

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAILED
SEP 21 2010
FCC Mail Room

Before the
Federal Commissions Commission
Washington, D. C. 20554

FCC 10M -07
08564

In the Matter of)	WT Docket No. 08-20
)	
WILLIAM F. CROWELL)	File No. 0002928684
)	
)	
Application to renew License for)	
Amateur Radio Service Station W6WBJ)	
)	

ORDER

Issued: September 15, 2010

Released: September 15, 2010

On August 30, 2010, Mr. Crowell served by mail (courtesy copies e-mailed) his pleading styled "Applicant's Reply to Order to Show Cause and Petition to Disqualify ALJ." Mr. Crowell represents that his pleading is in response to a directive in the Presiding Judge's *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, FCC 10M-04, released July 29, 2010, to wit:

William F. Crowell SHALL SHOW CAUSE as to why there should be no abuse of process issues added.

The only pleading that could be responsive to the directive in *FCC 10M-04* would be a Reply to Order to Show Cause. But a Petition to Disqualify ALJ was incorporated into the same pleading, without authorization, and in violation of *FCC 10-04* which was limited to a singular pleading. Mr. Crowell's disqualification assertions and arguments are conspicuously intertwined with his show cause narrative so as to confound the pleading, compound the confusion, and cause undue hardship and complexity for Bureau counsel who would be attempting to formulate a concise pleading.

Ruling

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Mr. Crowell shall file separately on **September 23, 2010**, his Reply to Order to Show Cause as a stand-alone pleading that does not include or incorporate any Petition to Disqualify.¹

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any Petition to Disqualify may be filed only as a separate pleading.²

¹ 47 C.F.R §1.44 (Separate pleadings are required for different requests). A Reply to Order to Show Cause is a pleading concerning a different subject than a Petition to Disqualify which, if denied by a presiding judge, would trigger interlocutory Commission action. See §1.44(a).

² 47 C.F.R. § 0.341 (b) (Presiding Judge may raise procedural issues that could be requested by a party).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pleadings filed by Mr. Crowell in this proceeding exceeding 10 pages must include a Summary that is *"suitably paragraphed, which should be a succinct, but accurate and clear condensation of the substance of the filing."*³ (Emphasis added.)

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Counsel for the Enforcement Bureau SHALL NOT FILE a responsive pleading to the *doppelganged* pleading dated August 30, 2010, and styled "Applicant's Reply to Order to Show Cause and Petition to Disqualify ALJ," which IS STRICKEN from consideration without prejudice to refile by **September 23, 2010**, in accordance with the ruling herein.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard L. Sippel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "R".

Richard L. Sippel
Chief Administrative Law Judge

³ 47 C.F.R §1.49(c). The "Summary" in the pleading filed by Mr. Crowell on July 29 failed to meet those requirements.