

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of:)	
)	
Carriage Complaint Against)	
)	
Armstrong Utilities, Inc.)	Docket No. 12-364
)	File No. CSR-8752-M
by)	
)	
Western Pacific Broadcast, LLC)	
)	
With Respect to Carriage Within the)	
Philadelphia, PA Designated Market Area,)	
of Local Commercial Television Station WACP,)	
Licensed to Atlantic City, New Jersey)	

Directed to: The Chief, Media Bureau

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO REPLY TO
OPPOSITION TO
PETITION FOR SPECIAL RELIEF
BY ORDER OF CARRIAGE**

Western Pacific Broadcast, LLC (“Western Pacific”), pursuant to Rule 1.46, hereby respectfully requests that the Bureau grant Western Pacific an extension ending on August 30, 2013, in which to file its reply to the opposition submitted by Armstrong Utilities, Inc. (“Armstrong”), as supplemented by Armstrong on June 28, 2013, (collectively the “Opposition”) to Western Pacific’s above-captioned petition for an order requiring Armstrong to carry local commercial television station WACP in accordance with the Commission’s must carry rules and policies on Armstrong’s cable system(s) within the Philadelphia, PA designated market area for the remaining duration of the current must carry election cycle, expiring December 31, 2014.¹

The Opposition alleges that that Armstrong does not receive a good quality signal at Armstrong's principal headend. Western Pacific's consulting engineer and Armstrong's engineer have had discussions concerning the signal strength. And, at the expense of Western Pacific installation of equipment (filter and preamp) was installed to overcome any concern with signal deficiency issues. Armstrong was willing to permit installation of the equipment and tests. The equipment was installed and tests made, but the engineers will need additional time to conduct further tests as Western Pacific is replacing the exciter/modulator in the WACP transmitter as that equipment was unstable. The installation of the new exciter/modulator equipment is expected to resolve the concerns as to signal quality. If this new WACP equipment along with the filter/preamp function as Western Pacific believes it will, the test results could resolve the controversy between Western Pacific and Armstrong, without the need for the Bureau to dedicate its resources to the consideration of the pleadings and the development of an order to formally resolve this dispute. Moreover, the grant of this motion could only harm the movant, Western Pacific, who is the party requesting action by the Bureau, and is for a very short duration. For these reasons, the grant of this motion would be in the public interest. The undersigned contacted the office of counsel for Armstrong to seek authorization for Western Pacific to represent that Armstrong is aware of the intention of Western Pacific to file this motion and will not interpose an objection to this motion. The primary counsel for Armstrong is traveling and a response has not yet been received.

WHEREFORE, the foregoing premises considered, Western Pacific Broadcast, LLC hereby respectfully requests that the Bureau grant the additional time requested for Western Pacific Broadcast, LLC to submit its reply in the above-captioned matter.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERN PACIFIC BROADCAST LLC

By: 

M. Scott Johnson
Thomas J. Dougherty, Jr.
Its Counsel

FLETCHER, HEALD & HILDRETH, PLC
1300 North 17th Street, Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 812-0400

July 8, 2013

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Valerie Admana, hereby certify that on this 8th day of July, 2013, I caused a copy of the foregoing "Motion for Extension of Time to Reply to Opposition to Petition for Special Relief by Order of Carriage" to be served via U.S. mail, postage prepaid, and email upon the following entity:

Christopher C. Cinnamon, Esq.
Cinnamon Mueller
307 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 1020
Chicago, IL 60601

cccinnamon@cm-chi.com



Valerie Admana