

James Meza III
Attorney

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
150 South Monroe Street
Room 400
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(404) 335-0769

July 16, 2004

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayó
Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and
Administrative Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 980119-TP (Supra Complaint)

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed is BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Opposition to Notice of Adoption of Testimony, which we ask that you file in the captioned docket.

Copies have been served to the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,


James Meza III

cc: All parties of record
Marshall M. Criser III
R. Douglas Lackey
Nancy B. White

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
Docket No. 980119-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail this 16th day of July, 2004 to the following:

Beth Keating
Patricia Christensen
Staff Counsels
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel No. (850) 413-6212
Fax No. (850) 413-6250
bkeating@psc.state.fl.us
pchrste@psc.state.fl.us

Ann H. Shelfer
Jonathan Audu
Supra Telecommunications &
Information Systems, Inc.
Koger Center – Ellis Building
1311 Executive Center Drive
Suite 220
Tallahassee, FL 32301-5067
Tel. No. (850) 402-0510
Fax. No. (850) 402-0522
ashelfer@stis.com
jonathan.audu@stis.com

Steve Chaiken
Supra Telecommuncations &
Information Systems, Inc.
2620 S.W. 27th Avenue
Miami, FL 33133
Tel. No. (305) 476-4239
Fax No. (305) 443-1078
Steve.chaiken@stis.com


James Meza III (BKS)

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Complaint of Supra Telecommunications) Docket No.: 980119-TP
and Information Systems, Inc., Against)
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.)
_____) Filed: July 16, 2004

OPPOSITION TO NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF TESTIMONY

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") respectfully requests that the Florida Public Service Commission ("Commission") deny Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc.'s ("Supra") unilateral attempt to substitute David Nilson for Supra's original witness, David Stahly ("Adoption Notice"), at the hearing of this matter. As will be established below, Supra's Adoption Notice is procedurally improper, is not based on cause, and is nothing more than an attempt by Supra to rehabilitate its case in this proceeding to the prejudice of BellSouth. In support of this Opposition, BellSouth states the following:

BACKGROUND

1. On November 10, 2003, Supra initiated this proceeding by protesting Commission Order No. PSC-03-1178-PAA-TP, wherein the Commission found that BellSouth complied with its previous Orders in this docket regarding on-line edit checking capability. The hearing of this matter is scheduled for August 4, 2004.

2. Supra filed the direct testimony consisting of 19 pages of its sole witness in this proceeding, David Stahly on April 21, 2004,. In this testimony, Mr. Stahly provided detailed testimony regarding Supra's positions in this docket. In addition, Mr. Stahly provided the Commission with a description of his background and experience, which consists of working for the Illinois Commerce Commission, Sprint, and Supra over the last 16 years. Mr. Stahly even boasts in his testimony that he has "filed

testimony and/or testified before regulatory Commissions in 26 states in 60 proceedings including one proceeding before the Florida Public Service Commission.” See Stahly Direct Testimony at 1-2.

3. On May 26, 2004, Supra filed the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Stahly, which consisted of 14 pages. Again, in his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Stahly advances Supra’s positions on the issues in this proceeding and attempts to rebut the testimony of BellSouth witness, Ron Pate.

4. On June 2, 2004, BellSouth requested the deposition of Mr. Stahly in Miami for July 7, 2004. Ultimately, the parties agreed to this date for depositions and the depositions occurred on July 7, 2004 as scheduled.

5. In his deposition, Mr. Stahly testified that he drafted his testimony and did not indicate that he was unavailable for the hearing of this matter. In addition, Mr. Stahly provided answers to questions asked by BellSouth regarding specific statements asserted in his prefiled testimony. Importantly, through his deposition, BellSouth was able to establish the scope of Mr. Stahly’s knowledge and the basis for his testimony.

6. On July 12, 2004, Supra unilaterally and without seeking leave filed its Adoption Notice. Supra provided no reason or cause why, on the eve of the hearing, Mr. Nilson should be allowed to substitute for Mr. Stahly at the hearing of this matter.

ARGUMENT

7. The Commission should reject Supra’s Adoption Notice and refuse to permit Mr. Nilson to testify at the hearing of this matter for the following reasons:

8. First, Supra’s Adoption Notice is procedurally improper because Supra did not seek leave of the Commission to substitute Mr. Nilson for Mr. Stahly. Pursuant to

Rule 28-106.204, Florida Administrative Code, all requests for relief must be made by motion. Supra has violated this rule and thus its proposed witness shuffle should be of no force and effect.

9. Second, Supra has provided this Commission with no reason why this substitution should be allowed, especially after Mr. Stahly filed direct testimony, filed rebuttal testimony, and was deposed by BellSouth. Although the adoption of witness testimony has occurred in the past in Commission proceedings, it almost always is because of the unavailability of the initial witness. See e.g., In Re: Complaint of Florida Competitive Carriers Association Against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Regarding BellSouth's Practice of Refusing to Provide FastAccess Internet Service to Customers Who Receive Voice Service from a Competitive Voice Provider, and Request for Expedited Relief, Docket No. 020507-TL, Order No. PSC-03-0636-PCO-TL (May 23, 2003) (statements of FCCA in describing the practice of witness adoption).

10. Here, Supra provides no reason for the proposed witness substitution and BellSouth submits that there is no legitimate cause for the substitution. Indeed, based on the fact that Supra filed its Adoption Notice two business days after BellSouth's deposition of Mr. Stahly, the logical conclusion is that Supra wishes to rehabilitate its case by changing witnesses at this late stage. Apparently, Supra believes that Mr. Nilson will be a better witness than Mr. Stahly. Such witness shuffling at this advanced date should not be permitted.

11. Supra made the tactical decision, whether good or bad, to have Mr. Stahly as its witness until two weeks prior to the hearing. As a result of Supra's designation of Mr. Stahly, BellSouth has prepared its case pursuant to Mr. Stahly's deposition


testimony and pre-filed testimony. BellSouth should not be forced to potentially change its defense approximately two weeks before a hearing based upon what another Supra witness may say about the testimony that Mr. Stahly drafted.


12. Simply put, it is patently unfair for Supra to be able to reinterpret or revise Mr. Stahly's testimony through the use of another witness. Mr. Stahly wrote the testimony, Mr. Stahly was deposed regarding his testimony, and BellSouth is prepared to go to trial based on what Mr. Stahly said – not how Mr. Nilson interprets Mr. Stahly's testimony.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, BellSouth requests that the Commission deny Supra's attempt to substitute Mr. Nilson for Mr. Stahly at the hearing of this matter.

Respectfully submitted this 15th day of July, 2004.

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.


NANCY B. WHITE (BSI)
c/o Nancy H. Sims
150 So. Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(305) 347-5558


R. DOUGLAS LACKEY (BSI)
JAMES MEZA III
Suite 4300
675 W. Peachtree St., NE
Atlanta, GA 30375
(404) 335-0769