pillsbury

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
2300 N Street, NW | Washington, DC 20037-1122 | tel 202.663.8000 | fax 202.663.8007

Clifford M. Harrington
tel 202.663.8525
clifford.harrington@pillsburylaw.com

June 6, 2014

VIA HAND DELIVERY AND ELECTRONIC MAIL

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

Attn: Mary Beth Murphy, Esq.
Evan Baranoff, Esq.
Raelynn Remy, Esq.
Policy Division
Media Bureau

Re: Status Report
Docket Nos: 13-317 CSR-8866-N
14-33 CSR-8874-C

Dear Ms. Dortch:

We are writing this letter on behalf of Sinclair Television Group, Inc. ("Sinclair"), and its ultimate subsidiary, WNWO Licensee, LLC, to provide the Commission with a further update regarding the status of retransmission consent negotiations between Sinclair and Buckeye Cablevision, Inc. ("Buckeye"), regarding carriage of station WNWO-TV, Toledo, Ohio.

As indicated in the telephone conference among the parties which was conducted on May 21, 2014, and in our prior status report of May 28, 2014, the parties met on April 30, 2014, in Los Angeles to discuss resolution of the current retransmission consent impasse. At that meeting, Buckeye stated that it would provide Sinclair with a new proposal. An additional ten days has passed since the May 28 status report, and Buckeye's promised proposal still has not been received by Sinclair.

Nor has Buckeye responded in any way to Sinclair's May 27, 2014, offer to Buckeye setting forth terms under which Sinclair would agree to grant retransmission consent for carriage of the WNWO-TV signal on Buckeye's Toledo system without any obligation to carry future cable channels that may be launched by Sinclair.

Sinclair submits that it is abundantly clear that Buckeye's claim that Sinclair has refused to negotiate in good faith are hypocritical. It is Buckeye, not Sinclair, which is not negotiating in good faith. Sinclair should not have to defend itself against Buckeye's absurd claims when Buckeye continues to ignore its own obligation to negotiate in good faith. If any entity should be sanctioned in this matter, it should be Buckeye, not Sinclair.

In the telephone conference of May 21, there was an indication that the Commission is actively working on the pending complaints in this matter. If the Commission were to promptly reject Buckeye's unfounded complaint that Sinclair is not negotiating in good faith, then perhaps Buckeye will return to the negotiating table. For this reason, Sinclair requests prompt action on the pending complaint.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. If the staff requires additional information, we would be happy to meet to discuss these proposals in a candid and open fashion.

Very truly yours,

By: _____
Clifford M. Harrington

Counsel to Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc. and its subsidiaries

cc: Michael D. Basile*
Jason E. Rademacher*
ECFS, MB Docket 13-203
ECFS, MB Docket 14-33

*By electronic mail and First Class U.S. Mail