

**Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.**  
**1300 North 17<sup>th</sup> Street 11<sup>th</sup> floor**  
**Arlington VA 22209**  
**703-812-0400 (voice)**  
**703-812-0486 (fax)**

MITCHELL LAZARUS  
703-812-0440  
LAZARUS@FHHLAW.COM

July 30, 2008

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington DC 20554

cc: ET Docket No. 04-186 (as *ex parte* notice)

**Re: Informal Complaint and Petition of the Public Interest Spectrum  
Coalition against Shure, Inc. et al. (filed July 16, 2008)**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I am writing on behalf of Sennheiser electronic GmbH & Co. KG ("Sennheiser") with regard to the above-referenced informal complaint.

The complaint lists an affiliate of Sennheiser as a defendant, along with several other companies, some of them unnamed.<sup>1</sup> Neither Sennheiser nor its affiliate was served with the complaint. The company learned of it only by accident.<sup>2</sup>

Sennheiser is not required to file an answer to the complaint until directed to by the Commission. The rules on several specific categories of informal complaint provide for the

---

<sup>1</sup> The complaint is directed against "Shure, Inc., Nady Systems, Inc., VocoPro, Audio2000, Sennheiser Electronic Corporation, Audix Microphones, Electro Voice (a subsidiary of Basch Communications Systems), Hisonic International, Inc., Pyle Audio, and any other manufacturers of wireless microphones authorized for use under Part 74, Subpart H that have violated the Commission's rules . . . ." Complaint at 1.

<sup>2</sup> A customer of Sennheiser's U.S. affiliate saw a reference to the complaint on the Internet and brought it to the attention of a company official.

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
July 30, 2008  
Page 2

Commission to forward the complaint to the defendant with a time period for response.<sup>3</sup> There is no rule of general applicability that says otherwise.<sup>4</sup>

Sennheiser will respond as instructed by the Commission, whether directly or by public notice. Sennheiser may also, at its option, put a statement in the public record addressing the merits of the complaint.

If there are any questions about this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Mitchell Lazarus  
Counsel for  
Sennheiser electronic GmbH & Co. KG

cc: ET Docket No. 04-186 (by electronic filing)

---

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.*, 47 C.F.R. Sec. 1.717 (informal complaints against common carriers); 47 C.F.R. Sec. 6.19 (same re access to telecommunications services and equipment by persons with disabilities); 47 C.F.R. Sec. 7.19 (same re access to voice mail and interactive menu services by persons with disabilities); 47 C.F.R. Sec. 64.604(c)(6)(v)(A)(3) (same re Telecommunications Relay Service); 47 C.F.R. Sec. 64.1150(d) (same re slamming); 47 C.F.R. Sec. 68.418(a) (same re hearing aid compatibility).

<sup>4</sup> Section 1.45(b) sets a time limit of ten days for opposition to "any motion, petition, or request," but does not address informal complaints.

