Exhibit 1

Subject: Re: FCC Order DA 10-1013: Mobex, Watercom, etc. are predecessors in interest of Maritime Communications/ Land Mobile LLC
Date: Friday, August 20, 2010 11:17 AM
From: Jimmy <jstobaugh@telesaurus.com>
To: "Dennis C. Brown" <d.c.brown@att.net>
Cc: Gary Schonman <gary.schonman@fcc.gov>, Brian Carter <brian.carter@fcc.gov>, Jeff Tobias <Jeff.Tobias@fcc.gov>, Scot Stone <Scot.Stone@fcc.gov>, <sharon.gillett@fcc.gov>, Warren Havens <warren.havens@sbcglobal.net>, Jimmy <jstobaugh@telesaurus.com>

All,

Mr. Havens is out of the office today. Mr. Havens or counsel will respond to the below in the near future.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Stobaugh

On 8/20/10 7:30 AM, "Dennis C. Brown" <d.c.brown@att.net> wrote:

> These issues have been fully briefed and further delay is harmful to the need for a prompt decision in this matter. MCLM has numerous assignment applications pending, including one for Positive Train Control to protect the public safety in Southern California.
>
> Once again, Warren Havens studiously refuses to recognize the difference between a predecessor in providing a service and a predecessor-in-interest in terms of acquiring ownership interest in an entity. MCLM bought the assets of Mobex Network Services Company, LLC in 2005; the FCC approved that assignment in November 2005. Among the assets were FCC licenses, several towers, and a right to any refunds or similar payments due to Mobex.
>
> MCLM did not acquire an ownership interest in Mobex. The shareholders of the two companies were different and they are different entities entirely. MCLM deserves finality; five years after the 2005 auction the FCC should resolve these issues once and for all. The FCC needs to protect the integrity of its auction process, so winners like MCLM know they will not be subject to endless litigation by losing bidders, such as Havens. The Commission should dismiss at once Havens frivolous attempt to confuse the matter.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis C. Brown
Legal Counsel to MCLM
8124 Cooke Court, Suite 201
Manassas, Virginia 20109
703/365-9437

On 8/19/2010 3:27 PM, Jimmy Stobaugh wrote:

FCC Order DA 10-1013: Mobex, Watercom, etc. are predecessors in interest of Maritime Communications/Land Mobile LLC Mr. Schonman and Mr. Carter, Enforcement Bureau ("EB")
Mr. Tobias and Mr. Stone, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau ("WTB")

Cc: Sharon Gillett, Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau ("WCB")

Per the certificate of service below, Mr. Dennis Brown is being served a copy of this email and attachments. He is also copied here.

Also, a copy of this email with its attachment will be filed on ULS under File No. 0002303355 and in WT Docket 10-83.

The below-listed parties (the "Petitioners") are sending this email to bring the following information to your attention for purposes of the FCC's ongoing investigation of Maritime Communications/Land Mobile LLC ("MCLM") under Sections 308 and 309. Please see the attached FCC *Order*, DA 10-1013, released June 4, 2010, WC Docket No. 06-122, *25 FCC Rcd 7170,* at paragraph 8 (the "Order") that states the following [underlining added for emphasis):

8. For these reasons, <u>we affirm the Bureau's prior</u>

conclusion that Maritime's predecessors were providing telecommunications services from 2001 through 2006 when they offered AMTS and that revenue from these services are subject to universal service contribution assessments.

And at Footnote 18 that states [underling added for emphasis]:

Maritime is incorrect in asserting that the Bureau should have proffered evidence that Watercom and Mobex offered their AMTS indiscriminately. Maritime Petition for Reconsideration at 4. As the applicant requesting a refund, Maritime bore the burden of proffering evidence that its predecessors in interest were the exception to the rule that CMRS providers are treated as common carriers. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.41; 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(1).

In this Order, the FCC states that Mobex and Watercom are predecessors in interest of Maritime Communications/Land Mobile's ("MCLM"). As such, Mobex and Watercom are affiliates of MCLM, which means they and their attributable gross revenues should have been disclosed on MCLM's Form 175 and Form 601 for Auction No. 61, which they were not. Watercom's and Mobex's gross revenues would have changed MCLM's size, disqualified it from its applied for bidding credit level and disqualified it from the auction for having conducted a major amendment to its application. This also shows that MCLM has committed further misrepresentations to the FCC regarding its affiliates/predecessors in interest and made false certifications on its Forms 175 and 601 for Auction No. 61.

Petitioners note here that in the subject WCB USF refund request proceeding, MCLM stated that it is the successor in

interest to Mobex and Watercom—the flipside to which of course is a predecessor in interest (also, as shown below, MCLM has told a court that Mobex is its predecessor in interest, and there is numerous other evidence presented by Petitioners, as stated below, that shows Mobex and Watercom to be MCLM's predecessors in interest).

Petitioners note here that they have shown with sound facts and arguments since 2005 and throughout their pleadings in the pending Section 309 proceeding for Auction No. 61 and in their other pending challenges regarding MCLM before the FCC (see e.g. Petitioners' recently filed Petition to Deny File No. 0004315013 that provided new and older evidence—see e.g Attachments 001-009 and all the Exhibits, including but not limited to Attachment 003 at Page 8 where MCLM states to a court that Mobex is its predecessor in interest.) that under FCC rules and law Mobex and Watercom are MCLM's predecessors in interest, that they had to be listed on MCLM's Forms 175 and 601 and MCLM knew this, and that they had significant attributable gross revenues that disqualified MCLM from a bidding credit. However, at no time has MCLM disclosed Mobex Network Services LLC (which includes Mobex Communications, Inc., its parent company, and all of that parent's numerous subsidiaries including Watercom) and Watercom as affiliates and listed their gross revenues on its Form 601 for Auction No. 61. In fact, MCLM's Main Form 601 and Form 175 for Auction No. 61 list none of its affiliates (see attached ULS revenue page from the MCLM Form 601), even though there are now over 30 known MCLM affiliates per MCLM's own belated admissions to the FCC, and that is without considering the evidence submitted by Petitioners that shows even more affiliates (MCLM included a few affiliates in an August 2006 attachment to its Form 601, but that is not the same as listing them in the required field on the Form 601, and in any case the majority are not listed). FCC rules, including but

not limited to Sections 1.17, 1.65, 1.2105, 1.2107 and 1.2110, required MCLM to list its affiliates and gross revenues on its Forms 175 and 601.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Stobaugh,
for Warren C. Havens, President
Skybridge Spectrum Foundation
Environmentel LLC
Verde Systems LLC
Intelligent Transportation & Monitoring Wireless LLC
Telesaurus Holdings GB LLC
2649 Benvenue Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94704
Ph: 510-841-2220

Certificate of Service

I, Jimmy Stobaugh, an employee of Petitioners, certify that I have on this 19th day of August 2010 caused to be served a copy of this email and its attachments via first-class USPS mail to the following*:

Dennis Brown (legal counsel to MCLM)
8124 Cooke Court, Suite 201
Manassas, VA 20109

[Signature on File. Filed electronically.]

_____
Jimmy Stobaugh

* The mailed copy being placed into a USPS drop-box today may not be processed by the USPS until the next business day.

On 6/8/10 12:17 PM, "Jimmy Stobaugh" <jstobaugh@telesaurus.com> wrote:

Mr. Schonman and Mr. Carter, Enforcement Bureau
Mr. Tobias and Mr. Stone, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Austin Schlick, General Counsel, Office of General Counsel (copied here for purposes of the ex parte communication discussed last below and the attached prior request by Petitioners for action by the Office of General Counsel)

[Note: a copy of this email and its attachments will be filed on ULS under File No. 0002303355 and in WT Docket No. 10-83 and a copy served on Mr. Brown as stated below]

The below-listed parties (the "Petitioners") are sending this email to bring the following information to your attention for purposes of the FCC's ongoing investigation of Maritime Communications/Land Mobile LLC ("MCLM"). Please see the attached FCC *Order*, DA 06-2368, released 11/27/06, *21 FCC Rcd 13735,* at Footnote 8 (the "Order") that reads as follows [underlining added for emphasis):

MC/LM also submitted a letter to the Bureau on May 25, 2006, requesting that the Bureau complete the processing

of long-form applications filed by winning bidders in Auction No. 61. Letter from John Reardon, President Maritime Communications/Land Mobile, LLC to Catherine W. Seidel, Acting Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (May 25, 2006). With the release of this Order, the Bureau is prepared to process MC/LM's application, FCC File No. 0002303355.

At no time did MCLM ever retract or correct its May 25, 2006 letter prior to or after grant of its Form 601 for Auction No. 61. The above-noted MCLM May 25, 2006 letter (as well as multiple other MCLM filings with the FCC and other documents submitted by Petitioners in the Section 308, Section 309 and Enforcement Bureau proceedings) clearly contradicts the responses of MCLM to the Enforcement Bureau's letters and to the Wireless Bureau's Section 308 letters that John Reardon was never President or an officer of MCLM, and shows those responses to be misrepresentations in that regard.

The Order also shows that the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau accepted the MCLM May 25, 2006 letter as being from Mr. Reardon as MCLM's President and that he had authority to submit the letter and request expedited processing of MCLM's Form 601. It is clear evidence in FCC records since 2006, prior to grant of the MCLM Form 601, that Mr. Reardon was an officer of MCLM during the relevant period of MCLM's Form 601 and, as such, he and his affiliates (e.g. Mobex and others) and their gross revenues had to be disclosed on the

MCLM Form 601, as required by Rule Sections 1.17, 1.65, 1.2105, 1.2110, and 1.2112.

The MCLM May 25, 2006 letter is also further evidence that Mobex is an affiliate of MCLM through common management (John Reardon was President and CEO of Mobex Network Services LLC and its parent company, Mobex Communications, Inc.: see e.g. http://www.alex4sensiblegrowth.org/candidates/reardon_q.html).

If Mobex's gross revenues (those of Mobex Network Services, LLC and Mobex Communications, Inc., and Mobex Communications' various subsidiaries, together "Mobex")) had been properly disclosed on the Form 175 and attributed to MCLM, then MCLM would not have qualified for the applied for bidding credit level (a disqualifying change under Section 1.2105) or any bidding credit at all when considering its other affiliates' gross revenues (per MCLM's request for refund to the Wireline Competition Bureau, Mobex had millions of dollars in revenues during the relevant years. The Mobex filed Forms 499-A for the relevant years also show this. These combined with the gross revenues of MCT Corp. (which the FCC and MCLM still have not disclosed to Petitioners, contrary to FCC rules, but that Petitioners have already shown from public and other records to be in the tens of millions of dollars range), American Nonwovens, MariTel, Inc., Bioventures, and all of MCLM's other affiliates would have disqualified MCLM from any bidding credit). Clearly, MCLM knew it did not qualify for the bidding credit it applied for or any at all. MCLM never updated its Form 601 (or its Form 602) to include Mr. Reardon and his

affiliates, including Mobex, and their gross revenues and the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau never required it to do so, despite having the MCLM May 25, 2006 letter signed by John Reardon as MCLM's President.

Impermissible Ex Parte Communication

Per Section 1.1208, the May 25, 2006 letter was an impermissible ex parte communication in a restricted proceeding. Attached is Petitioners' previous filing with the FCC on this ex parte issue. In that filing, Petitioners' requested that action be taken against MCLM for its ex parte communication in its May 25, 2006 letter, however, Petitioners are not aware of any action ever being taken against MCLM by either the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau or the Office of General Counsel. Petitioners reiterate here again that request for action.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Stobaugh,
for Warren C. Havens, President
Skybridge Spectrum Foundation
Environmentel LLC
Verde Systems LLC
Intelligent Transportation & Monitoring Wireless LLC
Telesaurus Holdings GB LLC
2649 Benvenue Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94704
Ph: 510-841-2220

Cc: Dennis Brown, counsel to MCLM
Russell Fox, counsel to MariTel, Inc.

Jason Smith, MariTel, Inc.
Warren Havens

Certificate of Service

I, Jimmy Stobaugh, an employee of Petitioners, certify that I have on this 8th day of June 2010 caused to be served a copy of this email and its attachments via first-class USPS mail to the following*:

Dennis Brown (legal counsel to MCLM)
8124 Cooke Court, Suite 201
Manassas, VA 20109

[Signature on File. Filed electronically.]

_____
Jimmy Stobaugh

* The mailed copy being placed into a USPS drop-box today may not be processed by the USPS until the next business day.

On 5/23/10 10:33 PM, "Warren Havens" <warren.havens@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Second try: this time addressed to the right Gary.

(I recalled the email below from the other Gary [ID now deleted in this final filing]: he has no relation to this matter.)

- W. Havens

----- Forwarded Message ----

From: Warren Havens <warren.havens@sbcglobal.net>
To: Gary ----- <----------->; Brian Carter <brian.carter@fcc.gov>
Cc: Scot Stone <Scot.Stone@fcc.gov>; jeff tobias <jeff.tobias@fcc.gov>; d brown <d.c.brown@att.net>; RFox@mintz.com; Jason Smith <jsmith@maritelusa.com>; jstobaugh@telesaurus.com; warrenhavens@mac.com
Sent: Sun, May 23, 2010 10:23:03 PM
Subject: FN 0002303355. New evidence: Investigation of Depriests, MCLM, affilates. Auction 61, Maritel, WPV etc

Mr. Schonman and Mr. Carter:

And Mr. Tobia and Mr. Stone for the WTB **[*]**

Attached are certain documents relevant to the above-referenced investigation **[*]** --

(i) 5.23.10. Peter Hamer (PH) Curriculum Vitae Jan. '10.
[1] 5.23.10. fr PH. Depriest (1) largest MCT owner, (2) $12 million bond fraud.
[2] 5.23.10. fr PH. Depriest. MCT revenues 2004-2003 well over $70 million.
[3] 5.23.10. fr PH. Ap '10 Crt Complt. Depriest 2003 MCT warrants & income to Phillips group.
[4] 5.23.10. fr PH. '07 Depriest (1) Director BioVentures with massive profits (2) 'our sale' of MCT, etc.
[5] 5.23.10. fr PH. Feb '10- Phillips Group Warrants in MCLM, related to FCC licenses, Depriest MCLM manager.

[6] 5.23.10. fr PH. Aug '09 Third Bank v Depriest, $300k note, false reps, and Chapter 11 likely.
[7] 5.23.10. Aug 2002. MCLM. 1.41 response. auc 61- another copy to FCC Enforcement.

The first 7 attachments (up to item '[7]') add important new evidence to make additionally clear that Donald and Sandra Depriest and MCLM, with John Reardon and Dennis Brown, have for years deliberately and repeatedly violated FCC rules, the Communications Act, and the US criminal code, in submitting numerous fraudulent filings under penalty of perjury before the FCC to obtain AMTS licenses and license-bidding discounts, and in relation to Maritel, Wirelsss Properties of Virginia, and other matters.

(Documents previously submitted, including those with testimony in the case of Oliver Phillips vs. Donald Depriest [that Mr. Phillips won for over $12 million in 2009] further show that Mr. Depriest engaged in wireless license matters before the FCC prior to these AMTS licensing matters, in a similar fashion: hiding other persons with disclosable interests.)

This entirely disqualifies MCLM form holding any geographic (or site-based) AMTS licenses, among other ramifications, based on Section 1.2015, the Commission's decision as to what that rule means when it implemented it (with regard to disqualification for any change in bidder size, or any change in control: both of which MCLM unquestionably engaged in after its Form 175 deadline in Auction 61) other FCC rules, and applicable court precedent. There is no question as to these facts or the applicable law.

These attached documents were sent last week to our office by Peter Harmer of Nashville TN. His resume is attachment '(i)' hereto (and also included in the other attachments behind his

cover statement). He has given me and my companies permission to provide the attached documents to the FCC for purposes of your investigation, as his cover statement explain.

As Mr. Harmer explained to me, he has a long history of direct dealings with Donald Depriest and Mr. Depriest's financing agents and affiliates.

I and my companies have no past or current business or other relations with Mr. Harmer. He contacted us, along with others that have had, in the relevant time period of your investigation, direct financial and business dealings with Donald Depriest, Sandra Depriest, John Reardon, MCLM and affiliated parties.

Notes on the attached documents, that I added, explain some of the more obvious significance to your investigation, including-- in the Auction 61 relevant periods of time -- including--

(1) Donald Depriest (D. Depriest) was the manager officer that is, in real life, executing major business transactions for MCLM. That is an "officer" in fact (under all relevant statutory and case law), regardless of whatever names, re-naming, and games are now employed by Sandra and Donald Depriest to suggest otherwise.
- He and Sandra Depriest and Dennis Brown in fact falsely state otherwise in their sworn FCC filings: that is fraudulent and criminal, apart from a disqualifying violation of FCC rules and the Communications Act.

(2) Donald Depriest was the majority shareholder of, and the Chairman officer of, MCT Corp. (while later called honorary "Chariman" or other such title for FCC cover-up purposes, he acts as an "officer" as that term is defined in statutory and case law). MCT had well over $70 million in gross revenues in the relevant years, as Donald Depriest reports herein.

- He and Sandra Depriest and Dennis Brown in fact falsely state otherwise in their sworn FCC filings: that is fraudulent and criminal, apart from a disqualifying violation of FCC rules and the Communications Act.
- They further falsely recently stated to the FCC they had no ability to obtain MCT records: no one can be the majority shareholder and Chairman and not have the company records for the period of those positions-- even for tax purposes those must be kept.

(3) Donald Depriest was a Director (on the Board) of Bioventures that, he writes in an enclosed document, had "massive profits."
- He and Sandra Depriest and Dennis Brown in fact falsely state otherwise in their sworn FCC filings: that is fraudulent and criminal, apart from a disqualifying violation of FCC rules and the Communications Act.

(4) Donald Depriest, signing as Manager of MCLM, issued warrants in MCLM the day before MCLM had to pay the FCC for its auction 61 high bids, when it borrowed over $730,000 (in addition to past debt), and in issuing the ownership warrants, MCLM did not disclose the control that said ownership would result in, but had a condition that the ownership would not be passed to the warrant holders until "the license" of MCLM was received (this was agreed to on the eve of MCLM paying for the noted FCC license authorizations).

This appears to be a undisclosed controlling interest, or at least one that caused the warrant holders to be affiliates, such as by having ownership sufficient for a board seat or other level of control. This loan was on the very eve of the payment deadline, and leverage was likely in that case. No one accepts warrants that have not described ownership percentage and character: that was undisclosed in the official documents attached, as was the condition that "the license" had to be issued first-- but the Plaintiff attorney stated this condition in

attempting get performance under the warrants, as on attached document shows at the end.
- He and Sandra Depriest and Dennis Brown in fact falsely state otherwise, by lack of disclosure, in many rounds of sword denials as to affiliates and relations of this sort: that is fraudulent and criminal, apart from a disqualifying violation of FCC rules and the Communications Act.

(5) One attachment, a 2009 court judgment and related documents, shows that, to get a $300,000 bank loan in 2007, Donald Depriest made false representations and warranties that there was no government proceedings against him: the Auction 61 proceeding named him directly, as did two court cases against him and MCLM (that were disclosed to the FCC including in the Auction 61 proceeding).
- This is misrepresentation of the status of FCC licensing proceedings, and related court proceedings that the Depriest litigation counsel argued to the courts was fully under FCC exclusive jurisdiction and indeed field preemption under Section 332 of the Communications Act.
- While the Depriest litigation attorneys "at law" are busy bamboozling US and California courts that Depriest will take care of all challenges at the FCC where they belong, and while he hides in those FCC proceedings behind his wife, he tells his lender bank that there are no proceedings at all going on, then uses the loan to pay Dennis Brown to cover up at the FCC.
- - - - -

We have been receiving many other documents -- including from other sources that came to us of their own accord who have direct knowledge of additional facts of decisional importance. Our office will complete review of and then send to you quite a few to you that are also relevant, in the near future, after reconfirming from the sources their permission to provide these on non-confidential or confidential basis, etc.

---

[*] My companies plan to use the attached in the Section 309 petitions to deny and reconsideration proceeding pending before the FCC related to the matters under your investigation at an appropriate point, but it is clear that your investigation is the means that, at this time, the FCC has elected to use regarding the subjects of the Section 309 proceeding. When we use the attached documents in said Section 309 proceeding, we expect to get into analysis of these and related documents.

However, to keep that Section 309 proceeding up to date, we will file this email and its attachments in that proceeding at this time.

That filing will include a service list including companies to whom MCLM is attempting to sell or lease AMTS spectrum: They all have more than sufficient knowledge of the fraud involved to make their purchase and lease attempts deliberate aiding and abetting. Their attorneys cannot mask that, and are also implicated.

Sincerely,
Warren Havens

President
Skybridge Spectrum Foundation

ATLIS Wireless LLC

Environmentel LLC
Verde Systems LLC
Telesaurus Holdings GB LLC
Intelligent Transportation & Monitoring Wireless LLC
Berkeley California

www.scribd.com/warren_havens <http://www.scribd.com/warren_havens> <http://www.scribd.com/warren_havens>

www.atliswireless.com <http://
www.atliswireless.com> <http://
www.atliswireless.com>
www.tetra-us.us <http://www.tetra-us.us>
<http://www.tetra-us.us>
510 841 2220 x 30
510 848 7797 -direct

From:

out of the Jackson firm by end of July at least, if
you don't get it sooner fro

------ End of Forwarded Message