UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

DOCKETING STATEMENT

Case]	Name:	<u>Puert</u>	o Rice	Telephone Co. v. FCC et al.
Appea	al No.	(if ava	ilable)	: _18-9567 (MCP No. 155)
Court	/Ageno	су Арр	ealing	From:Federal Communications Commission ("FCC")_
Court	/Ageno	ey Doc	ket No	.: <u>FCC 18-133 (WT Dkt. No. 17-79, WC Dkt. No. 17-84</u>
Distri	ct Judg	ge: <u>N</u>	JA_	
Party	or Part	ties Fil	ing No	tice of Appeal/Petition:
Pue	rto Ric	e Tele	phone (Company Inc., d/b/a Claro ("PRTC")_
I.	TIME	ELINE	SS OF	APPEAL OR PETITION FOR REVIEW
	A.	APP	EAL F	FROM DISTRICT COURT
		1.	Date	notice of appeal filed:
			a.	Was a motion filed for an extension of time to file the notice of appeal? If so, give the filing date of the motion, the date of any order disposing of the motion, and the deadline for filing notice of appeal:
			b.	Is the United States or an officer or an agency of the United States a party to this appeal?
		2.	Auth	ority fixing time limit for filing notice of appeal:
				o. 4 (a)(1)(A) Fed. R. App. 4(a)(6) o. 4 (a)(1)(B) Fed. R. App. 4(b)(1)

Fed. I	R. App.	. 4 (a)(2) Fed. R. App. 4(b)(3)				
Fed. I	R. App.	4 (a)(3) Fed. R. App. 4(b)(4)				
Fed. I	R. App.	. 4 (a)(4) Fed. R. App. 4(c)				
		4 (a)(5)				
Other						
3.		final judgment or order to be reviewed was entered on the et court docket:				
4.	Does the judgment or order to be reviewed dispose of all claims by					
••		gainst all parties? See Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).				
		wer to Question 4 above is no, please answer g questions in this section.)				
	a.	If not, did district court direct entry of judgment in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b)? When was this done?				
	b.	If the judgment or order is not a final disposition, is it appealable under 28 U.S.C. ' 1292(a)?				
	c.	If none of the above applies, what is the specific statutory basis for determining that the judgment or order is appealable?				
5.	Tollir	ng Motions. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A); 4(b)(3)(A).				
	a.	Give the filing date of any motion that tolls the time to appear pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A) or 4(b)(3)(A):				
	b.	Has an order been entered by the district court disposing of any such motion, and, if so, when?				
6.	Cross	Appeals.				

a. If this is a cross appeal, what relief do you seek beyond preserving the judgment below? *See United Fire & Cas. Co. v. Boulder Plaza Residential, LLC*, 633 F.3d 951, 958 (10th

Cir. 2011)(addressing jurisdictional validity of conditional

		cross appeals).					
		b. If you do not seek relief beyond an alternative basis for affirmance, what is the jurisdictional basis for your appeal? See Breakthrough Mgt. Group, Inc. v. Chukchansi Gold Casino and Resort, 629 F.3d 1173, 1196-98 and n. 18 (10th Cir. 2010)(discussing protective or conditional cross appeals)					
В.	with	VIEW OF AGENCY ORDER (To be completed only in connection a petitions for review or applications for enforcement filed directly with court of appeals.)					
	1.	Date petition for review was filed:10/25/2018					
	2.	Date of the order to be reviewed: _10/15/2018_					
	3.	Specify the statute or other authority granting the court of appeals jurisdiction to review the order:47 U.S.C. § 402(a), 28 U.S.C. §§ 2342(1), 2344					
	4.	Specify the time limit for filing the petition (cite specific statutory section or other authority): 60 days. See 28 U.S.C. § 2344; 47 C.F.R § 1.4(b).					
C.	API	PEAL OF TAX COURT DECISION					
	1.	Date notice of appeal was filed: (If notice was filed by mail, attach proof of postmark.)					
	2.	Time limit for filing notice of appeal:					
	3.	Date of entry of decision appealed:					
	4.	Was a timely motion to vacate or revise a decision made under the Tax Court=s Rules of Practice, and if so, when? <i>See</i> Fed. R. App. P. 13(a)					

II. LIST ALL RELATED OR PRIOR RELATED APPEALS IN THIS COURT WITH APPROPRIATE CITATION(S). If none, please so state.

Sprint Corporation, v. FCC, et al., No. 18-9563 (MCP No. 155) (10th Cir.) Verizon Communications, v. FCC, et al., No. 18-9566 (MCP No. 155) (10th Cir.) City of San Jose, et al. v. FCC et al., No. 18-9568 (MCP No. 155) (10th Cir.) City of Seattle, et al. v. FCC, et al., No. 18-9571 (MCP No. 155) (10th Cir.) City of Huntington Beach, et al. v. FCC, et al., No. 18-9572 (MCP No. 155) (10th Cir.)

III. GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE UNDERLYING CASE AND RESULT BELOW.

This petition for review involves a final order of the Federal Communications Commission captioned *In re Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order, WT Docket No. 17-79, WC Docket No. 17-84, FCC 18-133 (rel. Sept. 27, 2018) ("Order"). The Order was published in the Federal Register on October 15, 2018. *See* 83 Fed. Reg. 51867.

In the Order, the FCC issued guidance and adopted rules to streamline the wireless infrastructure siting review process in order to facilitate the deployment of wireless facilities, including fifth-generation or "5G" facilities. Despite substantial evidence in the record supporting the need for the FCC to adopt a "deemed granted" remedy when authorities subject applications for wireless infrastructure siting to unreasonable delays or effective prohibitions, the FCC declined to adopt such a remedy. PRTC, which participated in the proceeding below, is the largest provider of telecommunications services in Puerto Rico and must deploy wireless facilities. PRTC is aggrieved by the Order and possesses standing to challenge it.

IV. IDENTIFY TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS, THE ISSUES TO BE RAISED IN THIS APPEAL.

PRTC seeks relief on the grounds that the FCC's decision not to adopt a "deemed granted" remedy is (1) arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion within the meaning of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.; (2) inconsistent with sections 253 and 332 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 253, 332; and (3) otherwise contrary to law. Accordingly, PRTC respectfully requests that this Court remand the relevant portion of the Order to the FCC, without vacatur, and with instructions for the FCC to adopt a "deemed granted" remedy as soon as is practicable.

Date Filed: 11/12/2018 Appellate Case: 18-9567 Document: 010110082312 Page: 5

V. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN CRIMINAL APPEALS.

A. Does this appeal involve review under 18 U.S.C. ' 3742(a) or (b) of sentence imposed?				
В.	If the answer to A (immediately above) is yes, does the defendant also challenge the judgment of conviction?			
C.	Describe the sentence imposed.			
D.	Was the sentence imposed after a plea of guilty?			
Е.	If the answer to D (immediately above) is yes, did the plea agreement include a waiver of appeal and/or collateral challenges?			
F.	Is defendant on probation or at liberty pending appeal?			
G.	If the defendant is incarcerated, what is the anticipated release date if the judgment of conviction is fully executed?			
Н.	Does this appeal involve the November 1, 2014 retroactive amendments to §§ 2D1.1 and 2D1.11 of the U.S. Sentencing Commission's Guidelines Manual, which reduced offense levels for certain drug trafficking offenses?			

NOTE:

In the event expedited review is requested and a motion to that effect is filed, the defendant shall consider whether a transcript of any portion of the trial court proceedings is necessary for the appeal. Necessary transcripts must be ordered by completing and delivering the transcript order form to the Clerk of the district court with a copy filed in the court of appeals.

VI. ATTORNEY FILING DOCKETING STATEMENT:

Name: Megan L. Broggi Telephone: 202.719.7000										
Firm: Wiley Rein LLP										
Email Address: <u>mbrown@wileyrein.com</u>										
Address: <u>1776 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006</u>										
A.		EASE IDENTIFY ON WHOSE BEHALF THE DOCKETING ATEMENT IS FILED:								
		Appellant								
	X	Petitioner								
		Cross-Appellant								
B. PLEASE IDENTIFY WHETHER THE FILING COUNSEL IS										
	X	Retained Attorney								
		Court-Appointed								
		Employed by a government entity								
		(please specify)						
		Employed by the Office of the Fed	deral Public D	efender.						
_/s Megan L. BrownNovember 12, 2018										
Signature Date										

NOTE:

A copy of the final judgment or order appealed from, any pertinent findings and conclusions, opinions, or orders, any tolling motion listed in Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A) or 4(b)(3)(A) and the dispositive order(s), any motion for extension of time to file notice of appeal and the dispositive order **must be submitted with the Docketing Statement.**

The Docketing Statement must be filed with the Clerk via the court's Electronic Case Filing System (ECF). Instructions and information regarding ECF can be found on the court's website, www.ca10.uscourts.gov.

This Docketing Statement must be accompanied by proof of service.

The following Certificate of Service may be used.

Appellate Case: 18-9567 Document: 010110082312 Date Filed: 11/12/2018 Page: 8

CERTIFICATE OF DIGITAL SUBMISSION

In accordance with the Court's CM/ECF User Manual, I hereby certify that (1) all required privacy redactions have been made pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 25(a)(5) and Tenth Circuit Rule 25.5; (2) hard copies of this pleading that may be required to be submitted to the Court are exact copies of the ECF filing; and (3) this submission has been scanned for viruses with the most recent version of a commercial virus scanning program, Cylance PROTECT version 2.0.1490.27, last updated on September 13, 2018, and, according to the program, is free of viruses.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Megan L. Brown

Megan L. Brown WILEY REIN LLP

1776 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006 (202) 719-7000

mbrown@wileyrein.com

Counsel for Petitioner

November 12, 2018

Appellate Case: 18-9567 Document: 010110082312 Date Filed: 11/12/2018 Page: 9

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Megan L. Brown, hereby certify that on November 12, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system.

I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users, that their names and email addresses appear in the docket of this case, and that service will therefore be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Megan L. Brown

Megan L. Brown
WILEY REIN LLP
1776 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 719-7000
mbrown@wileyrein.com

Counsel for Petitioner

November 12, 2018