FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Enforcement Bureau Market Disputes Resolution Division 45 L Street NE

Washington, D.C. 20054

EBMDRD.division@fcc.gov

September 6, 2024

Copies sent by E-mail

MUSSIE GEBRE,)
Complainant, v.) Proceeding Number 24-221) Bureau ID Number EB-24-MD-003
LIGHTHOUSE FOR THE BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED,)))
Defendant.)
MUSSIE GEBRE 2648 INTERNATIONAL BLVD #115 OAKLAND, CA 94601 GMUSSIE9@HOTMAIL.COM Pro se Complainant	STEPHEN E. CORAN DAVID S. KEIR F. SCOTT PIPPIN LERMAN SENTER PLLC 2001 L STREET, NW, SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 SCORAN@LERMANSENTER.COM DKEIR@LERMANSENTER.COM SPIPPIN@LERMANSENTER.COM Counsel for Defendant

Dear Mr. Gebre and Counsel:

We have received the Motion to Dismiss (Motion to Dismiss)¹ and the Motion to Suspend Procedural Deadlines and Discovery (Motion to Suspend),² both filed by defendant Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired (Lighthouse). We have also received Mr.

¹ Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief May Be Granted, Proceeding No. 24-221, Bureau ID No. EB-24-MD-003 (filed September 4, 2024).

² Motion to Suspend Procedural Deadlines and Discovery, Proceeding No. 24-221, Bureau ID No. EB-24-MD-003 (filed September 4, 2024).

Gebre's Opposition to the motions (Opposition).³ Lighthouse contends that a prior-filed complaint in state court in California contains claims substantially overlapping with the allegations here.⁴ In addition, Lighthouse alleges that the FCC lacks authority to provide the relief sought by Mr. Gebre.⁵ In the Opposition, Mr. Gebre asserts that Lighthouse is employing "stalling tactics" to "escape accountability" for its alleged misdeeds.⁶ In light of the issues raised in the Motion to Dismiss, however, we find that the interests of justice would be served, and the parties' resources conserved, by thoroughly considering the parties' arguments before requiring further submissions from the parties. We therefore grant the Motion to Suspend. We now suspend the schedule for this proceeding⁷ so that we may consider the Motion to Dismiss and the Opposition thereto.⁸

We issue this letter ruling under sections 4(i), 4(j), and 208 of the Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 208, sections 1.3, 1.46, 1.720-1.740 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR §§ 1.3, 1.46, and 1.720-1.740, and the authority delegated in sections 0.111 and 0.311 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.111, 0.311.

Sincerely,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Enforcement Bureau Market Disputes Resolution Division

³ Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, Proceeding No. 24-221, Bureau ID No. EB-24-MD-003 (filed September 5, 2024). The Opposition appears to oppose the Motion to Dismiss and the Motion to Suspend, so it will be treated as an opposition to both motions.

⁴ See Motion to Dismiss at 11-12.

⁵ See id. at 9-11.

⁶ Opposition at 1-2.

⁷ See Notice of Formal Complaint from Enforcement Bureau, Market Disputes Resolution Division, to Mussie Gebre, Complainant, and Sharon Giovinazzo, Lighthouse, Proceeding No. 24-221, Bureau ID No. EB-24-MD-003 (dated Aug. 1, 2024) (Notice of Formal Complaint) (establishing the schedule for proceedings); Email from Adam Suppes, Enforcement Bureau, Market Disputes Resolution Division, to Mussie Gebre, Complainant, and Liam Gaarder Feingold and David Keir, Lighthouse, Proceeding No. 24-221, Bureau ID No. EB-24-MD-003 (dated Aug. 26, 2024) (revising the schedule for proceedings established in the Notice of Formal Complaint).

⁸ See 47 CFR § 1.729(d).