## State of Florida



# Hublic Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

## -M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

AH 10: ERK

DATE:

MAY 30, 2002

TO:

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION CLERK & ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (BAYÓ)

FROM:

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL (BELLAK) RCB

RE:

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP - PETITION BY BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN ISSUES IN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH SUPRA TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.

AGENDA:

JUNE 11, 2002 - POST HEARING DECISION - PARTICIPATION IS

LIMITED TO COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: NONE

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\GCL\WP\001305#3.RCM

#### CASE BACKGROUND

On April 17, 2002, Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. (Supra) filed a Motion to Disqualify And Recuse Commission Staff And Commission Panel From All Further Consideration of The Docket And to Refer This Docket to The Division of Administrative Hearings For All Further Proceedings. (Disqualification Motion).

On April 24, 2002, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. filed an Opposition to Supra Telecommunications and Information System, Inc.'s Motion to Disqualify and Refer (Opposition Response).

On May 1, 2002, Supra filed a Motion to Strike and Reply to BellSouth's Opposition Response. On May 1, 2002, BellSouth filed an Opposition to Supra's Motion to Strike and Reply.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

05710 MAY 30 B

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP DATE: May 30, 2002

### DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Is Supra's Motion to Strike an authorized motion?

**RECOMMENDATION:** No. Supra's Motion to Strike is unauthorized and cannot be considered.

STAFF ANALYSIS: According to Supra at p. 1 of its Motion to Strike and Reply, Rule 1.140(f), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes a party to move to strike certain matter "from any pleading at any time". However, neither motions nor responses in opposition thereto are "pleadings". See, Rule 1.100(a), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. See also, Harris v. Lewis State Bank, 436 So. 2d 338, 340, n. 1 (Fla. 1st DCA 1983); Motzner v. Tanner, 561 So. 2d 1336 (Fla. 5th DCA 1990). Therefore, Supra's Motion to Strike Portions of BellSouth's Opposition Response is unauthorized and cannot be considered.

ISSUE 2: Is Supra's Reply to BellSouth's Opposition authorized by
the administrative rule?

<u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> No, Supra's Reply is unauthorized by Rule 28.106-204 and cannot be considered.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Supra cites nothing affirmatively supporting its ability to file a "Reply" to BellSouth's Opposition Response, asserting only a lack of any express prohibition in the Florida Administrative Rules against doing so. However, Rule 28-106.204 sets out the rules governing motions and specifically states:

The original written motion  $\underline{\text{shall}}$  be filed with the presiding officer. When time allows, the other parties  $\underline{\text{may}}$ , within 7 days of service of a written motion, file a response in opposition.

DOCKET NO. 001305-TP DATE: May 30, 2002

Thus, the administrative rules explicitly set out what <u>shall</u> be done and what <u>may</u> be done by the various parties participating in motion practice. Supra has cited no authority supporting the assumption that the movant <u>may</u> file <u>a reply</u> to an opposition, or that the movant can guess the amount of time by which a reply <u>may</u> be filed. Accordingly, Supra's Reply to BellSouth's Opposition Response is unauthorized and cannot be considered.

**ISSUE 3:** Should this docket remain open?

**RECOMMENDATION:** Yes. The docket should remain open.

RCB

- 3 -