

From: blank <harveyfree [REDACTED]>

Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 3:15 PM

To: ATR-LitIII-Information (ATR) <ATR.LitIII.Information@ATR.USDOJ.gov>

Subject: Since their entry in 1941, the Department has periodically reviewed the operation and effectiveness of the Consent Decrees, most recently in 2014 - 2015 [links]. Both Consent Decrees have been amended since their entry. The ASCAP Consent Decree was las...

. This process is totally unfair and leaves ASCAP and BMI with collectiing fees from consumers multiple times for the same music. For instance, there are many many record and video pools that sells their music to restaurants, bars and djs that replay the music. Video pools such as Promo Only, franchise record pool, bpm supreme and many more. When we purchase a subscription from them we are paying for the music when they have already paid BMI and ASCAP for the music and now the consumer have to pay again. Therefore, BMI can be getting paid on multiple occasions for the same music we pay them over and over. BMI does not care that you purchased the music from somewhere that they sold the rights to sale the music.

Lastly, why should a venue have to pay BMI for a live music performance in which they suppose to give the proceeds back to the performing artist after the venue have to paid the artist as well?