

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

Start 2/15/2005	Suspend: 4/20/2005	Status CLOSE	HQ:	Local:	Agent
COMPLAINANT			SUBJECT		
Name:	[REDACTED]		LARRY KAUFMAN		
Company:	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		
Address:	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		
City:	[REDACTED]	ST:	San Diego	ST:	CA
Geo:	[REDACTED]	Zip:	[REDACTED]	Zip:	[REDACTED]
Phone:	[REDACTED]	Aux:	[REDACTED]	Aux:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		
P_Address:	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		
Notes:	[REDACTED] is now Meryll Lynch as of 6-19-06.		Bus: Blind Speed, 6638 University Ave., SD, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is no longer in service		
Source:	Archived	Freq:	[REDACTED]	:Freq	<input type="checkbox"/> Complaint
Safety:	Non-Safety	Call:	[REDACTED]	:Call	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential
Special:	None	Entity:	Archived	:Entity	<input type="checkbox"/> Congressional
Utility:	[REDACTED]	To:	Archived	:From	<input type="checkbox"/> Info. Request
Problem Description:	HEEE IX problem from next door neighbor. San Diego		[REDACTED]	:ASR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interference
			[REDACTED]	:Lat.	[REDACTED]:XCity
			[REDACTED]	:Long	[REDACTED]:XState

WORK EVENTS

EventDate	Agent	Event Type	WeUtility
2/15/2005	[REDACTED]	OPEN	
<p>Prob. Resolution: Complainant sent [REDACTED] an e-mail complaint re radio & TV IX allegedly from his neighbor Mr. Kauffman. Complainant said that SDG&E determined that the IX was emanating from Kauffman's home. 4 Condos located in the vicinity turned off all the power in their home and the IX wasn't eliminated until Kauffman turned his off.</p> <p>[REDACTED] sent e-mail message to WG and he asked [REDACTED] to handle. [REDACTED] sent an e-mail message to the complainant asking him various questions re the IX and included names, address & phone numbers of any neighbors that are also experiencing IX.</p> <p>[REDACTED] sent various e-mails and provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The IX is described as intermittent streaks of white noise w/snow on TV and a buzzing sound. - The IX affects TV channels 2 and to a lesser extent 3,4,5, and 6 at times. - The interference is present when it is not connected to the cable system. Also, the Cox technician checked the cable from the outside connection and there was no IX to his TV monitor. - The IX is not present 24 hours. The IX is intermittent and he has kept a log. [REDACTED] REQUESTED A COPY OF THE LOG. - He said that the neighbors agreed to turn their power off one by one (4 condos) and [REDACTED] noted that the IX cleared on his TV when his neighbor/subject Kaufman turned off his power. However, 			

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

Mr. Kaufman will not do anything else to isolate what is causing the IX.
- The SDG&E technician (Paul 858-581-7581) came to his location and said the IX was coming from Kaufman's Utility closet and/or his garage.
- Cox cable conducted a field visit and determined that there were no problems with their equipment.
- He is the only one that is experiencing IX from Kaufman.

sent him an e-mail and advised calls would be made to Cox & SDG&E and we would evaluate whether a field visit is necessary to his location.

2/16/2005 UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: called from SDG&E re the Nunez complaint. left a message on his voice mail to call JG back tomorrow.

received a reply from 's e-mail requesting his log of the IX. said he'll fax it to tomorrow.

2/17/2005 UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: called back and said that he advised the complainant to ascertain whether it was possible to shut down the power for each condo unit to determine which condo was the source of his IX. said that told him that he met with the property manager and they did shut down the power for the condos one by one and learned the IX disappeared after turning his neighbor's (Kauffman) condo power off.

said he is not sure of the source of his IX. He thinks it may be a piece of communications equipment. The IX sounds like a beeping noise similar to that of an answering machine. said he didn't see the TVI on Mr. set, however, he did hear the IX in the AM band.

sent log of the IX. sent him a response and asked him when was the best time to conduct a field visit when the subject was most likely to be at home.

2/24/2005 UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: called complainant and left a message on his work voice mail to call back. advised that we would like to make a field visit to his location on Monday, 2/28, at an hour when his neighbor/subject is most likely to be home.

Subject is home at approximately 5PM. advised we would make a field visit to his location on 2/28/05.

2/28/2005 ON SCENE

Prob. Resolution: and conducted field visit to complainant's home and observed the interference on his TV and FM IX to his stereo. DD traced interference to a coaxial cable that was in a storage cabinet of his neighbor's (Kaufman) home. Subject Kaufman arrived home and DD introduced himself and explained that he traced IX coming from a coaxial cable in his storage closet. Kaufman confirmed that the cable was probably leading to his home. However, he would not offer any assistance in tracing which device was causing the IX.

He said he felt he should call his lawyer for his advice since he didn't want anyone in his home. DD did show Kaufman the signal

3/11/2005 UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: Citation drafted & sent

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

3/28/2005 [REDACTED] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] returned complainant's call of last week. [REDACTED] was on leave the week of 3/21/05. [REDACTED] said he called to advise that he still has his interference. Nothing has changed.

[REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] that a letter was sent to [REDACTED] on 3/11/05 via CM-RRR and via regular mail. [REDACTED] advised that FCC/SD had not received a signed receipt that [REDACTED] had received the certified letter. However, the letter sent to him via regular mail was not returned. Per DD/SD, [REDACTED] also advised that DD would be reviewing his case this week and determine what further action to take. [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] with the SD #858-496-5111 and asked him to call the DD on Friday re the status.

4/7/2005 [REDACTED] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: 4-6-05

[REDACTED] and I went to [REDACTED] residence at about 4:50 pm. We saw the pulsing IX on cable channels 2, 3, 4, and 6. Channel two was the only station in which the audio was being affected. I took a video recording of the IX with my digital camera.

I used the Rohde & Schwarz and a whip antenna to find the IX in the radio spectrum between 54 MHz to 59 MHz. I got the strongest signal at the coax cable hanging in the utility closet next to Mr. Kaufman's front door. [REDACTED] said it was the same cable that [REDACTED] found was the source of the IX during an earlier visit. I also used the battery powered TV to see and hear the IX on TV ch 6 and confirmed that the IX was radiating from the non-terminated coax cable.

Mrs. Kaufman arrived at about 5:30 pm. [REDACTED] asked Mrs. Kaufman for her assistance in resolving the IX. Then Mr. Kaufman came out of his residence. I pointed out to Mr. Kaufman that the IX was radiating from the coax cable. Mr. Kaufman said that was not his cable that it was Cox's. [REDACTED] asked if the cable went into his residence. Mr. Kaufman said that the cable went to all the units. I asked [REDACTED] if Cox had checked out the cable causing the IX. She didn't think so. I said we should find out from Cox about the cable.

[REDACTED] asked Mr. Kaufman if he would be willing to arrange to meet with us and Cox. Mr. Kaufman said yes.

[REDACTED] got two phone numbers to contact Mr. Kaufman.

Mr. Kaufman said he was upset that his neighbor, [REDACTED], turned off his power without his knowledge or consent.

I took pictures of the cable drop.

4-7-05:

I left a message on [REDACTED] voice mail if he had a contact name and number for the Cox cable tech that came to his residence.

4/12/2005 [REDACTED] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: I called [REDACTED] Network Operations Manager, Cox Comm, re the IX case.

[REDACTED] said he would send a technician out to the residence and terminate the open ended coax cable from which the IX is radiating.

[REDACTED] said the tech should be able to make it out there tomorrow and that [REDACTED] would get make to me by the end of the week.

I e-mailed the two photos I took of the radiating cable to [REDACTED] along with [REDACTED] name and address, and Kaufman's name and address.

I told [REDACTED] about Cox's plan to terminate the cable which should fix the problem. She said she would call [REDACTED] and ask him to check his TV for IX when he gets back into town later this month.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

4/12/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] called [REDACTED] to advise that Cox cable would be coming out either today or tomorrow to terminate their cable connection in the utility closet located in front of subject Kaufman's front door. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] to call her tomorrow morning re the status of his complaint. Complainant said he would call [REDACTED] on 4/13/05. He said he is leaving town from 4/14/05 - 4/24/05.

[REDACTED] also sent him an e-mail with the reminder to check on the IX and asked to send JG an e-mail message since [REDACTED] will be in El Centro on 4/14/05 for a meeting.

4/18/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] called Kaufman at 8:45 AM to schedule an appointment to go to his condo w/cable company. Mrs. Kaufman answered and said her husband was sleeping and said she would leave him a message re the appointment w/FCC and cable company. [REDACTED] advised Mrs. Kaufman that we would like to come tomorrow (4/19) at 5PM. Mrs. Kaufman was on her way to work when [REDACTED] called. Therefore, she said she would also call Mr. Kaufman to relay the message. [REDACTED] left the FCC 5111 number and asked that they call that number to confirm the appointment with either [REDACTED]

4/19/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: Mr. Kaufman called and said he had a [REDACTED] and wouldn't be able to meet us this week. He asked if we would need to enter his residence. I said probably. He said he expects to feel better next week, so he asked me to call him next week.

4/25/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Mr. Kaufman. [REDACTED]
I said we would go ahead and see what we can do from the outside.
Mr. Kaufman said has [REDACTED] appointment today, and asked me to call him tomorrow.
I said I would.

4/26/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Mr. Kaufman.
[REDACTED]
I asked if I should call back tomorrow.
He said that would be fine.

4/27/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Mr. Kaufman and got his voice mail. I left a message asking him to call me back.

5/2/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Mr. Kaufman and got his voice mail. I left my phone number and e-mail address.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

5/10/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 5-9-05:

I met Cox cable techs [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at 5:00pm at [REDACTED]'s residence. They saw the IX on [REDACTED]'s TV. After extensively looking over their system, they decided to run a new cable from the drop in the utility closet outside of Mr. Kaufman's residence into [REDACTED]'s residence. [REDACTED] said he wasn't sure if that would get rid of [REDACTED]'s TV interference, but [REDACTED] agreed to have it done for no cost.

[REDACTED] also subscribes to Cox broadband and their phone service.)

[REDACTED] said he gets interference for his FM radio reception, particularly, KSDS, 88.3 MHz. He tuned his stereo to 88.3 MHz, and I could hear the pulsing IX coming over KSDS's signal.

I walked around in front of the garage doors with the Rohde & Schwarz FSH-3 and a whip antenna. I was getting the strongest IX signal in front of Mr. Kaufman's garage, on the left hand side of the garage (left as looking at the garage door from the outside).

[REDACTED] called his neighbors at [REDACTED], the other next door neighbor to Mr. Kaufman, and got their permission to turn off their power. While looking at the IX on the FSH-3, I turned off the power to [REDACTED], and the IX remained on the air.

I rang Mr. Kaufman's front door bell. Mr. Kaufman came to the door, but didn't open it. I told the interfering signal was radiating out of his "garage". I told him I didn't know what it was, but that it would only take a few minutes to determine what it was and he would let me inside. Mr. Kaufman said he had [REDACTED] and said he didn't have a few minutes. I asked if his wife would be able to assist. He said his wife was not at home. I asked if we could arrange sometime tomorrow to meet him and/or his wife. He asked me to phone him at 10:00 am after his [REDACTED] appointment. I said I would.

[REDACTED] asked about what could be done in regards to getting rid of the IX. I described to him the process of issuing a NAL, NOF, and US Attorney referral. I told him if Mr. Kaufman wasn't "sobered up" by the NAL to cooperate, then it would be a very long process to get a resolution. Mr. Nunez said that it sounded like it would take well over a year, and I said it would.

5-10-05:

I sent Sam an e-mail asking for Mrs. Kaufman's license plate number. He replied that he would send it. He also the IX returned last night.

I phoned Mr. Kaufman's cell number. I got a voice mail and left a message and my phone number.

5/16/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 5-11-05:

Mr. Kaufman called and left a message on my voice mail.

5-16-05:

I called Mr. Kaufman and left a message asking if we could arrange something for May 23, 24, or 25.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

6/30/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 6-29-05:

[REDACTED] and I went to Kaufman's to request an inspection. We arrived at about 5pm.

I saw Kaufman's van parked along the complex's street (in the opposite direction from the 'normal' parking area). Kaufman's next door neighbor at [REDACTED] said Kaufman wasn't home. I told him that Kaufman's van was parked nearby. He said Kaufman had more than one van (I believed it at the time but now think it was bad info). I rang Kaufman's doorbell several times. No one answered.

At about 6pm I rang the doorbell several more times. Again no one answered. At about 6:20 pm while in the Tahoe in the 'normal' parking area, I saw Kaufman exit his residence and walk towards his van. I drove the Tahoe to where Kaufman's van was parked. [REDACTED] was in the passenger seat. The van was facing us as we drove to it. [REDACTED] was waving at Kaufman and Kaufman did make eye contact with me. I stopped the Tahoe right next to the passenger's side window, but then a couple of seconds later Kaufman drove away. We waited another half hour for Kaufman or his wife to show up, neither one did.

6/30/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 6-29-05:

[REDACTED] and I went to attempt an inspection of Kaufman's residence.

We arrived at Kaufman's residence at about 5:00 pm. I rang the doorbell three times. No one answered the door.

I saw what I thought was Kaufman's business van parked near his residence. I asked Kaufman's next door neighbor at [REDACTED] if Kaufman was home. He said he didn't think so. I said I saw the van. The neighbor said Kaufman more than one van.

[REDACTED] and I waited for Mr. or Mrs. Kaufman to come home. Around 6:00 pm I rang the doorbell three times. No one answered.

At about 6:15pm we saw Kaufman leave his residence and walk to where the van was parked. I drove overthere. Just as Paul and I pulled up alongside Kaufman he drove away.

[REDACTED] and I waited another 30 minutes. I watched one door and [REDACTED] watched the other, but we didn't see Mr. or Mrs Kaufman.

7/14/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 7-13-05:

[REDACTED] and I went to Kaufman's to request an inspection. We arrived at about 5pm. Kaufman's van was parked in the normal parking area.

I rang his doorbell several times. I also yelled "Mr. Kaufman" several times into his white screen door. No one answered.

At about 6pm, I rang the doorbell several more times and again yelled "Mr. Kaufman" several times. No one answered.

We departed.

7-14-05:

[REDACTED] and I agreed to go back Monday, 7-18-05, at about 7:30 pm.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

7/19/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 7-18-05:

[REDACTED] and I went to Kaufman's residence to request an inspection. As we drove to his residence I didn't see either Kaufman's or his wife's van. We were waiting in the parking lot when Mr. Kaufman drove up.

When Mr. Kaufman got out of his van I went up to him and made an official request for an inspection. He initially did not want to allow the inspection, so I told him that he would get a seven thousand dollar fine. I told him the choice of allowing an inspection or getting the fine was his.

He agreed to allow the inspection.

We entered his residence at about 7:15 pm.

We found that the strongest radiated signal was in Kaufman's den. I asked Kaufman to turn off breakers. He said he did (neither [REDACTED] or myself were watching him), but the signal did not go away. I turned off the power to his entertainment center, which included the satellite receiver, but the signal did not go away. I unplugged the RF connection to the satellite rx and plugged it into the spectrum analyzer and the signal was much stronger (10 to 20 dB) than the radiated emission.

I asked Kaufman if there was a junction box that the coax cable went to. He seemed to think that the cable went directly to the satellite antenna. He said there was no power going to the satellite antenna.

We went upstairs and I climbed onto the roof to look at the satellite antenna. I could pick up some radiated emission of the IX signal, but not as strong as down in the den. There were four cables hooked up to the satellite antenna. Three were connected using barrels. I unplugged each of these and found the IX signal was approximately the same level on each cable. One cable I wasn't able to disconnect, because it went into the antenna and I had no way to find where it was connected. The antenna was an Egel Aspen.

We went back downstairs. I asked Mr. Kaufman to turn off the breakers again. I watched as he turned them off. [REDACTED] was watching the spectrum analyzer, and said the signal went away. We found that when the lower left breaker was turned off the signal sent away. The refrigerator and a pest control device were also losing power when the breaker was turned off. There was no indication on the breaker what that breaker was for. The breaker panel was in the downstairs hall behind a picture just outside of the den.

We left his residence at 8:15 pm.

7-19-05:

I sent an e-mail to DirectTV via their website, in which I mentioned the interference and asked them to contact me.

7/22/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I found in [REDACTED]'s rolodex a DirectTV contact: [REDACTED], System Engineering, El Segundo, CA, 3 [REDACTED]

I phoned [REDACTED] number. I left a voice mail message re a DirectTV installation causing IX to his neighbor with an emission on TV channel 2.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

7/25/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] called back. He said there is an LNB in the feed horn. I told him that I cut power to the receiver, but that didn't get rid of the IX. I asked him if the power runs directly from the receiver to the dish. He said usually, but he didn't elaborate. He mentioned that some installations have mutli-switches, but the switches don't have any active compenents. He said some installations have diplexer for receiving local off air signals. I asked him if it would be possible to find out who installed it. He said he would check and get back to me.

I sent an e-mail to [REDACTED]
I asked him to ask his property manager about the lower left breaker that killed the interefering signal.

I called [REDACTED] and left a message with my phone number and e-mail address.

9/22/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I sent an e-mail to [REDACTED] asking if he was still receiving any IX, and that I never heard back from his property manager re the lower left breaker.

10/12/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 10-11-05:
[REDACTED] sent an e-mail asking about the status.

10-12-05:
I asked if he had gotten the breaker info from his property manager.

[REDACTED] sent an e-mail back stating that his property manager has changed.

I sent another e-mail asking if his and Kaufman's place were the same layout, that way we could could the breaker info by checking his own breaker.

10/17/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 10-13-05:
Received voice mail message from [REDACTED] of DirecTV. He said [REDACTED] referred him to me.

10-17-05:
I returned [REDACTED] call and left a voice mail message.

[REDACTED] Property Manager said she couldn't hwlp with the wiring of Kaufman's unit.

I sent her an e-mail asking if Kaufman and [REDACTED] would have the same layout.

10/20/2005 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 10-20-05:
I left a voice mail message for [REDACTED]. I asked him to send me an e-mail so we could communicate that way.

1/26/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] called. He said he's been waiting a year and he's problem hasn't been solved, eventhough he's a taxpayer. He said he wanted to talk to my supervisor. I refered his call to [REDACTED]

I phoned Kaufman, and left a message on his voice mail.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

1/27/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] and I went to Kaufman's. We didn't see his van. I rang the doorbell, but nobody answered. I left my business card in his front door, and left a note on it to please give me a call.

We looked at the signal on the Rohde & Schwarz. We saw the same pulsing signal centered at 58 MHz, and then again at 88 MHz, 118 MHz, 148 MHz, and 178 MHz. The signal got weaker with the higher freqs. I couldn't find a signal at 208 MHz. We still got the max signal strength in front of Kaufman's garage door.

WE listened on the Tahoe car radio on 88.3 MHz and we could hear the IX until we got about 30 feet away and then the IX was no longer heard.

1/30/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I called Kaufman's home phone, [REDACTED] and cell phone, [REDACTED], and left a message to call me back.

[REDACTED] and I drove to Kaufman's. We arrived at 4:00pm. Kaufman's van was not around. We waited outside until 5:20pm and there was no sign of Kaufman, so we left.

1/31/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: Kaufman called back and left a voice mail message that he would call me back later. He called from [REDACTED].

2/1/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I called Kaufman back at [REDACTED] and left a message with my Nextel phone # and e-mail address. I asked him for a day and time of when we can get back into his house to find the radiating device.
I also phoned his cell phone, [REDACTED], but only got his voice mail. I did not leave a message on his cell phone voice mail.

2/8/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 2-6-06:
[REDACTED] and I drove to Kaufman's. We arrived at 4:30 pm. The IX was present, but Kaufman was not there. We waited until 5:30 pm for Kaufman to arrive, but he didn't.

2-7-06:
Hiep and I arrived at Kaufman's at 8:30 am. The IX was not on the air. Kaufman's van was there. The following phone numbers were on Kaufman's "Sparkle Blinds" van:

[REDACTED]

We returned at 12:30 and again the IX was not present. Kaufman's van was not there.

2/9/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] and I drove by Kaufman's. We arrived at about 1:30 pm. The IX signal was present. Kaufman's van was not there.

I called Kaufman at [REDACTED]. I got Kaufman's voice mail with Kaufman's voice unlike his other numbers.

I left a message asking for a time when I could come over and find the source of the radiating signal. I left my Nextel number and e-mail address.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

2/22/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] and I drove the MDDF-5 to Kaufman's. The IX was on the air. Kaufman's van was there, but no one answered the door. Kaufman's son showed up. I told him what we needed to do. He went into the house and then came back out and said his dad is not at home. He said his dad is at the barbershop. I asked him when his dad would be back. He said he didn't know. I asked him to tell his dad that if we can't get into the house to look for the IX, then we will be issuing him a \$7,000 fine.

After I got back to the office, I phoned Kaufman. I persuaded him to allow us to inspect. He said his wife would be there this evening at 7:30pm. I told him I would be there.

[REDACTED] and I drove the MDDF-5 to Kaufman's. We arrived at 7:20 pm. The IX signal was not on the air. Kaufman and his wife were at home. Kaufman let us in his house. I told him the IX was not on the air I asked him if he may have turned something off. He said he's no electronic genius and that he wasn't aware of anything he might have turned off. Kaufman and his wife were eating in the den watching satellite TV. They closed the door. I went into the living room and had [REDACTED] turn off the lower left breaker. The only thing that turned off was the over head light. There was a remote control for the overhead light and fan. It had an FCC ID number. [REDACTED] and I couldn't read it, so Hiep took a photo with his camera phone. We left the residence at about 7:37 pm.

2/23/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I drove by Kaufman's with the MDDF-5 at 9:00 am. The IX signal was back on the air.

2/27/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I told [REDACTED] that Kaufman was not cooperating and that we need to put the onus on him to get rid of the IX. [REDACTED] said he was talking to [REDACTED] about what to do next.

5/10/2006 [REDACTED] CLOSED Archived

Prob. Resolution: Most of ix resolved. Case closed.

6/13/2006 [REDACTED] REOPEN

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] said he got a phone call from [REDACTED] that the IX is still present.

I mentioned nailing Kaufman for being over the emission limit in TV ch 2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
The Rohde & Schwarz FSH3 is in AZ and will be back on June 14.

[REDACTED] and I drove by Kaufman's at about 8:30 pm and saw the interfering signal.

6/15/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I called Kaufman at 619-342-6435. He answered. I asked him about arranging another data and time to find the radiating device in his residence. He said "what a pain in the ass". I told him we needed to look in the room where he and his wife were eating dinner the last time. He said we already looked in there. I ran through the past history about not all of the circuit breakers were turned off when I asked him to during the first visit and the second visit the signal was not on the air. He asked me to call back so he could talk to his wife first. He said to call back about 7:00 pm this evening.

I called Kaufman back at 7:20 pm. I got his voice mail and I left him a message.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

6/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 6-16-06:
I called Kaufman at noon. I got his voice mail and I left him a message.

6/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I called Kaufman at 8:30 am. I got his voice mail and left a message.

6/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I told [REDACTED] that Kaufman is not answering his phone and not returning my messages.



6/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I e-mailed Kaufman's phone number to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] responded saying [REDACTED] is in Penn.

6/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman. I got his voice mail and left a message.

6/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman and got his voice mail and left a message at 5:30 pm

6/21/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman on his cell phone. I got his voice mail and left a message.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

6/27/2006 UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: 6-21-06:

and I arrived at Kaufman's at 7:00 pm. Kaufman answered the door. I requested an official inspection. He let us in his residence. The IX was present. We determined again that the IX was on the circuit controlled by the lower left circuit breaker.

The only devices that appeared to be on that circuit in his entertainment room were a frig, pest controller, and a ceiling light. We turned off each one of those and it had no affect on the IX. Kaufman and his family were watching satellite TV and when we turned the circuit breaker off, and the IX went away, it had no affect on his TV picture.

I then noticed pull down attic staircase in the ceiling. I asked if they had an attic Kaufman said yes. Kaufman and his family were eating dinner right where the staircase would come into the entertainment room. I told Kaufman that we would need to get in his attic, and if we could come back in 20 minutes. He said 30 minutes.

We came back at 7:30 pm. The IX was on the air when he returned, but it went off just before we went back into his residence.

There was a light in the attic that was on the same lower left circuit breaker. We went into the attic. The attic was a mess with boxes and all kinds of stuff.

We tried running down cables and determining which were his satellite cables.

We found five black cables that we determined were not part of his satellite system. We mentioned to Kaufman that there were lots of coax cable in his attic. He mentioned that he wished Cox had gotten rid of the cables. We asked him if the cables were being used by his satellite system and he said no. I asked him if we could remove the black cables. He said that would be OK.

We cut out the five black cables running across his attic floor with boxes and other stuff on top of them.

About ten minutes later his neighbor at [REDACTED], came into Kaufman's residence yelling that he didn't have any cable or internet.

[REDACTED] went to Radio Shack to get some connectors, so we could hook his cable back up. I discovered that there were two live cable runs coming into Kaufman's attic. It turned out that [REDACTED] was also getting Cox cable through Kaufman's attic.

We had no luck getting the cables hooked back up that night. We didn't make any further attempts to locate the IX.

I apologized to both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for their cable interruption.

6-22-06:

I phoned [REDACTED] at 7:30 am and he said Cox would not be able to come out until Saturday.

I called [REDACTED] at Cox, [REDACTED] replacement, and asked for assistance.

I got a voice mail message from a tech sup, [REDACTED] about the interruption in cable service. I called back twice and left a message each time, stating that it was Cox's responsibility to repair the interrupted cable service.

[REDACTED] and I went to Kaufman's to repair the two cut cables runs in Kaufman's attic. A few minutes after we arrived a Cox subcontractor arrived. He only had a repair order for [REDACTED]. I went into Kaufman's attic to repair the [REDACTED] run. I repaired the cable and checked with [REDACTED] that she had cable service again. She said she did.

We then left Kaufman's. I did not have an opportunity to look for the source of the IX as it was very hot in the attic and by the time I had finished repairing [REDACTED] cable I was too sore and exhausted to do any more work in the attic.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

7/19/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: 7-17-06:

I phoned Kaufman on his cell phone. I asked him about arranging a date and time to get back in his attic to look for the IX source.
 Kaufman said "again".
 I told him we got diverted when we cut his neighbors cable tv cox in his attic.
 He said Wednesday or Thursday might work. He said he would need to talk to his wife.
 I told him I would call him back.

7/19/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman's home phone and his cell phone, and left voice mail messages on each if we could get back into his attic tomorrow night.

7/20/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman's home phone and nobody answered. I did not leave a message.
 I then phoned Kaufman's cell phone and left a voice mail message.

7/24/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: 7-24-06:

I phoned Kaufman on his cell phone and left a voice mail message.

Kaufman called back on my direct line and left a message that he and his wife [redacted]

7/31/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman on his cell phone and left a voice mail message.

I phoned his home phone, also, and got his answering machine, but I didn't leave a message.

8/8/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman.

Kaufman agreed to allow un into his house tonight at 6:00pm.

[redacted] and I arrived in the MDDF-7 at about 5:40 pm. Kaufman was home.

The IX was on the air.

We determined again that the source of the IX was getting its power from the circuit controlled by the lower left circuit breaker.

I went inot the attic to try and trace out where Ac power would be going from that particular circuit. I found one wire that went to the attic light, one appeared to go to the ceiling light in the den, another went into the wall. I was able to disconnect that power, but it did not affect the IX..

There was one more wire that I could not determine if it was on that circuit or not. It went past the attic staircase and then into the wall on the north side of the attic.

I could not find any power going to the southeast corner of the attic from that circuit. I had thought there might be a distribution amp in that corner off the attic, but after looking again I changed my mind and concluded there was not a distribution amp in that area.

At about 6:40 pm Kaufman said his wife would be home soon and they would be eating dinner in the den. I came down from the attic after taking a few pictures of the wires in the attic.

We left Kaufman residence at about 6:45 pm.

8/9/2006 [redacted] **UPDATE**

Prob. Resolution: I told [redacted] that we were unsuccessful in finding the IX last night.

I told him it would probably take going into the circuit breaker box and finding what's on that circuit, and was wires are powering the device that is causing the IX. I told him that I thought that would be a job for a professional electrician, not me.

[redacted] agreed that we had done all that we could in finding the IX and that are involvement will end.

CASE DETAILS - EB-05-SD-028

Run Date: 10/11/2006

8/30/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman. I told him we would like to check the upstairs for something on the particular breaker that may be causing the IX. I told him it should only take 15-30 min, and that it would be the last time we would be in his residence. I asked if we could do it tomorrow evening. He said he would need to check with his wife. I told him I would call him back in the morning. He said during our last time in his attic that his neighbor at [REDACTED] lost her cable, and that it took Cox 4 days to come out and replace it. He said they ran the cable on the outside.

8/31/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman. He said [REDACTED] and said next week would work, he said Tuesday would probably work. I asked if I should call him Tuesday. He said yes.

9/7/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I phoned Kaufman and left a message on his cell phone voice mail.

9/19/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I called Kaufman and arranged to meet at this residence at 6:00 pm. [REDACTED] and I arrived at about 5:50 pm. The IX was on the air, but Kaufman wasn't at home. We waited until 6:10 pm and I called Kaufman and he said he was having computer problems at his business. I told him I would call him back to arrange another time.

9/21/2006 [REDACTED] UPDATE

Prob. Resolution: I called Kaufman at 2:48 pm, and only got his voice mail. I did not leave a message. (He doesn't return my messages asking for a call back.) I called back at 4:45 pm. Kaufman said to come over right now. [REDACTED] and I showed at Kaufman's at 5:50 pm. The IX was not on the air. I went upstairs with Kaufman to look at his entertainment equipment. It all was getting power.

9/25/2006 [REDACTED] CLOSED Archived

Prob. Resolution: I talked to [REDACTED] that when [REDACTED] and I went to Kaufman's on Thursday that the IX was not on the air. We agreed to close the case.

RULE VIOLATIONS

Rule Violation	Violation Date	Issue Date	Notice Type
15.29(a)	2/28/2005	3/11/2005	CITATION
15.5(b)	2/28/2005	3/11/2005	CITATION

Federal Communications Commission

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
Mr. Larry Kaufman)	File No.: EB-05-SD-028
San Diego, California 92115)	Citation No.: C200532940001

CITATION

Released: March 11, 2005

By the District Director, San Diego Office, Western Region, Enforcement Bureau:

1. This is an Official Citation issued pursuant to Section 503(b)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended ("Act"),¹ to Mr. Larry Kaufman for violation of Section 15.5(b) and 15.29(a) of the Commission's rules ("Rules").²

2. Investigation by the FCC's San Diego Office revealed that on February 28, 2005, a Part 15 device³ at the residence of Mr. Larry Kaufman in San Diego, California was causing interference to a neighbor's TV and FM radio reception and Mr. Kaufman refused to allow inspection of the offending device.

3. Section 15.5(b) of the Rules states "[o]peration of an intentional, unintentional, or incidental radiator is subject to the conditions that no harmful interference is caused"⁴ Section 15.29(a) of the Rules states "[a]ny equipment or device subject to the provisions of this part, . . . shall be made available for inspection by a Commission representative upon reasonable request."⁵ Kaufman's refusal to acknowledge the interference problem and refusal to allow Commission's representatives to inspect the offending Part 15 device violate these rule sections.

4. The FCC's San Diego office received a complaint of interference to the reception of TV and FM Broadcast stations by Mr. Kaufman's neighbor. On February 28, 2005, agents from the San Diego office confirmed that radio signals on centered at 58.6 MHz (TV Channel 3) were emanating from Mr. Kaufman's residence in San Diego, California. The agents requested Mr. Kaufman's assistance in locating the source of the interference and requested his permission to examine any possible radio sources within his residence. Mr. Kaufman refused to assist the agents and refused to allow the inspection of any offending transmitter.

¹47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(5).

²47 C.F.R. §§ 15.5(b) and 15.29(a).

³47 C.F.R. § 15.1 *et seq.*

⁴47 C.F.R. § 15.5(b).

⁵47 C.F.R. § 15.29(a).

Federal Communications Commission

5. Violations of the Act or the Commission's Rules may subject the violator to substantial monetary forfeitures,⁶ seizure of equipment through *in rem* forfeiture action, and criminal sanctions, including imprisonment.⁷

6. Pursuant to Sections 4(i), 4(j), 308(b) and 403 of the Act, Mr. Kaufman is directed to provide the information specified herein, within 10 days from the date of this Citation.

- a. Examine all Part 15 devices at his residence in San Diego, California and discontinue the operation until repairs to or replacement of the offending device can be made. If the offending device is found and the interference is resolved, send a complete report on what was found and the actions taken to resolve the interference.
- b. If the interference cannot be resolved, advise this office in order to arrange for Commission agents to locate and examine the offending device.

7. Mr. Kaufman or his representative may request an interview at the closest FCC Office, which is Federal Communications Commission, 4542 Ruffner Street, Suite 370, San Diego, California 92111.⁸ You may contact this office by telephone, (858) 496-5111, to schedule this interview, which must take place within 14 days of this Citation. Mr. Kaufman may also submit a written statement to the above address within 14 days of the date of this Citation. Any written statements should specify what actions have been taken to correct the violations outlined above. Please reference file number EB-05-SD-028 when corresponding with the Commission.

8. Any statement or information provided by you may be used by the Commission to determine if further enforcement action is required.⁹ Any knowingly or willfully false statement made in reply to this Citation is punishable by fine or imprisonment.¹⁰

9. **IT IS ORDERED** that copies of this Citation shall be sent by First Class U.S. Mail and Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested to Mr. Larry Kaufman at his record of address.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION



William R. Zears Jr.
District Director, San Diego Office
Western Region
Enforcement Bureau

⁶47 C.F.R. § 1.80(b)(3).

⁷47 U.S.C. §§ 401, 501, 503, 510.

⁸47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(5).

⁹See Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(3).

¹⁰See 18 U.S.C. § 1001 *et seq.*

*At reply
received 5/1/05*

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2005 8:27 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: interference

[REDACTED]
 I have forwarded your e-mail to [REDACTED] who has been working on this case.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] el ([REDACTED]) [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2005 2:17 PM
To: J [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: interference

Dear [REDACTED] it has been close to 6 months since I first approached the FCC for help w/interference caused by my neighbor. Despite your and other peoples efforts the TV & Radio interference is still present. I am surprised that the FCC seems to have so little power that Mr. Kauffman has refused entry to your boss and others, refused to unplug appliance causing the interfeence and has basically laughed in our faces (FCC included). Also surprised that Cox had to rewire the cable to my TV which helped a little but I still have the interference. Would you be so kind to tell me whom should I contact that can help me with this matter?
 Regards,
 [REDACTED]

Regards / Saludos afectuosos

[REDACTED] & [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] directo ☎ [REDACTED] directo ☎

Vice Presidents / International Financial Advisors

[REDACTED]

International Financial Advisor

[REDACTED] directo ☎

[REDACTED] fax

[REDACTED] fax exclusivo para transferencias

☎ Desde México, sin costo [REDACTED]

(de 10 a 17:00 hrs., horario del D.F.)

✉ [REDACTED] ✉ [REDACTED] ✉ [REDACTED]

Para cualquier asunto administrativo u operacional favor de llamar a nuestra asistente: [REDACTED] al tel. [REDACTED] email: [REDACTED]

For assistance with any operational or administrative matter please call our assistant: [REDACTED] at ph. # [REDACTED] email [REDACTED]

We are providing the information you requested, however, we consider your monthly statements or trade confirmations to be the official record of your transactions. Portions of the material were produced through a personal computer owned by a Merrill Lynch Financial Consultant. In the event of any discrepancy between it and data produced directly through the facility of Merrill Lynch, the recipient must rely on the latter. The information herein was obtained from sources that we believe to be reliable, but we do not guarantee its accuracy. Neither the information nor any opinion expressed constitutes a solicitation by us of the purchase or sale of any securities or commodities. Furthermore, the information contained in this email transmission is confidential and intended only for the use of the addressee. If the reader of the communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this email is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original transmission to us at the address above via United States Postal Service.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2005 2:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: interference

[REDACTED]

In response to your e-mail dated February 15, 2005, it is requested that you answer the following questions. Your answers to these questions will assist us in analyzing the source of your interference.

- 1) What is the nature of the interference to your TV? Is the audio and video affected? If yes, please describe what happens to both?
- 2) Which TV channels are affected by the interference? How many TVs in your household are affected?
- 3) Are all TVs on cable? If yes, is the interference present when the cable is disconnected?
- 4) What did Cox cable conclude with their field check to your location? Did they perform any maintenance, replacement, etc. of their equipment?
- 5) Did Cox check the area for cable leakage? A break in the cable or illegal tap would allow signals to get into the cable system.
- 5) Did SDG&E trace the interference to a particular breaker in Mr. Kaufman's home? Did he trace it to a particular device?
- 6) What is the name and telephone number of the SDG&E person that conducted the field visit?
- 7) Are your neighbors affected by the interference? If yes, please provide their names, addresses & telephone numbers.
- 8) Does your condo share a wall with Mr. Kaufman's?
- 9) What is name and telephone number of your property manager?

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please call me at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Compliance Specialist
FCC

4542 Ruffner St., #370
San Diego, CA 92111-2216
Fax #: 858-496-5112

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2005 1:13 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: interference

[REDACTED]

I am writing to you to ask for your help and advice.
It has been several months since I first detected some type of interference on my radio and TV. Cox cable and SDG&E have been out twice, the person of SDG&E who works at the radio and TV interference department has also been out to see what the problem was. The interference was traced to my neighbour's utility closet and to a lesser extent my neighbour's garage which has been converted to a TV room.
I asked my neighbour to look into the matter and he said he was not the source of the interference. I live in a row of 4 townhouses that are in a row side by side. It was suggested to me that in order to isolate the probable cause of the problem that I should turn off all electricity to the houses one by one. This was done and when the electricity to [REDACTED] (Larry Kauffman) was turned off the interference stopped.
I just recently informed Mr. Kauffman [REDACTED] that the interference was coming from his unit and asked him to do something about it. His reply was he was NOT going to do anything about it..
The Collwood Park homeowner's association, Cox cable, SDG&E all claim they are powerless to do anything about it.
Not being an expert I'm also concerned about any potential health hazards caused by this interference??? Who can help me with this matter??

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] home
[REDACTED] work

Regards / Saludos afectuosos

[REDACTED] & [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] directo [REDACTED] directo

Vice Presidents

Financial Advisors / Asesores Financieros

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] x exclusivo para transferencias

☎ Desde México, sin costo de [REDACTED]

(de 10 a 17:30 hrs., horario del D.F.)

☒ [REDACTED] ☒ [REDACTED]

Para cualquier asunto administrativo u operacional favor de llamar a nuestra asistente: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] al tel. [REDACTED] email: [REDACTED]@com

For assistance with any operational or administrative matter please call our assistant: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] at ph. # [REDACTED] email [REDACTED]

We are providing the information you requested, however, we consider your monthly statements or trade confirmations to be the official record of your transactions. Portions of the material were produced through a personal computer owned by a Merrill Lynch Financial Consultant. In the event of any discrepancy between it and data produced directly through the facility of Merrill Lynch, the recipient must rely on the latter. The information herein was obtained from sources that we believe to be reliable, but we do not guarantee its accuracy. Neither the information nor any opinion expressed constitutes a solicitation by us of the purchase or sale of any securities or commodities. Furthermore, the information contained in this email transmission is confidential and intended only for the use of the addressee. If the reader of the communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this email is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original transmission to us at the address above via United States Postal Service.

Disclaimer:

CAUTION: electronic mail sent through the internet is not secure and could be intercepted by a third party. For your protection, avoid sending identifying information, such as account, Social Security, or card numbers to us or others. Further, do not send time-sensitive, action-oriented messages, such as transaction orders, fund transfer instructions, or check stop payments, as it is our policy not to accept such items electronically.

If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender, delete it and do not read, act upon, print, disclose, copy, retain or redistribute it. [Click here for important additional terms relating to this e-mail.](http://www.ml.com/email/terms/) <http://www.ml.com/email/terms/>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2005 9:08 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: your interference

[REDACTED]

We were able to gain entry to Mr. Kaufman's address last week. We did find the circuit breaker which killed the interfering signal, but were unable to determine which device was causing the problem. I'm working with DirectTV to try and find out who installed Mr. Kaufman's satellite system. One thing that would be helpful is if I knew which breaker killed which outlets. Kaufman's breaker that killed the interfering signal was the lower left breaker in the breaker box in the hall just next to the kitchen and what used to be his garage. The property manager should have this information.
Thank you.

[REDACTED]