

Timolyn Henry

From: Michelle Blanton [mblanton@mac-law.com]
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2004 4:35 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Vicki Gordon Kaufman; james.meza@bellsouth.com; Patty Christensen; aleiro@idstelcom.com
Subject: Docket No. 031125-TP

Pursuant to the Commission's procedures for e-filing, IDS Telecom LLC provides the following information:

a. The attorney for this filing is:

Vicki Gordon Kaufman
McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin
Davidson Kaufman & Arnold, P.A.
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850-222-2525
850-222-5606 (fax)

b. The document is to be filed in Docket No. 031125-TP in Re: Complaint of IDS Telcom, LLC against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for overbilling and discontinuance of service, and petition for emergency order restoring service.

c. The document is filed on behalf of IDS Telecom LLC.

d. The document is 7 pages long and the exhibit is 4 pages long. Total pages 11

e. The document is: IDS Telcom's Response and Opposition to BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration and Exhibit A.

Michelle Blanton
Legal Assistant
McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin
Davidson Kaufman & Arnold, P.A.
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

CMP
COM 3
Tel: 850-222-2525
Fax: 850-222-5606

CTR _____
ECR _____
GCL _____
OPC _____
MMS _____
RCA _____
SCR _____
SEC | _____
OTH _____

7/19/2004

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07856 JUL 19 04

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

ORIGINAL

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Complaint of IDS Telcom, LLC against
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for
over billing and discontinuance of service, and
petition for emergency order restoring service

Docket No. 031125-TP

Filed: July 19, 2004

**IDS TELCOM'S RESPONSE AND OPPOSITION TO
BELLSOUTH'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

IDS TELCOM, LLC ("IDS"), by and through its undersigned counsel and pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, hereby files this its response and opposition to BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BellSouth"), Motion For Reconsideration (dated July 12, 2004) ("Motion for Reconsideration"), and in support thereof states as follows.

I. BACKGROUND

1. On or about March 15, 2004, BellSouth served its First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production ("Discovery"). The interrogatories purported to be numbered 1 through 35, however many interrogatories contained between four and ten sub-parts each. In total with sub-parts, BellSouth propounded approximately 123 interrogatories. Together with the interrogatories, BellSouth served one overly broad, vague and harassing request for production, which simply stated as follows: *"Please produce all documents identified, referred to, relied upon or responsive to BellSouth's First Set of Interrogatories propounded upon IDS on March 15, 2002."*

2. On or about April 14, 2004, IDS served its responses and objections to BellSouth's discovery. IDS objected to some of the interrogatories and responded to the production request by stating that it would produce documents and correspondence relating to the settlement "Q" Account. As part of its responses, IDS not only answered many of BellSouth's approximately 123 interrogatories (counting sub-parts), but IDS also produced to BellSouth hundreds of pages of documents relating to the settlement "Q" Account dispute set forth in IDS' pleadings in this docket.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
07856 JUL 19 03
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

3. After receiving IDS' responses, BellSouth advised that it believed IDS' responses to Interrogatory Nos. 23 and 24 were not acceptable. Interrogatory No. 23 made the following request:

Identify all legal proceedings (by case caption and court) where IDS, any owner of IDS, any present or former officer of IDS, and/or any current or former employee of IDS testified about or provided discovery responses relating to IDS' disputes with BellSouth, the Confidential Settlement, and/or the Settlement Agreement. For each such proceeding, identify all pleadings, depositions, and discovery responses responsive to this Interrogatory.

Likewise, Interrogatory No. 24 was similar to Interrogatory No. 23, making the following request:

Identify all legal proceedings (by case caption and court) where former employees of IDS sued IDS and alleged facts that implicated or relate to the IDS' disputes with BellSouth, the Confidential Settlement, and/or the Settlement Amendment.

4. IDS had originally responded to these two BellSouth's interrogatory by objecting and stating that there were no lawsuits or other proceedings pending that involved the same issues being litigated in this docket. Although IDS's response was a true statement, BellSouth complained that the response was not satisfactory because it was aware of a lawsuit filed against IDS in which one the plaintiffs had subpoenaed BellSouth for a copy of the September 2001 Settlement Agreement, that is part of the settlement "Q" Account dispute. BellSouth did not proffer any relevance for the interrogatory questions, but stated that unless IDS revised its answers, BellSouth would file a motion to compel.

5. Although the lawsuit mentioned by BellSouth had no relevance to this docket, to avoid an unnecessary discovery motion, IDS agreed to revise its responses to Interrogatory Nos. 23 and 24 to identify the lawsuit which BellSouth was referring to [i.e. Gulas, et al. v. Noshay, et al., Case No. 02-29516 (CA 01)] and directing BellSouth to the Miami-Dade County Clerk of the Court website which contained a docket of the case. A true and correct copy of that website docket is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". A copy of the IDS' revised response is attached to BellSouth's

Motion for Reconsideration as Exhibit "1". IDS had also agreed to make some other revisions and provide BellSouth copies of the documents it intended to produce.

6. Because IDS did not finish its revisions and document production within the time period sought by BellSouth, BellSouth filed its motion to compel on or about June 4, 2004. On or before June 9, 2004, IDS had produced documents to BellSouth and had completed the revisions agreed to with BellSouth. On June 11, 2004, IDS filed its response to BellSouth's Motion to Compel stating, in part, that it believe most of BellSouth's motion to compel was moot because IDS had produced the agreed documents and had revised its interrogatory responses. IDS also stated that it still objected to BellSouth's Interrogatory No. 22, which requested information on IDS' gross revenues, on the grounds that it was irrelevant, harassing and abusive.

7. On July 1, 2004, this Commission entered an order denying BellSouth's Motion to Compel, noting that IDS had provided BellSouth supplemental interrogatory answers which appeared to have mooted the motion to compel on everything but BellSouth Interrogatory No. 22, which was then denied because it appeared that IDS' gross revenues were irrelevant to any of the issues in dispute (and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence).

II. BELLSOUTH'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

8. On July 12, 2004, BellSouth filed its Motion for Reconsideration¹, arguing that BellSouth considered IDS' revised responses to Interrogatories No. 23 and 24, to be "*evasive and incomplete ... and thus not rendered moot as a result of IDS's supplemental responses.*"

9. In its Motion for Reconsideration BellSouth argues that it has met the standard for reconsideration because BellSouth has identified a point of fact or law which was overlooked or which this Commission failed to consider in rendering the order, citing Diamond Cab Co. v. King,

¹ Despite having received IDS' production and interrogatory responses on or about June 9, 2004, BellSouth did not complain to IDS or otherwise advise this Commission that it believed IDS' responses were inadequate or incomplete. It simply filed a Motion for Reconsideration.

146 So.2d 889, 891 (Fla. 1962). However, BellSouth has failed to meet the reconsideration standard.

10. IDS appropriately supplemented the two interrogatory questions (and corresponding document request). First, both Interrogatory Nos. 23 and 24 ask IDS to identify any lawsuit which mentioned or related in any way (in the broadest sense) to the Confidential Settlement or Settlement Amendment. Because IDS was sued by persons claiming to have provided work on the docket leading up to the Confidential Settlement, IDS identified the lawsuit [i.e. Gulas, et al. v. Noshay, et al., Case No. 02-29516 (CA 01)]. This response completely satisfies BellSouth Interrogatory No. 24 which asks for nothing more. Like Interrogatory No. 24, Interrogatory No. 23 also asks IDS to identify the lawsuit, but then also asks IDS to identify all pleadings, depositions and discovery responses in that lawsuit. In response, IDS referred BellSouth to the Miami-Dade County Clerk of the Court website, which provides an on-line copy of docket on that case. Since the docket contains any notices of deposition and service of discovery requests, the docket does identify "all pleadings, depositions and discovery responses." See Exhibit "A" for a copy of the court docket.

11. First, BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration complains that IDS should have provided BellSouth copies of such "pleadings, depositions and discovery responses (if any)." However, given the attachments to BellSouth's Motion to Compel, it appears that BellSouth has already copied the court file of that case. Given the fact that BellSouth's downtown Miami offices are practically across the street from the Miami-Dade County Civil Courthouse (where the file is kept), BellSouth can easily obtain a copy of the court file (and probably already has done so).

12. Second, BellSouth claims that it knows from the court file that Joe Millstone of IDS was deposed and that he may have said something in the deposition which might be inconsistent

with IDS' position in this case. IDS cannot produce documents it does not have. To IDS' knowledge, the deposition of Mr. Millstone was never transcribed, and IDS does not have a copy. If BellSouth wants those transcripts, BellSouth should purchase the transcripts directly from the court reporter.

13. Further, the only production made by IDS in the circuit court case was recently and after BellSouth had filed its Motion to Compel. Moreover, the documents produced in that circuit case are the same documents produced earlier to BellSouth in this docket, together with copies of pleadings filed in this docket. Thus, Bellsouth should already have a copy of every document IDS produced in that circuit court case.

14. IDS properly responded in its supplemental answers to Interrogatory Nos. 23 and 24 by providing the style of the case and a reference to the court docket which identifies and lists the pleadings and discovery requested in that case. In addition, with respect to documentary discovery, IDS' only obligations are to make any such documents available as they are kept in the ordinary and regular course of business. See Florida Rule Civil of Procedure 1.350(b) (*"When producing documents, the producing party shall either produce them as they are kept in the usual course of business or shall identify them to correspond with the categories in the request"*). This means that documents may be produced where they are stored and kept. See Evangelos v. Dachiel, 553 So.2d 245 (Fla. 3d DCA 1989) (*documents need only be produced where and as they are kept in the ordinary course of business*). Although it is almost certain that BellSouth already has a copy of any and all discovery provided by IDS in that circuit court case, if BellSouth truly insists upon pursuing the court file (i.e. pleadings and discovery), BellSouth should be required (at its own cost) to go to Tampa and/or coordinate with IDS' counsel in Tampa, in order to review that file.

III. SUMMARY

15. IDS satisfactorily responded to BellSouth Interrogatory Nos. 23, 24 and Request for Production No. 1 in IDS' supplemental response, and hence BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration should be denied.

16. If this Commission does not simply deny BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration, to the extent any discovery in the Court file has been taken and is not already public record, IDS can only produce what it has. IDS does not have the deposition transcript(s) which BellSouth claims it wants to review. If BellSouth wants such transcript, it needs to order it directly from the court reporter. With respect to documents, IDS believes that BellSouth already has copies of any production made by IDS in the circuit court case. If BellSouth wants more, it should be required to coordinate with IDS' Tampa attorney (as this is where any such documents would be kept in the ordinary course of business) and pay for any and all such costs at BellSouth's own expense. IDS' Tampa attorney is: Mitchell Lloyd Feldman, Esq. at Silver Levy Feldman & Bass, P.A., 1408 N West Shore Blvd., Suite 806, Tampa, Florida 33607-4585; telephone - (813) 639-9366, facsimile - (813) 639-9376.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, this Commission should deny BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration.

s/ Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Joseph A. McGlothlin
McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin
Davidson Kaufman & Arnold, PA
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel: (850) 222-2525
Fax: (850) 222-5606

Attorneys for IDS Telcom, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing IDS Telecom's Response and Opposition to BellSouth's Motion for Reconsideration has been provided by Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail, this 19th day of July, 2004, to the following:

Patricia Christensen
Office of General Counsel
Room 370 Gunter Building
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399

James Meza, III
Nancy B. White
c/o Ms. Nancy H. Sims
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

s/ Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Vicki Gordon Kaufman

Clerk of Courts
1th Judicial Circuit of Florida
Miami-Dade County



Home Online Services Meet the Clerk Contact Us miamidade.gov

Civil / Family / Probate Justice System Docket Information

GULAS, WILLIAM vs NOSHAY, MICHAEL

* Click on BOOK/PAGE of a particular docket to see the image if it is available *

Case Number (LOCAL):	2002-29516-CA-01	Filing Date:	11/22/2002
Case Number (STATE):	13-2002-CA-029516-0000-01	Dockets Retrieved:	98
		Judicial Section:	13
Date	Book/Page	Docket Entry	Comments
07/01/04		NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION	
06/28/04		ORDER ON MOTION TO COMPEL	
06/28/04		ORDER:	DENYING AMENDED MTN TO STAY
06/23/04		NOTICE:	OF PROPOSAL FOR SETTLEMENT
06/17/04		AFFIDAVIT OF:	OF WILLIAM GULAS
06/17/04		NOTICE OF HRG SPECIAL APPT	07/15/2004 : 09:15 AM
06/10/04		AFFIDAVIT OF:	WILLIAM GULAS
06/10/04		MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER	
06/10/04		MOTION:	TO HOLD DEFS IN CONTEMPT OF COURT & F/SANCTIONS.
06/10/04		NOTICE NOT TIMELY FILED	06/09/2004 : 08:30 AM
06/10/04		NOTICE OF HRG SPECIAL APPT	07/06/2004 : 09:15 AM
05/21/04		MOTION TO COMPEL	
05/21/04		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 08/09/2004 : 08:30 AM
05/03/04		MOTION TO COMPEL	
05/03/04		NOTICE HAS WRONG TIME	05/19/2004 : 09:30 AM
03/16/04		ORDER:	DENYING MTN F/PROTECTIVE ORDR & NOT. OF OBJCTN TKNG DSPT
03/15/04		ORDER:	DENYING MTN TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING APPEALS
02/26/04		REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION	
02/17/04		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 03/08/2004 : 08:30 AM
02/10/04		SUBPOENA RETURNED	
02/03/04		ORDER:	DENYING MTN FOR SANCTIONS
01/20/04		MOTION TO STAY	

01/20/04		NOTICE NOT TIMELY FILED	01/20/2004 : 09:30 AM
01/16/04		NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION	
12/12/03	21839 / 1508 Pages: N/A	COURT ORDER	BK:21839 PG:1508 COMPELLING COMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORD.& GRANTING SANCTION
12/05/03		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 01/20/2004 : 09:30 AM
12/05/03		NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY/ABSENCE	DEC 23, 2003 THRU JAN 2, 2004 & FEB 22 THRU FEB 27, 2004
11/12/03		NOTICE OF HRG SPECIAL APPT	12/02/2003 : 09:30 AM
11/10/03		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 11/12/2003 : 09:30 AM
11/03/03		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 11/12/2003 : 09:30 AM
10/27/03		MOTION FOR SANCTIONS	
10/27/03	21693 / 1866 Pages: 10	NOTICE OF APPEAL	BK:21693 PG:1866
10/27/03		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 11/12/2003 : 09:30 AM
10/27/03		TEXT	AMENDED MTN TO VACATE ORD DENYING MTN FOR STAY ETC...
10/27/03		TEXT	AMENDED MTN TO VACATE ORDER DENYING DEF'S MTN FOR REHRG
10/24/03		MOTION:	TO VACATE ORDER DENYING COMPLIANCE
10/24/03		MOTION:	TO VACATE ORDER DENYING DEF'S MTN FOR REHEARING
10/10/03		ORDER:	DENYING MOTION FOR RE-HEARING
10/10/03		ORDER:	DENYING MOTION FOR STAY
10/08/03		MOTION FOR SANCTIONS	
10/08/03		NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 10/23/2003 : 09:30 AM
10/06/03		RESPONSE:	AND MEMO OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO PLTS MTN TO COMPEL
10/06/03		RESPONSE:	TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS
10/03/03		MEMORANDUM OF LAW	OPPOSING MOTION FOR REHEARING
10/03/03		TEXT	REPLY TO MEMO. OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO MTN TO COMPEL
09/12/03		NOTICE:	OF WITHDRAWAL OF NOT. OF HEARING ON MTN FOR SANCTIONS
09/11/03		MOTION TO COMPEL	
09/11/03		NOTICE OF HRG SPECIAL APPT	10/07/2003 : 09:30 AM
09/10/03		NOTICE OF HRG SPECIAL APPT	10/07/2003 : 09:30 AM
09/04/03		MOTION FOR REHEARING	
09/03/03		AFFIDAVIT OF:	ALAN C. GOLD
09/03/03		MEMORANDUM	IN RESPONSE TO MEMO IN OPPOSITION OF MTN TO ENFORCE SETT
08/25/03	21542 / 3508 Pages: 5	COURT ORDER	BK:21542 PG:3508 GRANTING MTN TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

08/19/03	AFFIDAVIT OF:	MARTIN SIMKOVIC
08/19/03	MEMORANDUM OF LAW	
08/12/03	ORDER FOR SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL	
08/08/03	AFFIDAVIT OF:	JOSEPH MILLSTONE, CEO OF IDS TELCOM, LLC
08/08/03	NOTICE OF FILING:	AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH MILLSTONE, CEO OF IDS TELCOM, LLC
08/06/03	RESPONSE:	TO MTN TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
07/25/03	NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 08/13/2003 : 10:30 AM
07/24/03	MOTION FOR SANCTIONS	
07/23/03	TEXT	VERIFIED RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' EMERG. MTN TO STRIKE
07/18/03	AFFIDAVIT OF:	MARTIN SIMKOVIC
07/18/03	NOTICE OF FILING:	AFFIDAVIT IN OPPOSITION TO MTN TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT
07/17/03	AFFIDAVIT OF:	NANCY SAMRY
07/17/03	NOTICE OF FILING:	AFF. OF NANCY M. SAMRY IN SUPPORT OF MTN ENFORCE SETTL
07/17/03	NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY/ABSENCE	
07/17/03	REQUEST:	COPIES
07/03/03	TEXT	STIPULATION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL
06/27/03	CANCELLATION NOTICE	07/09/2003 : 09:30 AM
06/27/03	NOTICE OF HEARING-	SPECIAL APPT 07/29/2003 : 09:30 AM
06/20/03	MOTION:	TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE
05/05/03	NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION	
05/02/03	NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION	
04/08/03	NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION	
03/31/03	ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	ATTORNEY:00304875 PN01 PN02
03/06/03	ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	ATTORNEY:00870625 DNC1 DN02 DNC3
02/28/03	NOTICE OF HEARING-	MOTIONS 03/12/2003 : 09M30 A
02/19/03	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME	
02/05/03	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME	
01/31/03	NOTICE OF PRODUCTION	
01/17/03	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME	
12/27/02	AMENDED COMPLAINT	
12/27/02	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
12/16/02	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME	
12/04/02	SERVICE RETURNED	BADGE # 1326 P 11/26/2002 DN01

12/04/02	SERVICE RETURNED	BADGE # 1328 P 11/25/2002 DN03
12/04/02	SERVICE RETURNED	BADGE # 1328 P 11/25/2002 DN05
12/04/02	SERVICE RETURNED	BADGE # 1328 P 11/26/2002 DN02
11/22/02	CIVIL COVER	
11/22/02	COMPLAINT	
11/22/02	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
11/22/02	SUMMONS ISSUED	DN01 DN02 DN03 DN04 DN05

[BEGIN NEW SEARCH](#)[ALL PARTIES](#)

[Home](#) | [Online Services](#) | [Meet the Clerk](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Miami-Dade County](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Disclaimer](#)
[Help](#) | [Email](#) | [Civil Search Home](#) | [Login](#)