

CASE REPORT - EB-09-CF-0099

Run Date: 8/27/2009

Start 7/8/2009	Susp. 9/6/2009	Status: CLOSED HQ	SolDate:	S	Agent: [REDACTED]
COMPLAINANT			SUBJECT		
Name: [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		
Company: SPRINT-NEXTEL			[REDACTED]		
Address: [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		
City: Columbia		ST: MD	[REDACTED]		ST: [REDACTED]
Geo: RC		Zip: 21046	[REDACTED]		Zip: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]		Aux: [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		Aux: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		
P_Address: [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		
Notes: [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		
CGeo: RC	Safety Non-Safety		SGeo: None		:Special
Freq:	Complt YES		:Freq		:Local
Call:	IX YES		:Call		:Master
Method: EMAIL	Confide		- - 0:FRN		:ASR
Entity: Licensee/Registrant	Cong.		Individual - NonLicen	:Entity	:Lat.
To: 090 - Land Mobile	InfoTrs		015 - Intentional Radi	:From	:Long
			:Utility		:XCityS
Sprint-Nextel found a wireless camera that is causing harmful interference to their network					

WORK EVENTS

EventDate	Agent	Event Type	WeUtility
7/8/2009	[REDACTED]	COMPLAINT_R	
<p>Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] received an email from [REDACTED] concerning another wireless camera that was causing interference on 898.19-MHz to 901 MHz. They left three separate letters for the homeowner since April 2009. There has been no response therefore they returned around the signal. The address of the interferor was included in the email.</p>			

CASE REPORT - EB-09-CF-0099

Run Date: 8/27/2009

7/8/2009 [REDACTED] INVESTIGATION invos invinview ixxsbfspur

Prob. Resolution: [REDACTED] found the address in the complaint and monitored the spectrum around 900 MHz in the trailer park where the camera was located.

The subject, [REDACTED], had two Astak cameras, one mounted on the upper left side of the trailer that was not plugged in and another mounted on the outdoor shed behind the trailer above the light fixture. The second camera was plugged in and was operating approximately between 898.8 MHz and 902 MHz. The model number for that camera is CM-918T2.

The first camera was operating approximately between 915 MHz and 925 MHz. [REDACTED] explained that he could use the first camera, but not the second one because it was causing interference.

[REDACTED] showed the agents the receiver, which he was not using, that had a model number YD-35-080030. He told the agents that he purchased the cameras from CostCo. He also showed the agents the latest letter that he received from Sprint/Nextel concerning the interference. In the letter, it suggested that he contact Astak's customer service for assistance with replacement of the equipment that he purchased. The website of the manufacturer is www.astak.com

Once the second camera, that was mounted on the outdoor shed, was unplugged, the agents verified that the interference was gone.

7/8/2009 [REDACTED] CLOSED CloseResolveByFCC

Prob. Resolution: The agents were satisfied that the interference was gone once [REDACTED] unplugged the second camera. He was told to discontinue use of the second camera, although he could use the first camera.

RULE VIOLATIONS