

LAW OFFICES
Messer, Caparello & Self
A Professional Association

Post Office Box 1876
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876
Internet: www.lawfla.com

February 2, 2004

BY HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Blanca Bayó, Director
Commission Clerk and Administrative Services
Room 110, Easley Building
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 030696-TI

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of 9278 Communications, Inc. are an original and fifteen copies of 9278 Communications, Inc.'s Response to Proposed Agency Action and Petition for Formal Administrative Proceeding in the above referenced docket.

Please acknowledge receipt of these documents by stamping the extra copy of this letter "filed" and returning the same to me.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

Sincerely yours,



Albert T. Gimbel

ATG/amb
Enclosures
cc: Parties of Record

DOCUMENT - 030696-TI

91485 FEB-2 5

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Compliance investigation
of 9278 Communications, Inc. for
apparent violation of Sections
364.02 and 364.04, Florida Statutes

Docket No.: 030696-TI

9278 Communications, Inc.
a Delaware Corporation

Order No.: PSC-04-0022-PAA-TI

Petitioner,

Issued: January 12, 2004

v.

Florida Public Service Commission,
a state agency,

Respondent.

**RESPONSE TO PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION AND
PETITION FOR FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**

Petitioner, **9278 Communications, Inc.** (hereinafter 9278), a Delaware Corporation, by and through the undersigned counsel, pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57, Florida Statutes and Rules 25-22.029, 28-106.201, and 28-106, Parts I and II, Florida Administrative Code, hereby files this Response to Proposed Agency Action and Petition for Formal Administrative Hearing to challenge the proposed agency action of the **Florida Public Service Commission** (hereinafter PSC) finding that 9278 violated certain rules and statutes related to prepaid calling services, allegedly within the jurisdiction of the PSC. In support of this Petition, 9278 states:

1. The agency affected by this proceeding is the Florida Public Service Commission. The address of the PSC is 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850. The PSC is a state agency charged with regulating the telecommunications industry in Florida in accordance with Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, and the rules promulgated thereunder. As such, the PSC is the appropriate entity upon which this challenge is to be filed.

2. Petitioner is 9278, a Delaware Corporation, whose principal office is located at 1942 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, NY 10461, telephone number (718) 887-9278. 9278 is a holding company and conducts no independent business activities. Since 1997, 9278 has held stock in several subsidiary companies that are in the business of distributing pre-paid calling cards on behalf of third party telecommunications carriers. For purposes of this proceeding, 9278's contact is Craig S. Libson.

3. Petitioner's representatives are Norman H. Horton, Jr. and Albert T. Gimbel, of the law firm of Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, telephone number (850) 222-0720. Messers. Horton and Gimbel shall be 9278's legal representatives for service purposes during the course of this proceeding.

4. 9278's substantial interests are affected by this proceeding in that the proposed agency action seeks to have 9278 cease and desist all operations in Florida, and impose a fine of \$25,000.00, for alleged violations of various telecommunications statutes which 9278 believes are inapplicable to its operations. 9278's substantial interests are further adversely affected by the PAA

in that 9278 has created a viable corporate structure and committed a substantial investment to the relevant subsidiary's training program, activities and operations in Florida.

5. The PSC issued its Proposed Agency Action by Order No. PSC-04-0022-PAA-TI, in Docket No. 030696-TI, on January 12, 2004 (hereinafter PAA). Although the PAA was issued on January 12, 2004, 9278 did not receive a copy until it was notified by Staff telephonically, through its representative Mr. Craig S. Libson, on January 23, 2004. Staff advised Mr. Libson that the PAA had issued and a copy was available on the official PSC website. On January 23, 2004, Mr. Libson retrieved a copy of the PAA. The PAA contained a Notice of Further Proceedings or Judicial Review detailing the rights or remedies available to those whose interests are substantially affected by the PAA. A copy of the PAA, and the accompanying Notice, are attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. According to the terms of such Notice, this petition is timely filed.

6. In its PAA, the PSC cited three separate statutory violations as grounds for its conclusion that 9278 is in violation of certain regulatory requirements, to wit:

- a. Violation of Section 364.02(13), Florida Statutes, for failing to provide the PSC with information necessary to contact and communicate with 9278;
- b. Violation of Section 364.04(1), Florida Statutes, for failing to file a tariff with the PSC; and,
- c. Violation of Section 364.285(1), Florida Statutes, for "willfully" violating the above referenced statutes.

7. 9278 initially identifies the following disputed issues of material fact, and reserves the right to supplement the foregoing, as additional facts become known to them:

- a. Whether 9278 was acting as an IXC provider in the state of Florida;
- b. Whether the PSC has the authority to discipline 9278 on the grounds stated in the PAA, if it is determined that 9278 was not acting as an IXC provider in Florida ;
- c. Whether the PSC's interpretation of Section 364.02(13) is correct when applied to the activities of 9278;
- d. Whether the PSC's interpretation of Section 364.04(1) is correct when applied to the activities of 9278;
- e. Whether the PSC's interpretation of Section 364.285(1) is correct when applied to the activities of 9278;

8. The ultimate facts alleged by 9278 that warrant reversal or modification of the PSC's proposed agency action, are as follows:

- a. 9278 is not a provider of pre-paid calling services, nor is it acting as an IXC in Florida, and therefore, it is not subject regulation by the PSC, nor is it subject to the statutes cited by the PSC as a basis for issuing the PAA;
- b. 9278 is not a provider of pre-paid calling services, nor is it acting as an IXC in Florida. and therefore, it is not required to provide the PSC with information necessary to contact and communicate with 9278, pursuant to the statutory authorities cited by the PSC;

c. 9278 is not a provider of pre-paid calling services, nor is it acting as an IXC in Florida, and therefore, it is not required to register or file a tariff, pursuant to the statutory authorities cited by the PSC;

d. The decision to cease and desist the Florida activities of 9278 and impose a penalty of \$25,000.00 is based upon factors which are not supported by statute or rule, and do not warrant the serious agency action proposed by the PSC;

e. 9278 conducts no independent business activities. However, 9278 holds stock in a number of subsidiary corporations which are in the business of distributing pre-paid calling cards for third party telecommunications carriers. These subsidiary corporations purchase the product from 9278 Distributors, Inc. (hereinafter 9278 Distributors), a New York Corporation which purchases the product from the carrier or from another subsidiary named NTSE Communications, Inc., a Delaware corporation, (hereinafter NTSE). At all times material hereto, 9278 Distributors and NTSE were subsidiaries of 9278. These cards are required to properly disclose the actual carrier. In Florida, such cards are distributed by 9278 Distributors Florida, Inc. (hereinafter 9278 Florida), a Florida corporation and also a subsidiary of Petitioner, 9278. Without the prior knowledge or approval of 9278, a small percentage of cards distributed in Florida by 9278 Florida, erroneously indicated that 9278 Communications, Inc. was the IXC service provider. 9278 undertook immediate action to correct such errors and to ensure accurate disclosure of the proper carrier as to all future cards; and,

f. Ironically, the PAA alleges that 9278 failed to provide the PSC with information necessary for the PSC to contact and communicate with 9278. However, the record here clearly reflects that the PSC had every possible means of communication with 9278 at its disposal. At all times material hereto, letters were written, phone calls were made, faxes were sent, electronic messages were exchanged, and a 9278 representative/contact person was available to, in contact with, and known by the PSC.

9. The specific rules or statutes that 9278 contends require reversal or modification of the PSC's decision to issue the PAA and impose the penalties set forth therein, are Sections 364.02(13), 364.04(1), and 364.285(1), Florida Statutes.

10. The potential penalties discussed herein clearly affects 9278's substantial interests, and it is therefore entitled to this relief by Chapter 120, Florida Statutes.

11. 9278 subsidiaries have current operations in most states. 9278 subsidiaries have not, during their period of operations, been the subject of any form of regulatory or enforcement action or compliance proceeding by any other regulating entity.

12. 9278 has been compelled to retain counsel to represent its interests with regard to the PSC's proposed agency action, and has agreed to pay said counsel a reasonable fee for its services.

13. In addition, Petitioner, 9278 moves to dismiss the PAA on the grounds that the PAA fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.


WHEREFORE, 9278 requests:

a. this Petition be forwarded to the Division of Administrative Hearings for assignment to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), and that the ALJ conduct a formal administrative hearing to contest the PSC's erroneous decision;

b. the entry of recommended and final orders that the PSC's decision that 9278 has violated several provisions of Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, relating to the provision of services by IXC's, was not supported by law or fact, was arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of the authority conferred on that agency, and was furthermore, inconsistent with and contrary to the intent of Chapters 120 and 364, Florida Statutes; and,

c. the entry of recommended and final orders awarding it its attorney's fees and costs incurred in this litigation.

Respectfully submitted this 2nd day of February, 2004.



Norman H. Horton, Jr.
Florida Bar No.: 156386
Albert T. Gimbel
Florida Bar No.: 279730

MESSER, CAPARELLO & SELF, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: (850) 222-0720
Facsimile: (850) 224-4359

Attorneys for 9278 Communications, Inc.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Compliance investigation
of 9278 Communications, Inc. for
apparent violation of Sections
364.02 and 364.04, Florida
Statutes.

DOCKET NO. 030696-TI
ORDER NO. PSC-04-0022-PAA-TI
ISSUED: January 12, 2004

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of
this matter:

LILA A. JABER, Chairman
J. TERRY DEASON
BRAULIO L. BAEZ
RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY
CHARLES M. DAVIDSON

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION
ORDER IMPOSING PENALTY UPON 9278 COMMUNICATIONS, INC. FOR
VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 364.02 AND 364.04, FLORIDA STATUTES

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE is hereby given by the Florida Public Service
Commission that the action discussed herein is preliminary in
nature and will become final unless a person whose interests are
substantially affected files a petition for a formal proceeding,
pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

CASE BACKGROUND

On March 3, 2003, our staff received a consumer complaint
regarding a prepaid phone card labeled *La Rendidora Pa' Colombia*.
The back of the phone card lists Universal Phones, Inc. as the
service provider and 9278 Communications, Inc. (9278
Communications) as the distributor. Universal Phones, Inc.
informed our staff via email that it does not provide service for
the *La Rendidora Pa' Colombia* prepaid phone card.

On April 10, 2003, our staff received a consumer complaint
regarding a prepaid phone card labeled *Welcome Florida Phonocard*.
The back of the phone card lists NTSE Communications as the service

provider. Our staff was unable to locate any information on a company using the name NTSE Communications, Inc. According to the 10-K report filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission for 9278 Communications fiscal year ended December 31, 2002, NTSE Holding Corp., wholly owned by Sajid Kapadia, merged with 9278 Communications on January 31, 2003. As a result, 9278 Communications became a privately held corporation owned by Sajid Kapadia. Our staff concluded that 9278 Communications was the service provider and was responsible for the prepaid phone cards branded as *La Rendiodora Pa' Colombia* and *Welcome Florida Phonecard*.

On April 21, 2003, our staff mailed 9278 Communications a certified letter via United States Postal Service (USPS) requesting that the company investigate the consumer complaints and notifying the company that a certificate of public convenience and necessity (certificate) is required. Our staff received a green card certified receipt indicating that the company received our staff's letter. A response was due on May 9, 2003.

On May 14, 2003, our staff received a consumer complaint regarding a prepaid phone card labeled *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card*. The back of the phone card lists 9278 Communications as the service provider. On May 22, 2003, our staff mailed 9278 Communications a second certified letter via USPS requesting that the company investigate the consumer complaint regarding the *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card*. Again, our staff requested that the company submit an application for an interexchange company certificate. At that time, Commission rules required that intrastate interexchange telecommunications companies (IXCs) providing prepaid calling services (PPCS) within the state obtain a certificate. The certified mail return receipt indicated that the company received the letter on or about May 27, 2003. A response was due on June 16, 2003.

On June 3, 2003, our staff received a second consumer complaint regarding the *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card*. Additionally on June 25, 2003, our staff received a third consumer complaint regarding the *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card*. In all three complaints, the consumers claim that the *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card* did not provide the full amount of minutes as advertised.

On July 25, 2003, our staff opened this docket to address the company's apparent violation of Sections 364.02(13) and 364.04, Florida Statutes.

On August 7, 2003, our staff filed its initial recommendation in this docket. On August 15, 2003, 9278 Communications requested deferral of this item from the August 19, 2003, Agenda Conference. 9278 Communications submitted its original letter requesting deferral on August 19, 2003. Through September 23, 2003, our staff worked with 9278 Communications on a negotiated resolution to this docket.

However, on September 4, 2003, our staff received a fourth consumer complaint regarding two of 9278 Communication's prepaid phone cards. One is branded as *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card* and the other is branded as *X Phone Card MIAMI*.

On September 24, 2003, 9278 Communications sent our staff an email stating that it is not providing service in Florida and the company believes that it is not required to register and file a tariff with this Commission. The company indicated that IBGH Communications, Inc. (IBGH) is the carrier that should be listed as the service provider on the phone cards, not 9278 Communications.

On September 29, 2003, our staff mailed 9278 Communications a letter via USPS and facsimile requesting documents and information related to the company's explanation in its email sent on September 24, 2003. On October 3, 2003, 9278 Communications sent an email stating that it would respond to our staff's letter dated September 29, 2003, and provide our staff with the requested documentation and information by October 10, 2003.

On November 4, 2003, in Docket No. 031032-TI, IBGH registered as an intrastate interexchange telecommunications company in Florida. On November 6, 2003 our staff sent 9278 Communications a certified letter via USPS informing the company that it had not yet received its response to our staff's letter dated September 29, 2003, and that the docket could not be resolved until the company provided the requested documentation and resolved the outstanding consumer complaint.

On November 19, 2003, our staff received the USPS certified mail receipt indicating that on November 11, 2003, 9278 Communications received staff's letter dated November 6, 2003.

On December 2, 2003, in Docket No. 030876-TI, this Commission approved the settlement proffered by IBGH for providing intrastate interexchange telecommunications service in Florida without providing this Commission with current company contact information

and filing a tariff, a violation of Sections 364.02, and 364.04, Florida Statutes.

This Commission is vested with jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Sections 364.02(13), 364.04, and 364.285 Florida Statutes.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

As outlined in the case background, this Commission received six consumer complaints regarding the prepaid phone card services apparently provided by 9278 Communications during the period from March 3, 2003, through September 4, 2003. The phone cards branded as *Arroz Con Pollo Florida Phone Card* and *X Phone Card MIAMI* list 9278 Communications as the service provider. Hence, it appears that 9278 Communications is providing intrastate interexchange telecommunications services to the public within Florida, and thus, is required to provide this Commission with current contact information and file a tariff and as required by Sections 364.02(13) and 364.04, Florida Statutes.

Our staff filed a recommendation in this docket on August 7, 2003, at which point 9278 Communications requested a deferral of the item from the August 19, 2003, Agenda Conference. Subsequently, our staff and 9278 Communications entered into negotiations to settle this matter. During negotiations, 9278 Communications indicated to our staff that it is not providing service in Florida and does not believe that it is required to file a tariff and provide this Commission with current contact information. In addition, the company indicated to our staff that 9278 Communications was inadvertently listed as the service provider on some of its phone cards whereas IBGH is the carrier and should have been listed on the phone cards. Although IBGH recently filed a tariff and registered with this Commission, our staff is not satisfied with 9278 Communications' explanation of its relationship with IBGH. In 9278 Communications' email sent on September 24, 2003, the company provided the following explanation:

IBGH Communications LLC, one of the carriers, is owned in part by the stockholder of 9278 Communications. There is no parent-subsidary relationship between the companies, nor is their financial information consolidated or reported together in any way. The companies operate separately, although due to the overlap in ownership, management of 9278 takes an active role in consulting

with IBGH management as to strategic decisions at IBGH and 9278 provides personnel support from time to time. To help establish IBGH's facilities, 9278 provided certain loans to IBGH in exchange for preferential use of IBGH's telecommunications platform.

Further, both 9278 Communications and IBGH list 1942 Williamsbridge Road, Bronx, New York, 10461 as their address.

Our staff then requested that 9278 Communications provide additional information and documentation to clarify the company's relationship with IBGH. However, the company at this time is no longer communicating with our staff. As of December 4, 2003, 9278 Communications has not responded to our staff's inquiries, nor taken the necessary actions to settle this matter, nor has the company provided this Commission with current contact information and filed a tariff in apparent violation of Sections 364.02(13) and 364.04, Florida Statutes.

APPLICABLE FLORIDA STATUTES

On May 23, 2003, the Governor signed the Tele-Competition Act which no longer requires an IXC providing services within the state to obtain a certificate. However, Section 364.02(13), Florida Statutes, requires each IXC to provide the Commission with information to contact and communicate with the company. Section 364.02(13), Florida Statutes, states in pertinent part:

Each intrastate interexchange telecommunications company shall continue to be subject to ss. 364.04, 364.10(3)(a), and (d), 364.285, 364.163, 364.501, 364.603, and 364.604, shall provide the commission with such current information as the commission deems necessary to contact and communicate with the company

Further, the Tele-Competition Act did not amend Section 364.04, Florida Statutes. IXCs providing service within the state are still required to file a tariff with the Commission in accordance with Section 364.04(1), Florida Statutes, which states:

Upon order of the commission, every telecommunications company shall file with the commission, and shall print and keep open to public inspection, schedules showing the rates, tolls, rentals, contracts, and charges that a company for service to be performed within the state.

PROPOSED PENALTY

We find that 9278 Communications' failure to provide this Commission with current contact information and file a tariff is a "willful violation" of Sections 364.02(13) and 364.04, Florida Statutes, in the sense intended by Section 364.285, Florida Statutes.

Pursuant to Section 364.285(1), Florida Statutes, this Commission is authorized to impose upon any entity subject to its jurisdiction a penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each day a violation continues, if such entity is found to have *refused to comply with or to have willfully violated* any lawful rule or order of the Commission, or any provision of Chapter 364, Florida Statutes.

Section 364.285(1), Florida Statutes, however, does not define what it is to "willfully violate" a rule or order. Nevertheless, it appears plain that the intent of the statutory language is to penalize those who affirmatively act in opposition to a Commission order or rule. See, Florida State Racing Commission v. Ponce de Leon Trotting Association, 151 So.2d 633, 634 & n.4 (Fla. 1963); c.f., McKenzie Tank Lines, Inc. v. McCauley, 418 So.2d 1177, 1181 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982) (there must be an intentional commission of an act violative of a statute with knowledge that such an act is likely to result in serious injury) [citing Smit v. Geyer Detective Agency, Inc., 130 So.2d 882, 884 (Fla. 1961)]. Thus, a "willful violation of law" at least covers an act of purposefulness.

However, "willful violation" need not be limited to acts of commission. The phrase "willful violation" can mean either an intentional act of commission or one of omission, that is *failing to act*. See, Nuger v. State Insurance Commissioner, 238 Md. 55, 67, 207 A.2d 619, 625 (1965) [emphasis added]. As the First District Court of Appeal stated, "willfully" can be defined as:

An act or omission is 'willfully' done, if done voluntarily and intentionally and with the specific intent to do something the law forbids, or *with the specific intent to fail to do something the law requires to be done*; that is to say, with bad purpose either to disobey or to disregard the law.

Metropolitan Dade County v. State Department of Environmental Protection, 714 So.2d 512, 517 (Fla. 1st DCA 1998) [emphasis added]. In other words, a willful violation of a statute, rule or order is

also one done with an intentional disregard of, or a plain indifference to, the applicable statute or regulation. See, L. R. Willson & Sons, Inc. v. Donovan, 685 F.2d 664, 667 n.1 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Thus, the failure of 9278 Communications to file a tariff and provide this Commission with current contact information meets the standard for a "refusal to comply" and "willful violations" as contemplated by the Legislature when enacting section 364.285, Florida Statutes.

9278 Communications also cannot claim that it did not know that it had the duty to file a tariff and provide this Commission with current contact information. "It is a common maxim, familiar to all minds, that 'ignorance of the law' will not excuse any person, either civilly or criminally." Barlow v. United States, 32 U.S. 404, 411 (1833); see, Perez v. Marti, 770 So.2d 284, 289 (Fla. 3rd DCA 2000) (ignorance of the law is never a defense). Moreover, in the context of this docket, all intrastate interexchange telecommunication companies, like 9278 Communications, are subject to the rules published in the Florida Administrative Code. See, Commercial Ventures, Inc. v. Beard, 595 So.2d 47, 48 (Fla. 1992).

Thus, this Commission finds that 9278 Communications, Inc. has, by its actions and inactions, willfully violated Sections 364.02(13) and 364.04, Florida Statutes, and imposes a \$25,000 penalty on the company to be paid to the Florida Public Service Commission. If 9278 Communications, Inc. fails to timely file a protest and request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts shall be deemed admitted, the right to a hearing waived, and the penalty shall be deemed assessed. Further, if the company fails to timely file a protest and fails to do any of the following:

1. file a tariff;
2. provide the Commission with current contact information; or
3. pay the penalty,

the company shall be required to immediately cease and desist providing intrastate interexchange telecommunications services in Florida upon issuance of the Consummating Order until the company pays the penalty, files a tariff and provides this Commission with current contact information.

This Order will become final upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by this Commission's decision files a protest within 21 days of the

issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. If the Commission's Order is not protested and the payment of the penalty is not received within fourteen calendar days after the issuance of the Consummating Order, the collection of the penalty shall be referred to the Department of Financial Services. This docket shall be closed administratively upon receipt of the company's tariff, the company's current contact information, and the payment of the penalty, or upon referral of the penalty to the Department of Financial Services.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that 9278 Communications, Inc. has, by its actions and inactions, willfully violated Sections 364.02(13) and 364.04, Florida Statutes. It is further

ORDERED that 9278 Communications, Inc. shall pay a \$25,000 penalty to the Florida Public Service Commission. If 9278 Communications, Inc. fails to timely file a protest and request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts shall be deemed admitted, the right to a hearing waived, and the penalty shall be deemed assessed. It is further

ORDERED that should 9278 Communications, Inc. fail to timely file a protest and fails to: 1) file a tariff; 2) provide the Commission with current contact information; and 3) pay the penalty, the company shall be required to immediately cease and desist providing intrastate interexchange telecommunications services in Florida upon issuance of the Consummating Order. It is further

ORDERED that if this Commission's Order is not protested and the payment of the penalty is not received within fourteen calendar days after the issuance of the Consummating Order, the collection of the penalty shall be referred to the Department of Financial Services. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall be closed administratively upon receipt of the company's tariff, the company's current contact information, and the payment of the penalty, or upon referral of the penalty to the Department of Financial Services.

ORDER NO. PSC-04-0022-PAA-TI
DOCKET NO. 030696-TI
PAGE 9

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 12th Day
of January, 2004.

/s/ Blanca S. Bayó
BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of the Commission Clerk
and Administrative Services

This is a facsimile copy. Go to the
Commission's Web site,
<http://www.floridapsc.com> or fax a request
to 1-850-413-7118, for a copy of the order
with signature.

(S E A L)

JPR

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing that is available under Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Mediation may be available on a case-by-case basis. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to a hearing.

The action proposed herein is preliminary in nature. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on February 2, 2004.

In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become final and effective upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.

Any objection or protest filed in this/these docket(s) before the issuance date of this order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the original and one copy of the foregoing has been Hand Delivered to: Dale R. Buys and Jason Rojas, Staff Attorneys for the Florida Public Service Commission, and to Blanca S. Bayo, Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, at: 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, this 2nd day of February, 2004.



Albert T. Gimbel