

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Uintah Basin Electronic)
Telecommunications d/b/a)
UBET Wireless)
)
Section 68.4(a) of the Commission's Rules)
Governing Hearing Aid Compatible)
Telephones) **WT Docket No. 01-309**
)
Request for Temporary Waiver, or)
Temporary Stay, of)
Section 20.19(d)(2) of the Rules)

To: The Commission

REPLY COMMENTS

Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless ("UBET Wireless"), by its attorneys and pursuant to the Commission's *Public Notice*, entitled "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Seeks Comment on Petitions for Reconsideration Filed In Hearing Aid Compatibility Docket," Mimeo DA 08-1087, dated May 7, 2008 (the "May 7, 2008 *Public Notice*"), hereby submits its Reply Comments in connection with its pending "Petition for Reconsideration," filed March 28, 2008 ("Petition"). In support hereof, the following is shown:

1. UBET Wireless' pending Petition requests reconsideration of the Commission's *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, *WT Docket No. 01-309*, FCC 08-67, released February 27, 2008 ("*HAC Waiver Order*") insofar as it denied UBET Wireless' request for a waiver of the Rule Section 20.19(d)(2) and 20.19 (b)(2) requirement that it include within its handset offerings by September 18, 2006 at least two Hearing Aid

Compatible (“HAC”) digital wireless handsets which meet a U3T (or M3T) rating for inductive coupling under ANSI Standard C63.19; and of its referral to the Enforcement Bureau for its apparent violation of Rule Sections 20.19(d)(2) and 20.19(b)(2) (which collective set forth one regulatory requirement). The May 7, 2008 *Public Notice* solicits public comment on the Petition.

2. Two comments were filed in response to the May 7, 2008 *Public Notice*, neither of which opposes the Petition. In fact, the Comments filed by the National Telecommunications Cooperative Association (“NTCA”) affirmatively urge the Commission to grant the Petition and other similar pending petitions. Notably, no organizations representing the interests of the deaf and hearing impaired filed comments in opposition to the Petition.

3. Like UBET Wireless, NTCA argues that the Commission’s action in the *HAC Waiver Order*, in adopting an arbitrary January 1, 2007 compliance deadline and denying UBET Wireless’ waiver request under this newly-adopted standard, was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and did not accord with the requirements of reasoned decision-making;¹ and that the Commission otherwise failed to correctly apply the waiver standard when ruling upon the waiver requests.² As NTCA further notes, the “Commission is well aware that small companies are last in line for obtaining equipment from manufacturers and justifies the waivers it did grant on that basis;” but “failed to recognize ... there are differences that dictate that some companies will receive equipment before others;” that “Tier III carriers come in different sizes and have different influence and relationships with manufacturers; and that small companies do “not possess

¹ NTCA Comments, pg. 1.

² NTCA Comments, pp. 2-4.


the same buying power or influence with manufacturers as one with several hundred thousand.”³ NTCA concludes that an “arbitrary waiver boundary provides no opportunity for careful and considered examination of the facts;” and that the “Commission must follow the law and its own precedent and examine the facts and circumstances surrounding each individual waiver request before granting or denying it.”⁴ Clearly, the Commission did not follow the waiver requirements when it denied UBET Wireless’ waiver petition.

WHEREFORE, UBET Wireless again requests that its pending Petition be granted; that its waiver request be granted *nunc pro tunc* to January 15, 2007; and that the referral to the Enforcement Bureau be rescinded.

Respectfully submitted,

**Uintah Basin Electronic
Telecommunications d/b/a
UBET Wireless**

Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens,
Duffy & Prendergast, LLP
2120 L Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20037
Tel.: 202-828-5515
FAX: 202-828-5568
E-mail: rmj@bloostonlaw.com

By: 
Robert M. Jackson
Its Attorney

Filed: June 2, 2008

³ NTCA Comments, pp. 3-4.

⁴ NTCA Comments, pg. 4.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that I am an attorney with the law offices of Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast and that on June 2, 2008 I caused to be sent either by first-class United States mail, postage prepaid, or by electronic mail (e-mail), a copy of the foregoing "**Reply Comments**" to the following:

Joseph Levin, Esquire
Federal Communications Commission
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Spectrum & Competition Policy Division
445 – 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554
E-Mail: Joseph.Levin@fcc.gov.

Jill M. Canfield, Esquire
National Telecommunications Cooperative Association
4121 Wilson Boulevard
10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203
E-mail: jcanfield@ntca.org.

Timothy E. Welch, Esquire
Law Offices of Hill & Welch
1330 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 113
Washington, D.C. 20036
E-mail: welchlaw@earthlink.net.

Best Copy and Printing, Inc.
Portals II
445 – 12th Street, S.W.
Room CY-B402
Washington, D.C. 20554
E-mail: Joshir@erols.com and fcc@bcpiweb.com.


Robert M. Jackson