffic arrangement, or any other means or unfair methods of competition? If 'Yes', attach exhibit explaining circumstances.	No
77) Is the Assignee or Transferee, or any party directly or indirectly controlling the Assignee or Transferee currently a party in circumstances.	Yes

<b>Race:</b>	American Indian or Alaska Native:	Asian:	Black or African-American:	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander:	White:
<b>Ethnicity:</b>	Hispanic or Latino:				

1) The Assignor or Transferor certifies either (1) that the authorization will not be assigned or that control of the license will not be transferred until the consent of the Federal Communications Commission has been given, or (2) that prior Commission consent is not required.

2) The Assignor or Transferor certifies that all statements made in this application and in the exhibits, attachments, or in documents incorporated by reference are material, are part of this application, and are true, complete, correct, and made in good faith.

79) Typed or Printed Name of Party Authorized to Sign

First Name: <b>Douglas</b>	MI: <b>4</b>	Last Name: <b>Brandon</b>	Suffix:
----------------------------	--------------	---------------------------	---------

80) Title: **Vice President**

- 1) The Assignee or Transferee certifies either (1) that the authorization will not be assigned or that control of the license will not be transferred until the consent of the Federal Communications Commission has been given, or (2) that prior Commission consent is not required because the transaction is subject to streamlined notification procedures for pro forma assignments and transfers by telecommunications carriers. See Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 FCC Rcd. 6293 (1998).
- 2) The Assignee or Transferee waives any claim to the use of any particular frequency or of the electromagnetic spectrum as against the regulatory power of the United States because of the previous use of the same, whether by license or otherwise, and requests an authorization in accordance with this application.
- 3) The Assignee or Transferee certifies that grant of this application would not cause the Assignee or Transferee to be in violation of any pertinent cross-ownership, attribution, or spectrum cap rule:  
 If the applicant has sought a waiver of any such rule in connection with this application, it may make this certification subject to the outcome of the waiver request.
- 4) The Assignee or Transferee agrees to assume all obligations and abide by all conditions imposed on the Assignor or Transferor under the subject authorization(s), unless the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to a request made herein otherwise allows, except for liability for any act done by, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced against the Assignor or Transferor prior to this assignment.
- 5) The Assignee or Transferee certifies that all statements made in this application and in the exhibits, attachments, or in documents incorporated by reference are material, are part of this application, and are true, complete, correct, and made in good faith.
- 6) The Assignee or Transferee certifies that neither it nor any other party to the application is subject to a denial of Federal benefits pursuant to Section 5301 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1998, 21 U.S.C § 862, because of a conviction for possession or distribution

**82) Typed or Printed Name of Party Authorized to Sign**

First Name: Carol	MI: L	Last Name: Tacker	Suffix:
83) Title: V.P.-Asst. Gen. Counsel & Corp. Sec.			
Signature: Carol L Tacker		84) Date: 01110103	
WILLFUL FALSE STATEMENTS MADE ON THIS FORM OR ANY ATTACHMENTS ARE PUNISHABLE BY FINE AND/OR IMPRISONMENT (U.S. Code, Title 18, § 1001) AND/OR REVOCATION OF ALL PRIVILEGES AND RIGHTS TO PERMIT (U.S. Code, Title 47, Section 312(a)(1)), AND/OR FORFEITURE (U.S. Code, Title 47, Section 503).			

**Authorizations To Be Assigned or Transferred**

85) Call Sign	86) Radio Service	87) Location Number	88) Path Number (Microwave only)	89) Frequency Number	90) Lower or Center Frequency (MHz)	91) Upper Frequency (MHz)	92) Constructed Yes / No
WPOK616	AL						Yes
WPOK629	AL						Yes

<b>FCC Form 603</b> <b>SCHEDULE A</b>		Approved by OMB 3060 - 0800 See instructions for public burden estimate
--	--	--

is the Assignee claiming the same category or a smaller category of eligibility for installment payments as the Assignor (as determined by the applicable rules governing the licenses issued to the Assignor)?

\_\_\_\_\_ payments?

Refer to applicable auction rules for method to determine required gross revenues and total assets information

Year 1 Gross Revenues (current)	Year 2 Gross Revenues	Year 3 Gross Revenues	Total Assets:

**3) Certification Statements**

For Assignees Claiming Eligibility as an Entrepreneur Under the General Rule

Assignee certifies that they are eligible to obtain the licenses for which they apply.

For Assignees Claiming Eligibility as a Publicly Traded Corporation

Assignee certifies that they are eligible to obtain the licenses for which they apply and that they comply with the definition of a Publicly Traded Corporation, as set out in the applicable FCC rules.

For Assignees Claiming Eligibility Using a Control Group Structure

Assignee certifies that they are eligible to obtain the licenses for which they apply.

Assignee certifies that the applicant's sole control group member is a pre-existing entity, if applicable.

For Assignees Claiming Eligibility as a Very Small Business, Very Small Business Consortium, Small Business, or as a Small Business Consortium

Assignee certifies that they are eligible to obtain the licenses for which they apply.

Assignee certifies that the applicant's sole control group member is a pre-existing entity, if applicable.

For Assignees Claiming Eligibility as a Rural Telephone Company,

Assignee certifies that they meet the definition of a Rural Telephone Company as set out in the applicable FCC rules and must disclose all parties to agreement(s) to Partition \_\_\_\_\_ won in this auction. \_\_\_\_\_ applicable

**Transfers of Control**

**4) Licensee Eligibility (for transfers of control only)**

As a result of transfer of control, must the licensee now claim a larger or higher category of eligibility than was originally declared?

If 'Yes', the new category of eligibility of the licensee is: \_\_\_\_\_

**Certification Statement for Transferees**

Transferee certifies that the answers provided in Item 4 are true and correct.

The copy resulting from Print Preview is intended to be used as a reference copy only and MAY NOT be submitted to the FCC as an application for manual filing.

Other	01/08/03	Exhibit A - Lead Application Information	0178130435073763114270295.pdf
Other	01/08/03	Exhibit Response to Question 77	0178131875073763114230295.pdf

**EXHIBIT A**  
**DESCRIPTION OF TRANSACTION AND**  
**PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT**

**Lead Application Information**

This application is one of fourteen applications being filed in connection with the full and partial assignment of licenses between subsidiaries of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. and subsidiaries of Cingular Wireless LLC, Meriwether Communications LLC, and Skagit Wireless. LLC. Applicants have designated the application being filed concurrently for the assignment of licenses from Ameritech Mobile Communications, LLC to AT&T Wireless Services of Hawaii, Inc. as the lead application for the transaction (ULS File No. 0001 146802). Accordingly, Applicants hereby incorporate by reference Exhibit **A** of the lead application.

## RESPONSE TO QUESTION 77

Cingular Wireless LLC (“Cingular”), the real party in interest to the assignee, hereby submits this response to Question 77 of the FCC Form 603 concerning allegations against various indirect subsidiaries or affiliates of Cingular. While these cases may fall outside the scope of disclosures required by Question 77, they are nevertheless being reported out of an abundance of caution. **In order to facilitate Commission’s review of the pending litigation information, pages 3 and 4 of this exhibit are copies of the cases previously reviewed and approved for Cingular in connection with ULS File No. 0001085730, which was granted on December 28, 2002. The current changes are underlined.**

On March 7, 2000, *In re Cellular Headquarters, Inc.; Cellular Headquarters, Inc. v. Comcast Cellular Communications, Inc., et al.*, No. 00-1067, was filed in the District of New Jersey. Plaintiff, a current sales agent, alleges a breach of the terms of his franchise agreement due to changes in the commission structure for outside sales **agents**, the alleged failure to “promote” the sales force through advertising, and anticompetitive steps towards outside sales agents. The court conducted a settlement conference in November. The December 10, 2002 trial date has been cancelled. The parties will seek the bankruptcy court’s approval of a tentative settlement agreement.

On January 18, 2001, *Westside Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellnet of Ohio v. New Par*, Case No. 1:01CV0505, was filed in Cuyahoga County, Ohio against the Cincinnati SMSA Limited Partnership (“CSLP”), AirTouch, Verizon, and others, for **damages** as a result of Defendants’ alleged failure to offer to sell cellular services to Cellnet at the same rates as it sold such service to its retail affiliates. Plaintiff had previously obtained an adverse order on the issue of liability from the Ohio PUC against CSLP and AirTouch. A notice of appeal of the Ohio PUC decision was filed with the Ohio Supreme Court on June 25, 2001, asserting that the claims are preempted by federal law. On December 30, 2002, the Ohio Supreme Court affirmed the PUC order, rejecting Defendants’ preemption arguments. The trial court likely will schedule trial for early 2003.

On November 6, 2001, *Valley Cellular Inc. v. Cingular Wireless LLC*, No. A442136, was filed in the District Court of Clark County, Nevada. Plaintiff is a former exclusive dealer of Defendant’s products. On behalf of itself and similarly situated persons. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant inappropriately converted Plaintiff’s business for itself by, among other things, opening retail locations immediately adjacent to Plaintiff’s retail locations. Plaintiff alleges breach of contract, fraud, interference with prospective economic advantage, and conspiracy, including unfair competition. In response to a motion by Cingular, on **February 14, 2002, the Court ordered that the matter be resolved through binding arbitration pursuant to the parties’ agency agreement.** Although the **Court** declined to issue a preliminary injunction ordering Plaintiff to comply with the non-compete provision in the parties’ agency agreement, it granted a

preliminary injunction enjoining Plaintiff from using Cingular's trademarks and confidential subscriber and business information. On March 20, 2002, Cingular filed a Demand for Arbitration. Plaintiff had twenty days to respond but failed to do so. The parties have agreed upon a single arbitrator.

On March 1, 2002, *United States Cellular Telephone of Greater Tulsa, L.L.C. v. SBC Communications, Inc.*, No. 02CV0163C (J), **was** filed in **the** U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma. SBC Communications, Inc. and SWB Telephone, L.P. ("SWBT") are defendants. The complaint alleges that because of land use (residential zoning) restrictions, the roof of a telephone building owned by Defendants is **an** "essential facility" to which Defendants have permitted access by an affiliate (Cingular) while denying access to Plaintiff. Cingular is **not** a defendant. Among other things, the complaint alleges that Defendants have violated § 2 of the Sherman Act by treating United States Cellular less favorably than Cingular with respect to the claimed "essential facility."

On or around August 23, 2002, an action styled *Millen, et al. v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al.* was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Case No. 02-11689 RGS). Cingular Wireless LLC is a named defendant along with several other wireless companies. Plaintiffs seek to certify a class of wireless customers in the Boston metropolitan area. Plaintiffs allege that defendants market handsets and wireless services through tying arrangements and that defendants monopolize markets for handsets. Plaintiffs **seek** damages and injunctive relief under the Sherman Act.

On or around September 20, **2002**, an action styled *Truong, et al v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al.* was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. C 02 **4580**). This complaint is similar **to** the Millen complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Cingular has not yet been served.

On or around September 27, 2002, an action styled *Morales, et al. v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al.* was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas (Case No. L-02-CV120). This complaint is similar to the Millen complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Cingular has received service.

On or around September 30, 2002, an action styled *Beeler, et al. v. AT&T Cellular Services, Inc., et al.* was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (Case No. 02C 6975). This complaint is similar to the Millen complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Cingular has received service.

### RESPONSE TO QUESTION 77

On March 7, 2000, *In re Cellular Headquarters, Inc.; Cellular Headquarters, Inc. v. Comcast Cellular Communications, Inc., et al.*, No. 00-1067, was filed in the District of New Jersey. Plaintiff, a current sales agent, alleges a breach of the terms of his franchise agreement due to changes in the commission structure for outside sales agents, the alleged failure to “promote” the sales force through advertising, and anticompetitive steps towards outside sales agents. Pursuant to a Consent Scheduling Order, the discovery deadlines and trial date have been rescheduled as follows: a settlement conference has been scheduled for November 1, 2002; and trial has been set for December 10, 2002.

On January 18, 2001, *Westside Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellnet & Ohio v. New Par*. Case No. 1:01CV0505, was filed in Cuyahoga County, Ohio against the Cincinnati SMSA Limited Partnership (“CSLP”), AirTouch, Verizon, and others, for damages as a result of Defendants’ alleged failure to offer to sell cellular services to Cellnet at the same rates as it sold such service to its retail affiliates. Plaintiff had previously obtained an adverse order on the issue of liability from the Ohio PUC against CSLP and AirTouch. A notice of appeal of the Ohio PUC decision was filed with the Ohio Supreme Court on June 25, 2001, asserting that the claims are preempted by federal law. Oral argument has been scheduled for November 13. This damages action has been remanded to the state court which has denied Defendants’ request to stay the action pending the appeal. Trial is set for December 2, 2002.

On November 6, 2001, *Valley Cellular Inc. v. Cingular Wireless LLC*. No. A442136, was filed in the District Court of Clark County, Nevada. Plaintiff is a former exclusive dealer of Defendant’s products. On behalf of itself and similarly situated persons, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant inappropriately convened Plaintiff’s business for itself by, among other things, opening retail locations immediately adjacent to Plaintiff’s retail locations. Plaintiff alleges breach of contract, fraud, interference with prospective economic advantage, and conspiracy, including unfair competition. In response to a motion by Cingular, on February 14, 2002, the Court ordered that the matter be resolved through binding arbitration pursuant to the parties’ agency agreement. Although the Court declined to issue a preliminary injunction ordering Plaintiff to comply with the non-compete provision in the parties’ agency agreement, it granted a preliminary injunction enjoining Plaintiff from using Cingular’s trademarks and confidential subscriber and business information. On March 20, 2002, Cingular filed a Demand for Arbitration. Plaintiff had twenty days to respond but failed to do so. The parties have agreed upon a single arbitrator.

On March 1, 2002, *United States Cellular Telephone of Greater Tulsa, L.L.C. v. SBC Communications, Inc.*, No. 02CV0163C (J), was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma. SBC Communications, Inc. and SWB Telephone, L.P. (“SWBT”) are defendants. The complaint alleges that because of land use (residential zoning) restrictions, the

roof of a telephone building owned by Defendants is an “essential facility” to which Defendants have permitted access by an affiliate (Cingular) while denying access to Plaintiff. Cingular is not a defendant. Among other things, the complaint alleges that Defendants have violated § 2 of the Sherman Act by treating United States Cellular less favorably than Cingular with respect to the claimed “essential facility.”

On or around August 23, 2002, an action styled Millen, et al. v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Case No. 02-11689 RGS). Cingular Wireless LLC is a named defendant along with several other wireless companies. Plaintiffs seek to certify a class of wireless customers in the Boston metropolitan area. Plaintiffs allege that defendants market handsets and wireless services through tying arrangements and that defendants monopolize markets for handsets. Plaintiffs seek damages and injunctive relief under the Sherman Act.

On or around September 20, 2002, an action styled Truong, et al v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. C 02 4580). This complaint is similar to the Millen complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Cingular has not yet been served.

On or around September 27, 2002, an action styled Morales, et al. v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC., et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas (Case No. L-02-CVI 20). This complaint is similar to the Millen complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Cingular has received **service**.

On or around September 30, 2002, an action styled Beeler, et al. v. AT&T Cellular Services, Inc., et al. was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (Case No. 02C 6975). This complaint is similar to the Millen complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Cingular has received service.