

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Initiation of show cause proceeding
against Q LINK WIRELESS LLC for apparent
violation of Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-
TP.

DOCKET NO. 20240146-TP
ORDER NO. PSC-2024-0479-PAA-TP
ISSUED: November 21, 2024

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

MIKE LA ROSA, Chairman
ART GRAHAM
GARY F. CLARK
ANDREW GILES FAY
GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO

PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION
ORDER FOR Q LINK WIRELESS LLC TO SHOW CAUSE
FOR APPARENT VIOLATION OF ORDER NO. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP,
OR REVOKE Q LINK WIRELESS LLC'S ETC DESIGNATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

Background

We opened this docket to initiate a show cause proceeding against Q LINK WIRELESS LLC (Q LINK or Company) for apparent violation of Commission Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP.¹

Q LINK is a provider of commercial mobile radio service and offers prepaid wireless telecommunications services to consumers as a wireless reseller. The company is regulated as a common carrier pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 153(11). Q LINK is a Limited Liability Company that was organized in the State of Delaware on August 25, 2011, and is wholly-owned by its parent, Quadrant Holdings Group LLC. By Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP (ETC Order), we designated Q LINK as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) throughout Florida, pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(c)(2020).² Q LINK's purpose in seeking its ETC designation was to receive federal support for offering the Lifeline discount to its low-income customers. As part of its petition seeking ETC designation, the Company committed to follow applicable state and federal rules. It is believed that Q LINK has approximately 15,429 Lifeline customers in Florida.

¹ Florida Public Service Commission Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP, issued June 20, 2024, in Docket No. 20240065-TP, *In re: Petition for designation as eligible telecommunications carrier in the State of Florida, by Q LINK WIRELESS.*

² Florida Public Service Commission Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP, Docket No. 06753-2024, *Notice of Proposed Agency Action Order Granting Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Designation*, issued June 20, 2024.

In its Petition³ for ETC designation, filed on April 16, 2024, Q LINK made various representations to this Commission regarding its adherence with federal and state regulations related to the Lifeline program:

- a. Q LINK, in its representations regarding “Prevention of Waste, Fraud and Abuse,” indicated its “commitment to being a trusted steward with public resources”⁴ and further discussed at length its alleged steps to prevent such waste, fraud and abuse by employing a “state-of-the-art proprietary fraud prevention system;”⁵
- b. Q LINK represented that “consistent with federal regulations, [it] would not seek USF reimbursement for inactive subscribers and will de-enroll any subscriber who has not used [its] Lifeline service as set forth in 47 C.F.R. § 54.407(c)(2);”⁶
- c. Q LINK represented that “[a]n account will be considered active if the authorized subscriber establishes usage, as ‘usage’ is defined by 47 C.F.R. § 54.407(c)(2), during the specified time frame, currently a period of thirty (30) days, or during the notice period set forth in 47 C.F.R. § 54.405(e)(3), currently a period of fifteen (15) days;”⁷
- d. Q LINK represented that “[b]y this Petition, [it] hereby asserts its willingness and ability to comply with the rules and regulations that the Commission may lawfully impose upon the Company’s provision of service contemplated by this Petition;”⁸
- e. Q LINK represented that “100% of federal universal service funds will flow through directly to Lifeline customers;”⁹ and,
- f. Q LINK stressed in its Petition, for a second time, that it “remains committed to careful stewardship of the Lifeline program.”¹⁰

On August 22, 2024, the United States commenced its criminal prosecution against Q LINK and Issa Asad [CEO of Q LINK and owner of Q LINK’s parent company (QUADRANT)] with the filing of an Information in the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida.¹¹ The Government charged both defendants with “Conspiracy to Commit Offenses

³ Florida Public Service Commission, *supra*, Docket No. 20240065-TP, Document No. 01893-2024, Petition, filed April 16, 2024.

⁴ *Id.*, Petition at p. 18.

⁵ *Id.*, Petition at p. 17.

⁶ *Id.*, Petition at p. 18.

⁷ *Id.*, Petition at p. 18.

⁸ *Id.*, Petition at p. 1.

⁹ *Id.*, Petition at p. 18-19.

¹⁰ *Id.*, Petition at p. 22.

¹¹ *United States v. Asad & Q Link Wireless LLC*, U.S. Distr. Ct. for the S.D. Fla., Case 1:24-cr-20363-RAR, Document 1 (Information), filed August 22, 2024, accessed via PACER.

Against, and to Defraud, the United States (18 U.S.C. § 371).¹² Further, Asad was charged with Money Laundering (18 U.S.C. § 1957).¹³

On October 15, 2024, Q LINK and Asad each admitted guilt and entered into Plea Agreements for conspiring to defraud and commit offenses against the United States in connection with a years-long scheme to steal over \$100 million from the federal Lifeline program.^{14,15}

Asad, in addition to entering a guilty plea to the conspiracy to defraud the United States, also entered a plea of guilty to laundering money from a separate scheme to defraud a different federal program meant to aid individuals and businesses hurt by the COVID-19 pandemic.

As part of their Plea Agreements, Q LINK and Asad agreed to pay, jointly and severally, the sum of \$109,637,057.00 in restitution to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) no later than the time of their sentencing hearings (currently set for January 15, 2025). Asad separately agreed to pay \$1,758,339.25 in restitution to the U.S. Small Business Administration and to a forfeiture judgment against him of at least \$17,484,118.00.

Q LINK agreed in its Plea Agreement that “it shall not participate in any program administered by the FCC”¹⁶ as of the date of sentencing, and further agreed that it would “cooperate with the FCC in the transition of all customers of any program administered by the FCC to other telecommunications providers.”¹⁷ The sentencing date is currently scheduled for January 15, 2025.

In a Factual Proffer, Q LINK admitted that

[It] conspired with others, including Asad and Director of Customer Relations #1, to submit and cause to be submitted false and fraudulent claims to the FCC Lifeline program for customers who were not using their cellphones according to the FCC usage rules. The Defendant and others conspired to mislead and trick the FCC into thinking customers were using their cellphones by manufacturing cellphone activity to pass off as usage and by engaging in coercive marketing techniques to get people to remain Q Link customers.¹⁸

For instance, as discussed in the Q Link Factual Proffer, its employees took “cellphone numbers of the Defendant’s customers who were not using their phones and placed outbound calls by temporarily swapping the customer’s electronic serial number (“ESN”) assigned to the physical cellphone for the ESN number of a cellphone in the Defendant’s shipping department.”¹⁹ This scheme was carried out roughly between 2013 and 2016 so that the

¹² *U.S. v Asad/Q Link, Id.*

¹³ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

¹⁴ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link*, Document 21 (Asad Plea Agreement).

¹⁵ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link*, Document 23 (Q Link Plea Agreement).

¹⁶ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.* at p. 3.

¹⁷ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.* at p. 4.

¹⁸ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link*, Document 24 (Q Link Factual Proffer), p. 3.

¹⁹ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

cellphone records of a customer would reflect an outbound call, and thus would have created “usage” as required by the FCC for reimbursement.²⁰

Around March 2020, Asad and Q LINK devised an automated script for its customers that falsely warned “Hello, your Medicaid, Foodstamp and Lifeline benefits are about to get cancelled.”²¹ Customers were then directed to press 1 to indicate that they wished to remain enrolled in the noted programs.

Other practices implemented by Q LINK included using

auto-dialers to originate a high volume of outbound calls from [Q LINK] to customers who were not using their cellphones to trick them into answering the phone to assent to [Q LINK’s] Lifeline services, including using the local area codes not facially associated with [Q LINK] and spoofing [the customers’] own cellphone numbers to deceive customers into thinking that [Q LINK’s] representative were (sic) was not on the other end . . . in order to trick and mislead customers into pressing a button to agree to remain Q Link customers so that the Defendant could keep billing the Lifeline program.²²

Other Q LINK business practices included ensuring that customers could not cancel online, but had to call Q LINK on the phone, with company representatives employing different scripts intended to prevent customers from cancelling.²³

Q LINK was aware as early as 2014 that the FCC was investigating it regarding customer usage issues.²⁴ Between 2015 and 2021, Q LINK provided to the FCC records of manufactured cellphone activity for those customers who were not meeting usage requirements – even including activity for phones for customers who were “so fed up” with Q LINK that they had turned over their phones to the FCC.²⁵

Other fraudulent business activity included trying to pass off records of unchecked voicemails as answered voice calls (hence creating “usage”), as well as changing the name of a header on a spreadsheet from “voicemail” to ‘voice’ to leave the FCC with the false impression that the call records contained voice calls.²⁶

Importantly, as of October 15, 2024, Q LINK admitted that it “has continued to bill the FCC Lifeline program up until the present, including for customers that Q Link should have stopped billing because the customers were not using their cellphones.”²⁷

²⁰ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

²¹ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

²² *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.* at p. 4.

²³ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

²⁴ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.* at p. 5.

²⁵ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

²⁶ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.*

²⁷ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.* at p. 6.

Given its admission of guilt to the crime of conspiring to defraud the United States in regard to its reimbursements from the Lifeline program, we find this to be evidence of Q LINK's apparent violation of its ETC Order and evidence of it no longer being in the public interest for Q LINK to be designated as an ETC in Florida.

This Order to Show Cause (Show Cause Order) qualifies as an administrative complaint against the entity as required by Section 120.60(5), Florida Statutes (F.S.).²⁸ For Q LINK to potentially keep its ETC designation in the State of Florida, it must provide a written response to this Commission within 21 days of issuance of this Show Cause Order, disputing the factual allegations set forth in this Show Cause Order, and requesting a hearing pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57, F.S. If the Company requests a hearing, a further proceeding will be scheduled before this Commission makes a final determination on the matter.

If Q LINK fails to timely respond to the Show Cause Order, then it would be deemed to have admitted the factual allegations contained in our Show Cause Order. The Company's failure to timely respond would also constitute a waiver of its right to a hearing. If the Company does not timely respond, a final order will be issued imposing the sanctions set out in the Show Cause Order.

If a final order is issued, then Q LINK's ETC status will be revoked in the state of Florida, and the Company would no longer be able to offer the Lifeline discount to its customers in Florida. Q LINK would also be prohibited from receiving monetary support from the Universal Service Fund for its Lifeline customers in Florida.

We have jurisdiction pursuant to Sections 364.10(2), 364.285, and 364.335, F.S.; 47 C.F.R. § 54.201; 47 C.F.R. § 54.400 – 54.423; and, Rule 25.4.0665, F.A.C.

Analysis & Decision

I. Revocation of Q Link's ETC Status

A. Applicable Law

State commissions have the primary responsibility for performing ETC designations. In the state of Florida, we have the jurisdiction to designate wireless carriers as ETCs to participate in the federal Lifeline program.²⁹ 47 C.F.R. Section 54.201(c) provides that:

Upon request and consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity, the state commission may, in the case of an area served by a rural telephone company, and shall, in the case of all other areas, designate more than one common carrier as an eligible telecommunications carrier for a service area designated by the state commission, so long as each additional requesting carrier meets the requirements of paragraph (d) of this section. Before designating an additional eligible telecommunications carrier for an area served by a rural

²⁸ See also Rule 28-106.2015(1), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) (“[A]n agency pleading or communication that seeks to exercise an agency’s enforcement authority and to take any kind of disciplinary action . . . shall be deemed an administrative complaint.”)

²⁹ Section 364.10(3), F.S.

telephone company, the state commission shall find that the designation is in the public interest.

47 C.F.R. § 54.407(c) provides that Lifeline providers that do not assess and collect a monthly fee from its subscribers: (1) shall not receive universal service support until the subscriber activates the service, and (2) shall only continue to receive universal service support for subscribers who have used the service within the last 30 days.

In addition to the responsibility for performing ETC designations, we also possesses the authority to revoke ETC designations for the failure of an ETC's compliance with any conditions imposed by us.³⁰ The FCC has found that individual state commissions are qualified to determine what information is necessary to ensure that ETCs are in compliance with applicable requirements, including state-specific ETC eligibility requirements.³¹

Pursuant to Section 364.285(1), F.S., we may impose upon any entity subject to jurisdiction a penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each such 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, F.S. Each day a violation continues is treated as a separate offense. Each penalty is a lien upon the real and personal property of the entity and is enforceable by the Commission as a statutory lien.

As an alternative to the above monetary penalties, Section 364.285(1), F.S., provides that we may amend, suspend, or revoke any certificate issued by us for any such violation. Part of the determination we must make in evaluating whether and how to penalize a company is whether the company willfully violated the order, rule, or statute. Section 364.285(1), F.S., does not define what it is to "willfully violate" an order, rule, or statute. Willfulness is a question of fact.³² The plain meaning of "willful" typically applied by the Courts in the absence of a statutory definition, is an act or omission that is done "voluntarily and intentionally" with specific intent and "purpose to violate or disregard the requirements of the law."³³

"It is a common maxim, familiar to all minds that 'ignorance of the law' will not excuse any person, either civilly or criminally."³⁴ In making similar decisions, the Commission has repeatedly held that certificated companies are charged with the knowledge of the Commission's orders, rules, and statutes, and that the intent of Section 364.285(1), F.S., is to penalize those who affirmatively act in opposition to those orders, rules, or statutes.³⁵ In other words, a company cannot excuse its violation because it "did not know."

³⁰ See *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 05-46, <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-05-46A1.pdf>, page 34.

³¹ *Id.* at 33.

³² *Fugate v. Fla. Elections Comm'n*, 924 So. 2d 74, 75 (Fla. 1st DCA 2006), citing *Metro. Dade County v. State Dep't of Env'tl. Prot.*, 714 So. 2d 512, 517 (Fla. 3d DCA 1998).

³³ *Id.* at 76.

³⁴ *Barlow v. United States*, 32 U.S. 404, 411 (1833).

³⁵ See Order No. PSC-15-0391-SC-TX, issued November 10, 2015, in Docket No. 20150158-TX, *In re: Initiation of show cause proceedings against Sun-Tel USA, Inc. for apparent violation of Section 364.335(2), F.S., (Application for Certificate of Authority), Section 364.183(1), F.S., (Access to Company Records), Rule 25-4.0665(20), F.A.C., (Lifeline Service), and Rule 25-4.0051, F.A.C., (Current Certificate Holder Information).*

In recommending a monetary penalty or a form of certificate suspension or revocation, we review prior Commission orders concerning the company at issue. While Section 364.285(1), F.S., treats each day of each violation as a separate offense with penalties of up to \$25,000 per offense, the general purpose of imposing monetary penalties is to obtain compliance with our orders, rules, or statutes.

If a company has a pattern of noncompliance with an order, rule, or statute, or in particular if the violation of an order, rule, or statute adversely impacts the public health, safety, or welfare, then a monetary penalty may not be appropriate or sufficient to address the situation. In such a case, the sanction should be the most severe.

In this docket, our informal investigation revealed that the admitted fraud committed by Q LINK has included, amongst other fraudulent practices, creating the appearance of customer usage of its service to receive federal funding from the Lifeline program by falsifying and/or manipulating records. Q LINK admitted on October 15, 2024, that it “has continued to bill the FCC Lifeline program up until the present, including for customers that Q Link should have stopped billing because the customers were not using their cellphones.”³⁶ This is in direct violation of Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP for various reasons, as will be discussed below.

47 C.F.R. § 54.407(c)(2)(i)-(v) sets forth usage requirements that would permit Q LINK to be reimbursed for offering Lifeline:

(2) After service activation, an eligible telecommunications carrier shall only continue to receive universal service support reimbursement for such Lifeline service provided to subscribers who have used the service within the last 30 days, or who have cured their non-usage as provided for in § 54.405(e)(3). Any of these activities, if undertaken by the subscriber, will establish “usage” of the Lifeline service:

(i) Completion of an outbound call or usage of data;

(ii) Purchase of minutes or data from the eligible telecommunications carrier to add to the subscriber's service plan;

(iii) Answering an incoming call from a party other than the eligible telecommunications carrier or the eligible telecommunications carrier's agent or representative;

(iv) Responding to direct contact from the eligible communications carrier and confirming that he or she wants to continue receiving Lifeline service; or

(v) Sending a text message.

³⁶ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link*, Q Link Factual Proffer, p. 6.

Rule 25-4.0665, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), specifically addresses the Lifeline Assistance Program. As set forth in the Rule, companies with ETC designations “must offer Lifeline Assistance as prescribed by the Federal Communications Commission in Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 54, Subpart E, Universal Service Support for Low-Income Consumers, Sections 54.400 through 54.423 . . . which are hereby incorporated into this rule by reference” (Emphasis added.) Hence, a violation of 47 C.F.R. § 54.407(c)(2)(i)-(v) is likewise a violation of Florida law.

We find that the admissions contained in the Plea Agreement of Q LINK and its associated Factual Proffer, as well as the admissions contained in the Plea Agreement and Factual Proffer of Asad, document its direct violation of Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP and that it is no longer in the public interest for Q LINK to be designated as an ETC in Florida. We find that the appropriate penalty is revoking Q LINK’s ETC designation.

B. Factual Allegations

Q LINK submitted false and fraudulent claims to the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) for Lifeline program reimbursements for customers who were not using their cellphones according to the FCC’s usage rules. The company conspired to mislead the FCC into thinking customers were using their cellphones by manufacturing cellphone activity to pass off as usage and by engaging in coercive marketing techniques to get people to remain subscribed to its service.³⁷

Q LINK has pleaded guilty to fraud and violating federal Lifeline reimbursement rules. As a result, we find Q LINK in violation of the ETC Order issued by us for the following reasons:

- 47 C.F.R. §54.407(c)(2)(i)-(v) sets forth usage requirements which would permit Q LINK to be reimbursed for offering Lifeline;
- The usage requirements of 47 C.F.R. §54.407(c)(2)(i)-(v) are incorporated into Rule 25-4.0665, F.A.C., by reference. Thus a violation of any of any portion of 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.400 – 54.423 constitutes a violation of Rule 25-4.0665, F.A.C.;
- In the ETC Order for Q LINK, this Commission reiterated that Q LINK “asserts that it meets all applicable federal requirements for designation as a Lifeline only ETC in Florida . . . and asserts that, if approved, it will comply with . . . Rule 25-4.0665, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) which govern Lifeline service”³⁸

³⁷ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link, Id.* at p. 3.

³⁸ Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP, issued June 20, 2024, in Docket No. 20240065-TP, *In re: Petition for designation as eligible telecommunications carrier in the State of Florida, by Q LINK WIRELESS* at p. 2.

By its own admission, Q LINK has violated 47 C.F.R. §54.407(c)(2)(i) and, hence, has violated Rule 25-4.0665, F.A.C., due to continuing “to bill the FCC Lifeline program up until the present, including for customers that Q Link should have stopped billing because the customers were not using their cellphones.”³⁹ Further, due to its admitted fraud against the Lifeline program, we find that it is no longer in the public interest for ETC designation to be extended to Q Link.

Accordingly, we order Q LINK to show cause, in writing, within 21 days from the issuance of this order, why its ETC designation should not be revoked for apparent violation of Commission Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP, due to, at a minimum, its violation of the Lifeline reimbursement provisions of 47 C.F.R. § 54.407(c)(2)(i) and, hence, Rule 25-4.0665, F.A.C., and because it is no longer in the public interest for Q LINK to be designated as an ETC.

In the event that Q Link fails to file a timely response to this Show Cause Order, the Company’s ETC designation will be deemed revoked, and a final order will be issued.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Q Link Wireless LLC shall show cause, in writing, within 21 days from issuance of this Show Cause Order, why its ETC designation should not be revoked for apparent violation of Commission Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP due to its admitted fraud against the Lifeline program and because it is no longer in the public interest for Q Link to be designated as an ETC in Florida. It is further

ORDERED that this Show Cause Order is an administrative complaint by the Florida Public Service Commission, as petitioner, against Q LINK WIRELESS LLC, as respondent. It is further

ORDERED that Q LINK shall respond to the Show Cause Order within 21 days of issuance, and the response shall reference Docket No. 20240146-TP, Initiation of show cause proceeding against Q LINK WIRELESS LLC for apparent violation of Order No. PSC-2024-0201-PAA-TP. It is further

ORDERED that Q LINK has the right to request a hearing to be conducted in accordance with Sections 120.569 and 120.57, F.S., and to be represented by counsel or other qualified representative. It is further

ORDERED that requests for hearing shall comply with Rule 28-106.2015, F.A.C. It is further

ORDERED that Q LINK’s response to this Show Cause Order shall identify those material facts that are in dispute. If there are none, the petition must so indicate. It is further

³⁹ *U.S. v. Asad/Q Link*, Q Link Factual Proffer, p. 6.

ORDERED that if Q LINK files a timely written response and makes a request for a hearing pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57, F.S., a further proceeding will be scheduled before a final determination of this matter is made. It is further

ORDERED that if Q Link timely responds in writing within 21 days of issuance of this Show Cause Order on it, this docket shall remain open to allow for the appropriate processing of the response. It is further

ORDERED that a failure to file a timely written response to this Show Cause Order will constitute an admission of the facts alleged herein, and a waiver of the right to a hearing on this issue. It is further

ORDERED that in the event that Q LINK fails to file a timely response to the Show Cause Order, a final order will issue which will:

- a. Require Q LINK to immediately cease accepting new Lifeline applicants in Florida as of the date of the final order;
- b. Require Q LINK to provide a spreadsheet of its existing Lifeline customers in Florida to this Commission, including names, phone numbers, mailing addresses, and, if available, email addresses, within 3 days of the final order;
- c. Direct Q LINK to contact all of its existing Lifeline customers in Florida in writing within 7 days of the date of the final order and advise of the specific need for the customer to select a new Lifeline carrier that is designated as either a wireline or wireless ETC. This notice shall include the Lifeline contact list on the Commission's website located at: <https://www.florida.psc.com/pscfiles/website-files//PDF/Utilities/Telecomm/Lifeline/CompanyContact-EN.pdf>;⁴⁰
- d. Advise Q LINK that a random sampling of Q LINK's Lifeline customers in Florida will be conducted by this Commission approximately 15 days after issuance of the final order to ascertain compliance by Q LINK with paragraph (c), above;
- e. Direct Q LINK to advise this Commission in writing within 10 days of the final order of its compliance with paragraph (c), above;
- f. Confirm that in the event random sampling by Commission staff indicates that Q LINK has failed to notify its Florida Lifeline customers as required, prior to the sentencing hearing the prosecutor in the pending U.S. District Court criminal proceeding will be notified of Q LINK's apparent failure to assist in the transition of customers to other Lifeline providers; and,

⁴⁰ There are up to 14 wireless ETCs and up to 1 wireline ETC that could provide the Lifeline discount to Q LINK's current customers, depending on the geographic location of the customer.

g. Revoke Q LINK's ETC status 30 days after the date of the final order.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 21st day of November, 2024.



ADAM J. TEITZMAN
Commission Clerk

Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons

JLA

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 or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, 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 or judicial review 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.

This order is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by this show cause order may file a response within 21 days of issuance of the show cause order as set forth herein. This response must be received by the Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on December 12, 2024.

Failure to respond within the time set forth above shall constitute an admission of all facts and a waiver of the right to a hearing and a default pursuant to Rule 28-106.111(4), Florida Administrative Code. Such default shall be effective on the day subsequent to the above date.

If an adversely affected person fails to respond to this order within the time prescribed above, that party may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of any electric, gas or telephone utility or by the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Office of Commission Clerk, and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.