



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

October 21, 2014

Mr. Bob Terpstra
15065 Michelangelo Blvd. #106
Delray Beach, FL 33466

Fox Television Stations, Inc.
c/o Joseph M. Di Scipio, Esq.
444 North Capital Street, NW
Suite 740
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Application for Renewal of License
WUTB(TV), Baltimore, MD, BRCT-
20120531AJL, ID No. 60552, *et al.*

Dear Mr. Terpstra:

This is in regard to the letter you wrote objecting to the applications filed by Fox Television Stations, Inc. for renewal of the licenses of stations WUTB(TV), Baltimore, MD, File No. BRCT-20120531AJL; WTTG(TV), Washington, DC, File No. BRCT-20120531AKE; WDCA(TV), File No. BRCT-20120531AKK. For the reasons stated below your objection is dismissed.

In your letter you stated that you hope that the Commission will deny the “[R]enewal of the operator’s license to Rupert and James Murdoch based on their blatant unfitness for same and their propensity to use their airwaves to advance their narrow partisan political causes.”

Section 309(k)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the “Act”), states that the Commission shall grant a license renewal application if it finds, with respect to that station, that (a) the station has served the public interest, convenience, and necessity; (b) there have been no serious violations by the licensee of the Communications Act or Commission rules and regulations; and (c) there have been no other violations by the licensee of the Act or Commission rules or regulations which, taken together, would constitute a pattern of abuse.¹ The Commission analyzes any public interest allegation according to a two-step process. The petition must first contain specific allegations of fact sufficient to show that such a grant would be prima facie inconsistent with the public interest.² If so, the Commission will designate the application for hearing when the allegations, together with any opposing evidence before the

¹ 47 U.S.C. §309(k)(1).

² 47 U.S.C. §309(d)(1); *Astroline Communications Co. Ltd. Partnership v. FCC*, 857 F.2d 1556 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

Commission, raise a substantial and material question of fact as to whether grant would serve the public interest, or if the Commission is otherwise unable to conclude that granting the application would serve the public interest.³ We find that the Objection fails to establish a *prima facie* case that grant of the renewal application would disserve the public interest.

Your letter does not contain any specific allegations of fact regarding the Murdochs, Fox Television Stations, Inc. or the stations at issue. Therefore, there is no basis for denying the renewals on which we can rule.

Accordingly, the Informal Objection filed against the applications for renewal of by Bob Terpstra WUTB(TV), Baltimore, MD, File No. BRCT-20120531AJL; WTTG(TV), Washington, DC, File No. BRCT-20120531AKE; WDCA(TV), File No. BRCT-20120531AKK **IS DISMISSED.**

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Kreisman
Chief, Video Division
Media Bureau

³ *Astroline*, 857 F.2d at 1561; 47 U.S.C. §309(e).