

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P.,	)	MB Docket No. 08-214
d/b/a Mid-Atlantic Sports Network,	)	
Complainant	)	File No. CSR-8001-P
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Comcast Corporation,	)	
Defendant	)	

To: Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary

Attn: The Honorable Richard L. Sippel  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

**OPPOSITION**

Comcast Corporation (“Comcast”), by its attorneys, hereby opposes the motion by TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P., d/b/a Mid-Atlantic Sports Network (“MASN”) to defer the date for the Enforcement Bureau (“Bureau”) to file comments in the above-captioned proceeding. There is no reason to believe that deferring the Bureau’s comments will aid the parties’ settlement efforts as MASN suggests. To the contrary, the Bureau’s comments may prove helpful to settlement, if a settlement is possible, by providing both Comcast and MASN with additional information that will better inform their respective settlement positions.

MASN has repeatedly pressed for expedition during the course of this proceeding. The Presiding Judge has in turn emphasized the need to proceed expeditiously in this matter, consistent with due process. Thus, the procedural delay MASN now advocates would be warranted only where the parties have reached an agreement in principle and need additional time to finalize the terms of a settlement, as occurred in the context of the *NFL Proceeding*,

CSR-7876-P. Here, the parties are continuing settlement negotiations, but Comcast has no reason to believe that the discussions have reached a stage where delay would support the parties' settlement efforts.

To the extent a settlement is possible, Comcast has always been interested in pursuing a reasonable business solution to MASN's complaint. Comcast originally elected to participate in non-binding alternative dispute resolution with MASN, and most recently, Comcast agreed after the hearing to participate in Bureau-sponsored mediation, neither of which was agreed to by MASN. Comcast also engaged in settlement discussions with MASN over the past several months – both before and after the hearing. Despite the parties' efforts, it is not clear that the parties are close to settlement and the mere fact that the parties are scheduled to discuss settlement yet again does not present a compelling reason for the Presiding Judge to delay this proceeding.

Accordingly, the Presiding Judge should deny MASN's motion to defer the filing date for the Bureau's comments in the above-captioned proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

**COMCAST CORPORATION**

James L. Casserly  
Michael H. Hammer  
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP  
1875 K Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1238  
(202) 303-1000

By:           /s/ David H. Solomon            
David H. Solomon  
L. Andrew Tollin  
J. Wade Lindsay  
WILKINSON BARKER KNAUER, LLP  
2300 N Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20037-1128  
(202) 783-4141

*Counsel for Comcast Corporation*

July 27, 2009

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Marc D. Knox , hereby certify that on July 27, 2009, copies of the attached Opposition were delivered by email, to the following:

David C. Frederick  
Wan J. Kim  
Evan Leo  
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd,  
Evans & Figel, P.L.L.C.  
1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036

Kris Anne Monteith  
William Davenport  
Gary P. Schonman  
Elizabeth Mumaw  
Enforcement Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Mark D. Knox

Mark D. Knox