

2/8/2008 11:04 AM

Office of Commission Clerk Official Filing

Ruth Nettles

From: Jennifer L. Washington [jwashington@fostermalish.com]
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2008 10:39 AM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: pc0755@att.com; mg2708@att.com; Lee Eng Tan; Frank Trueblood; Chris Malish; Steven Tepera
Subject: Docket No. 050863-TP: dPi's Reply to AT&T's Objection to Additional Discovery

Attachments: dPi's reply ATT objection addit. discovery.2-8-08.pdf



dPi's reply ATT
objection addi...

Please file dPi's Reply to AT&T's Objection to Additional Discovery and let me know if you need anything else. Thank you.

- A. Jennifer L. Washington, CP
Paralegal
Foster Malish Blair & Cowan, LLP
1403 West Sixth Street
Austin, TX 78703
(512) 476-8591
(512) 477-8657/fax
jennifer@fostermalish.com
- B. dPi Teleconnect, LLC v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. - Docket No. 050863-TP C.
dPi Teleconnect, LLC D. 2 pages including certificate of service E. dPi's Reply to
AT&T's Objection to Additional Discovery

Jennifer L. Washington, CP
Paralegal
Foster Malish & Cowan, LLP
1403 West Sixth Street
Austin, Texas 78703
(512) 476-8591/phone
(512) 477-8657/fax
jennifer@fostermalish.com

This electronic communication (including any attached document may contain privileged and/or confidential information. This information is intended only for the use of indicated e-mail addressees. If you are not an intended recipient of this communication, please be advised that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this communication or any attached document is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and promptly destroy all electronic and printed copies of this communication and any attached documents.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01000 FEB-8 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re:) DOCKET NO. 050863-TP
)
dPi Teleconnect, L.L.C. v.)
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.)

dPi's REPLY TO AT&T'S OBJECTION TO ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY

1. Discovery which AT&T was compelled to produce just before the original hearing date in this case showed that – contrary to AT&T's prior representations – AT&T *has* in fact repeatedly and systematically provided Line Connection Charge waivers to its end users taking only basic service plus two Touchstar Blocking Features – between 14 and 30% of the time from 2003 to 2007.
2. AT&T now claims, and will testify to the Florida Commission, that these Line Connection Charge waivers were made pursuant to promotions or discounts other than the Line Connection Charge Waiver. *See, e.g.*, AT&T's Response in Objection to dPi's Motion for Additional Discovery at p. 4: "the line connection charges are waived for a variety of other reasons other than the LCCW promotion"; "some of the waivers were for reasons completely unrelated to the LCCW promotion. "
3. Accordingly, on or about January 11, 2008, dPi moved this Commission to permit additional discovery to develop evidence that will test this latest round of assertions from AT&T, which are highly implausible. Why are these orders for Basic Service plus TouchStar Blocking Features receiving a waiver of the Line Connection Charge if not in connection with Line Connection Charge Waiver? What information is AT&T using to make its assertions?

4. AT&T opposes this additional discovery. It complains that dPi has “over papered this case to a staggering degree.” In essence, it says “HEY! TRUST US! OUR WORD SHOULD BE GOOD ENOUGH FOR YOU.” But the facts which dPi has discovered through discovery so far clearly show that we cannot take such critical statements on faith:
- a. ATT initially testified that it had not provided the Line Connection Charge Waiver to retail customers taking basic service and the TouchStar Blocking Features;
 - b. ATT subsequently resisted discovery requests seeking documentation of what ATT’s retail customers taking basic service and the TouchStar Blocking Features were charged; and
 - c. When that documentation was finally produced, it showed that AT&T had repeatedly and systematically waived the Line Connection Charge for such customers – with the best explanation for why the waiver was not given to ALL such customers being that most of them were not win over or winback customers.

In short, the more discovery that is conducted, the more AT&T’s claims are exposed as being implausible, if not incorrect. It is no wonder it would prefer to prevent further discovery.

5. AT&T also claims its answers to similar questions propounded in other states should be good enough for Florida. However, the answers that AT&T has given in those states so far has been one iteration or another of “our systems don’t capture the data requested.” Such answers give rise to yet more questions: if the systems doesn’t provide such information, how is AT&T able to say that the waivers were given for reasons other than the LCCW promotion? It appears now that even more discovery is needed to get the answers to these questions: depositions of marketing, sales, or systems managers or accountants, for

example.

6. The new discovery is necessary to help determine whether AT&T was waiving the Line Connection Charge for customers with basic service plus two Touchstar Blocking Features pursuant to the Line Connection Charge Waiver or some other promotion. The need for the particular requests could not have been anticipated until after (1) AT&T produced its Line Connection Charge waiver data and (2) articulated its explanations as to why the data shows it had been extending the waiver to retail orders configured like dPi's -- both of which came after the discovery cut-off.

7. At the end of the day, this Commission is faced with a fundamental decision about the administration of justice in Florida: does the Commission wish to try this case on the facts, based on an examination of what BellSouth actually *did*, or on BellSouth's after-the-fact policy statements: "after we have analyzed this issue, this is what we think our policy must have been."

PRAAYER

8. The documentation provided by AT&T so far indicates that despite its earlier testimony to the contrary, AT&T has repeatedly and systematically waived the line connection charge for its retail customers taking just basic service and TouchStar Blocking Features and nothing else. AT&T has now represented that these waivers were given for reasons other than the Line Connection Charge Waiver promotion. The additional discovery requested tests these contentions on this critical subject and could not have been earlier anticipated, since they were triggered by materials produced and positions taken, by AT&T after the discovery deadline. dPi prays the Commission allows additional discovery.

Respectfully Submitted,

FOSTER MALISH BLAIR & COWAN, LLP

/s/ Chris Malish

Chris Malish

Texas Bar No. 00791164

cmalish@fostermalish.com

Steven Tepera

Texas Bar No. 24053510

stepera@fostermalish.com

1403 West Sixth Street

Austin, Texas 78703

Phone: (512) 476-8591

Fax: (512) 477-8657

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the above instrument was transmitted to Counsel for Defendants at the below address via electronic mail and first class mail on February 8, 2008.

/s/ Chris Malish
Chris Malish

cc: J. Phillip Carver, Sr. Attorney
AT&T Southeast
675 West Peachtree Street, Suite 4300
Atlanta, Georgia 30375

Via First-Class Mail
Via Electronic Mail: pc0755@att.com

Manuel A. Gurdian, Attorney
AT&T Florida
150 South Monroe Street, Room 400
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Via First-Class Mail
Via Electronic Mail: mg2708@att.com

Lee Eng Tan, Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Via First-Class Mail
Via Electronic Mail: ltan@psc.state.fl.us