

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Compliance investigation of Primo Communications, Inc. for apparent violation of Rule 25-24.470, F.A.C., Registration Required. | DOCKET NO. 050838-TI
ORDER NO. PSC-06-0026-PAA-TI
ISSUED: January 10, 2006

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY, Chairman
J. TERRY DEASON
LISA POLAK EDGAR
ISILIO ARRIAGA

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION
ORDER IMPOSING PENALTY FOR APPARENT VIOLATION
OF RULE 25-24.470, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

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.

I. Case Background

Primo Communications, Inc. (Primo) is an interexchange company (IXC) located in Rochester Hills, Michigan. Primo was granted an IXC certificate (Registration No. TJ724) on February 28, 2003. On December 27, 2004, Primo's tariff was cancelled and the company was removed from the register for failing to pay Regulatory Assessment Fees (RAFs), a violation of Section 364.336, Florida Statutes.¹ However, the company apparently continued to provide intrastate interexchange telephone service after the cancellation of its registration.

On August 16, 2005, we received a consumer complaint (Request No. 663177T) regarding the long distance telephone services provided by Primo. Included with the complaint was a copy of a bill from Primo in which an intrastate interexchange telephone call was charged. Thereafter, the company was contacted via certified mail and facsimile. The company responded via telephone call and facsimile on September 13, 2005, in which it indicated that the complaint had been resolved. During the phone conversation, also confirmed via facsimile letter, Mr. Benjamin Ardelean, CEO of Primo, indicated that his company would pay the penalty of \$500 imposed by Commission Order No. PSC-04-1198-PAA-TI, plus the past due RAFs. He also

¹ Docket No. 040938-TI, In re: Compliance Investigation of Primo Communications, Inc. for apparent violation of Section 364.336, F.S.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00195 JAN 10 06

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

indicated the company would submit an IXC registration form and file a tariff. Mr. Ardelean requested that Primo be given until the end of September 2005 to complete the filings.

On October 11, 2005, Primo was sent a facsimile reminding the company that it has not taken the actions set forth in its facsimile. On October 25, 2005, this docket was established to address the company's apparent failure to register as an IXC.

We are vested with jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Sections 364.02, 364.04, and 364.285, Florida Statutes.

II. Analysis

Rule 25-24.470(1), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), states that:

No person shall provide intrastate interexchange telephone service without first filing an initial tariff containing the rates, terms, and conditions of service and providing the company's current contact information with the Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services.

Based on the fact that Primo billed a Florida consumer for an intrastate interexchange telephone call placed on May 19, 2005, and by the company's admission, Primo is apparently providing intrastate interexchange telephone service in Florida. Primo failed to pay RAFs for the calendar year 2003, and consequently, its tariff was cancelled and it was removed from the register of interexchange companies effective December 27, 2004. By providing intrastate interexchange telephone service without first submitting a completed registration form and filing a tariff, Primo is apparently in violation of Rule 25-24.470, F.A.C.

Primo's failure to file a tariff and provide this Commission with the company's current contact information is a "willful violation" of Rule 25-24.470, F.A.C.

Pursuant to Section 364.285(1), Florida Statutes, we are authorized to impose upon any entity subject to our 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 Commission order, or any provision of Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, or revoke any certificate issued by this Commission for any such violation.

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 Smith 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 omission. 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 Primo to submit a completed registration form and file a tariff meets the standard for a "refusal to comply" and a "willful violation" as contemplated by the Legislature when enacting section 364.285, Florida Statutes.

"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 interexchange companies, like Primo, are subject to certain rules published in the Florida Administrative Code. See, *Commercial Ventures, Inc. v. Beard*, 595 So.2d 47, 48 (Fla. 1992).

Furthermore, the amount of the proposed penalty is consistent with penalties previously imposed by this Commission upon other intrastate interexchange telephone service providers for similar violations. Therefore, we hereby impose a penalty upon Primo Communications, Inc. in the amount of \$25,000 for the company's apparent violation of Rule 25-24.470, F.A.C.

III. Decision

We hereby impose a penalty upon Primo Communications, Inc. in the amount of \$25,000 for the company's apparent violation of Rule 25-24.470, F.A.C. This Order shall become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by this Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, F.A.C., within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13) (b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute shall be deemed stipulated. If Primo 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. If Primo fails to pay the penalty within fourteen (14) calendar days after the issuance of the

Consummating Order, the collection of the penalty shall be referred to the Department of Financial Services and the company shall be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications services in Florida. This docket shall be closed administratively upon either receipt of the payment of the penalty or upon referral of the collection of the penalty to the Department of Financial Services.

Based upon the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that we hereby impose a penalty upon Primo Communications, Inc. in the amount of \$25,000 for the company's apparent violation of Rule 25-24.470, F.A.C. It is further

ORDERED that this Order shall become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by this Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, F.A.C., within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. It is further

ORDERED that as provided by Section 120.80(13) (b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute shall be deemed stipulated. If Primo 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 If Primo fails to pay the penalty within fourteen (14) calendar days after the issuance of the Consummating Order, the collection of the penalty shall be referred to the Department of Financial Services and the company shall be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications services in Florida. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall be closed administratively upon either receipt of the payment of the penalty or upon referral of the collection of the penalty to the Department of Financial Services.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 10th day of January, 2006.

BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of the Commission Clerk
and Administrative Services

By: Kay Flynn
Kay Flynn, Chief
Bureau of Records

(S E A L)

KS

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 January 31, 2006.

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.