

Fort Lauderdale  
Jacksonville  
Los Angeles  
Madison  
Miami  
New York  
Orlando  
Tallahassee  
Tampa  
Tysons Corner  
Washington, DC  
West Palm Beach

Suite 1200  
106 East College Avenue  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
www.akerman.com  
william.furlow@akerman.com  
850 425.1679 tel 850 222 0103 fax

May 15, 2008

**HAND DELIVERY**

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RECEIVED-FPSC  
08 MAY 16 AM 8:31  
COMMISSION  
CLERK

RE: VCI Company d/b/a Vilaire Communications, Inc.  
Case No. 1D08-\_\_\_\_\_ 080065-TX

Dear Ms. Cole:

Pursuant to 9.100(e)(2) enclosed for filing is a copy of the Petition for Writ of Prohibition in the above referenced case. The original Petition has been filed with the First District Court of Appeal, together with our check in the amount of \$300.00 for filing fees. Also enclosed is a copy of the Petitioner's Motion for Expedited Stay of Public Service Commission Proceedings.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Sincerely,



Elisa Miller, Assistant to  
Katherine E. Giddings

/em  
Enclosures

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL  
FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT  
STATE OF FLORIDA

VCI COMPANY d/b/a VILAIRE  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

080065-TX

CASE NO.: 1D08

RECEIVED--FPSC  
08 MAY 16 AM 8:36  
COMMISSION  
CLERK

Petitioner.

---

**PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR EXPEDITED STAY OF  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioner, VCI Company, doing business in Florida as Vilaire Communications, Inc. ("VCI"), pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.190(e)(2)(A), moves for an expedited order staying the Florida Public Service Commission's (the "Commission") proceedings in *In re: Investigation Of Vilaire Communications, Inc.'s Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Status And Competitive Local Exchange Company Certificate Status In The State Of Florida*, Docket No. 080065-TX (the "Proceeding Below") pending resolution of VCI's Petition for Writ of Prohibition filed simultaneously with this Motion.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This Court, as opposed to the Florida Supreme Court, has original jurisdiction over the Petition and this Motion because the Proceeding Below relates to VCI's certification and does not involve "rates and services" as required for the Supreme Court to exercise jurisdiction under Article V, Section 3(b)(2), Florida Constitution. *See Callard v. Baez*, 934 So. 2d 1184 (Fla. 2006) (transferring to district court an appeal of dispute relating to overcharges to an individual residence); § 350.128(1) ("[T]he Supreme Court shall, upon petition, review any action of the commission relating to rates or services of utilities providing electric, gas, or telephone service. The District Court of Appeal, First District, shall, upon petition, review any other action of the commission.")

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Contemporaneously with this Motion, VCI has petitioned this Court for a Writ of Prohibition (the "Petition") restraining the Commission from exercising subject matter jurisdiction over the Proceeding Below. In the Proceeding Below, the Commission seeks to (i) disqualify VCI from participating in the federal universal service program and (ii) cancel VCI's certificate to provide local exchange service as a competitive local telecommunications carrier ("the Certificate"). In the Petition, VCI asserts that the Commission does not have jurisdiction to take these actions, and, thus, the Commission should be enjoined from proceeding in the Proceeding Below.

VCI asks this Court to stay the Proceeding Below pending this Court's determination of whether the Commission has jurisdiction. The Commission has alleged that VCI should be disqualified from participating in the federal universal service program based on alleged violations of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"). This, in turn, has lead the Commission to assert that VCI has violated Florida law and Commission rules pertaining to universal service, and, as such, that VCI's Certificate should be cancelled. The Commission has no authority to administer the federal universal service program, nor to determine whether VCI has violated rules regarding that program. Only the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") has such jurisdiction.

The Commission intends to proceed with the hearing in this matter without ruling on the issue of jurisdiction. Additionally, the Commission staff is vigorously pursuing discovery in preparation for that hearing and has moved for sanctions against VCI because VCI has asked that jurisdiction be determined before unwarranted and unnecessary discovery is executed. The FCC has a open matter involving VCI, and if the Proceeding Below is not stayed, VCI will be wrongly forced to defend dual actions. Further, the Commission staff has asked for sanctions to be imposed against VCI for not providing discovery — even though the Commission has thus far refused to address the issue of jurisdiction, and all indications are that they do intend to do so until *after* the hearing on the merits in this matter is held.

VCI has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of the Petition, and an expedited stay of the Proceeding Below pending review of the Petition is in the public interest. If the Proceeding Below is allowed to move forward during the pendency of this Court's review of the Petition, VCI and its customers will suffer irreparable harm for which it has no adequate remedy at law. VCI recognizes that issuance of an order to show cause why its requested relief should not be granted will immediately stay all further proceedings in the Commission per Rule 9.100(h). VCI files this Motion seeking to expedite the issuance of a stay pending initial review of the Petition because the Commission has given strong indications,

including a statement by the prehearing officer, that it will not determine the issue of jurisdiction until *after* the hearing on the merits, it is conducting extensive discovery at this time, and it is now seeking to impose severe sanctions because VCI has asked that the issue of jurisdiction be determined before discovery proceeds. Under these circumstances, it would be futile to seek a stay before the Commission—thus, VCI has shown good cause to seek this stay in this Court.

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS**<sup>2</sup>

The Commission seeks to rescind VCI's status as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier ("ETC") and cancel its Certificate based on federal law and FCC rules governing ETCs. The Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Agency Action on February 13, 2008.

Despite the fact that its actions were preliminary in nature, the Commission issued a news release under the headline "Florida Public Service Commission Shuts Down [VCI] in Florida." The news release stated that VCI had "falsely obtained more than \$1.3 million in funds earmarked to provide telephone service to low-income residents." It also stated that AT&T will take over VCI's customers until they choose a new provider and that the results of the Commission's

---

<sup>2</sup> The facts are set out at greater length in the Petition, which is accompanied by a two volume appendix. A copy of the Petition, which contains appendix cites for the factual statements is attached as Exhibit A to this Motion. A summary of the most relevant facts related to this Motion are below.

investigation would be forwarded to federal authorities to recover funds obtained by VCI through misrepresentations made to the administrator of the Federal Universal Service Fund (the "Fund"). VCI filed a Petition for Formal Hearing with the Commission on March 5, 2008. The hearing is set for June 6, 2008.

Since the onset of the Commission's investigation and audit of VCI in September 2007, VCI has asserted that the Commission does not have jurisdiction to audit VCI or rescind its Certificate. VCI repeatedly opposed discovery demands on grounds that included the Commission's lack of subject matter jurisdiction. VCI also put the Commission on notice that it intended to file a complaint in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida requesting that court to adjudicate this issue.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, the Prehearing Officer issued an order to compel discovery (without hearing from VCI) on April 25, 2008, *in which he stated that the Commission would decide its jurisdiction subsequent to the evidentiary hearing.*

VCI challenged the Commission's jurisdiction again in a petition for reconsideration of the discovery order, which the Commission denied on May 8, 2008. Noting VCI's intent to seek a judicial decision on its jurisdiction prior to the June 2008 hearing, the Commission nevertheless declined to reach the issue of its jurisdiction.

---

<sup>3</sup> VCI filed a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief with the United States District Court Northern District of Florida on May 15, 2008.

In the interim, VCI filed a motion to dismiss the proceeding for lack of subject matter jurisdiction or, in the alternative, abate the proceeding. The Commission has not ruled on that motion, and VCI has no reasonable grounds on which to expect that the Commission will review, much less grant, the motion.

On May 9, 2008, VCI notified the Commission that VCI declined to comply with the Commission's discovery order because that order was issued without delegated legislative authority. The Commission staff is now seeking to impose severe sanctions against VCI. Absent issuance of a stay by this Court, VCI faces the imposition of sanctions as well as unwarranted and unauthorized prosecution of allegations over which the Commission has no jurisdiction.

Because the Commission has refused to determine the issue of jurisdiction or to stay its prosecution pending that determination, because the Commission has no jurisdiction to proceed against VCI under the circumstances of this case, and because sanctions are now being pursued against VCI by the Commission, VCI has good cause to bring this Motion For Expedited Stay directly to this Court.

### **III. ARGUMENT**

#### **THE PROCEEDING BELOW SHOULD BE STAYED PENDING APPELLATE REVIEW.**

When jurisdiction of a Florida administrative agency is asserted or challenged, Florida courts have stayed the underlying proceeding while determining whether or not jurisdiction is proper in the administrative agency. *De*

*Souza v. Ortiz*, 901 So. 2d 269, 270 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 2005) (trial court erred in denying the motion to stay where exclusive jurisdiction was with the administrative law judge); *Williams v. Coastal Florida Police*, 765 So. 2d 908, 909 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 2000) (writ of prohibition denied, but court stayed PERC proceeding to allow parties to appeal to Supreme Court).

In ruling on a stay motion, this Court is to consider the likelihood of success on appeal; the harm that would be suffered by the petitioner if a stay is not granted; and the harm that could be suffered if a stay is granted. *State ex rel. Price v. McCord*, 380 So. 2d 1037 (Fla. 1980); *Perez v. Perez*, 769 So. 2d 389 (Fla. 3d DCA 1999). These factors show VCI's entitlement to an order staying the Proceeding Below in its entirety pending the Court's consideration of the merits of VCI's Petition.

**VCI is likely to succeed on the merits.** As explained at length in the Petition, the Commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction. The United States Congress has not and cannot confer jurisdiction on or require the Commission to adjudicate federal law pertaining to the federal universal service program. The Commission has no authority with respect to ETCs or federal universal service other than that which the Florida Legislature has conferred upon it. The Legislature has not granted the Commission the authority to administer the Federal Universal Service Fund, oversee ETCs' operations according to federal rules, or



rescind an ETC designation. Further, the Legislature could not and did not enact a statute authorizing the Commission to adopt the federal rules it seeks to enforce against VCI, and no such rules were adopted by the Commission. The Commission's attempt to enforce unadopted rules against VCI violates the Florida Administrative Procedures Act and VCI's constitutional rights to due process. Hence, the likelihood of VCI's success on the Petition is high. In light of the Commission's slim chances for success on the Petition, an expedited stay of the Proceeding Below is warranted.

**VCI Will Suffer Irreparable Injury.** VCI has been, is being, and will be harmed by the Commission's unconstitutional and unlawful attempt to enforce the FCC's universal service rules. The Commission's announcement that VCI violated the FCC's rules has damaged its reputation and resulted in the loss of customer goodwill. The Commission's revocation of VCI's Certificate will force VCI to stop doing business in Florida. The revocation of its ETC designation will not only make VCI ineligible to continue receiving Fund support in Florida, but it also will jeopardize the support VCI receives from the Fund for its service to low-income customers in other states. Additionally, if the requested stay is not issued, VCI will be forced to defend its refusal to fully respond to discovery requests, a refusal that was based on the Commission's lack of jurisdiction. VCI also will be forced to defend against sanctions. In addition, VCI will spend substantial resources

preparing for a hearing on the merits that the Commission is not authorized to conduct. Finally, even if it is ultimately determined that the Commission does not have jurisdiction, an adverse order from the Commission after the hearing—and the presumed publicity the Commission will give such an order based on its previous conduct—will further damage VCI's reputation and goodwill.

**VCI Has No Other Adequate Remedy.** VCI will suffer immediate, adverse impacts if the Proceeding Below is not stayed. VCI has no other adequate remedy to seek the interim relief sought here during the pendency of the review of the Petition, especially given that the Commission intends to proceed with the hearing on the merits without ruling on the jurisdictional issue. Damage to VCI's reputation and goodwill, which will occur as a result of an order issued by the Commission after the hearing and the presumed publicity of that order, cannot be remedied at law.


**Public Interest Considerations Support A Stay Of The Proceeding Below.** The public interest is best served by curbing agencies' misuse of their powers. Staying the Proceeding Below may discourage the Commission and other agencies from taking ill-considered and unsupported actions. Staying the Proceeding Below will prevent the waste of Commission resources from a prosecution over which it has no jurisdiction as well as taxpayers' money being

used in the preparation for and holding of the hearing. Moreover, the Commission will suffer no harm from a stay of the Proceeding Below.

**V. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, VCI moves this Court to immediately stay the Proceeding Below, or grant such other immediate relief as the Court deems appropriate, pending review. If the Court does not immediately stay the Proceeding Below upon the filing of this motion, VCI respectfully requests that the Court shorten the time for the Commission to respond to this Motion to Stay by giving the Commission 24 hours to respond to this Motion and, following any response, to issue an order staying the Proceeding Below during the pendency of the review of the Petition for Writ of Prohibition.

Respectfully submitted,



**KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS** (0949396)

**NANCY M. WALLACE** (0065897)

**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**

106 East College Ave., Suite 1200

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Telephone: (850) 224-9634

Telecopier: (850) 222-0103


katherine.giddings@akerman.com

**Attorneys for Petitioner, VCI Company  
d/b/a Vilaire Communications, Inc.**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served via hand delivery to the Commission via its Clerk: Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32309; and the persons listed below this 15th day of May, 2008:

Lee Eng Tan, Senior Attorney Florida Public Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 LTan@psc.state.fl.us Counsel for the Commission	Michael Cooke, General Counsel Florida Public Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 Counsel for the Commission
Adam Teitzman, Supervising Attorney Florida Public Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us Counsel for the Commission	Beth Salak, Director/Competitive Markets and Enforcement 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 bsalak@psc.state.fl.us

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS**

---

APPENDIX

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL  
FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT  
STATE OF FLORIDA

VCI COMPANY D/B/A VILAIRE  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

CASE NO.: 1D08-\_\_\_\_\_

**Petitioner.**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION**

Pursuant to Rules 9.100 and 9.030(b)(3), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure, VCI Company d/b/a Vilaire Communications, Inc., a Washington corporation ("VCI"), petitions this court for a writ of prohibition restraining the Florida Public Service Commission's (the "Commission") improper exercise of subject matter jurisdiction over the proceeding below ("Proceeding Below")<sup>1</sup> involving VCI.

**I. BASIS FOR INVOKING JURISDICTION**

Article V, Section 4 (b) (3), of the Florida Constitution vests this court with jurisdiction to issue writs of prohibition.<sup>2</sup> "Prohibition is an extraordinary writ

<sup>1</sup> Captioned *In re: Investigation Of Vilaire Communications, Inc.'s Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Status And Competitive Local Exchange Company Certificate Status In The State Of Florida*, Docket No. 080065-TX.

<sup>2</sup> This Court, as opposed to the Florida Supreme Court, has original jurisdiction over the Petition and this Motion because the Proceeding Below relates to VCI's certification and does not involve "rates and services" as required for the Supreme Court to exercise jurisdiction under Article V, Section 3(b)(2), Florida Constitution. *See Callard v. Baez*, 934 So. 2d 1184 (Fla. 2006) (transferring to

RECEIVED  
MEMBER DATE  
04077 MAY 16 2008  
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

which a superior court may prevent an inferior court or tribunal, over which it has appellate and supervisory jurisdiction, from acting outside its jurisdiction." *Mandico v. Taos Const., Inc.*, 605 So. 2d 850, 853 (Fla. 1992). Prohibition is used to challenge the subject matter jurisdiction of Florida agencies, including the Commission. *City of Tallahassee v. Mann*, 411 So. 2d 162, 163 (Fla. 1981). A writ of prohibition directed to the Commission will prevent in advance of the final order the harm that can result by the improper exercise of power by the Commission over a proceeding not within its jurisdiction. *See Miccosukee Tribe of Indians v. Napoleoni*, 890 So. 2d 1152, 1153 (Fla. 1st DCA 1988).

When it is shown that a lower tribunal, such as the Commission, is without jurisdiction or attempting to act in excess of its jurisdiction, prohibition may be granted. *English v. McCrary*, 348 So. 2d 293, 296 (Fla. 1977). Prohibition will be issued to forestall an impending present injury where the person seeking the writ has no other appropriate and adequate legal remedy. *Id.* at 297.

This case is exactly the type of case for which the writ of prohibition was designed. As explained in this Petition, the Commission is acting without jurisdiction. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has a current

---

district court an appeal of dispute relating to overcharges to an individual residence); § 350.128(1) ("[T]he Supreme Court shall, upon petition, review any action of the commission relating to rates or services of utilities providing electric, gas, or telephone service. The District Court of Appeal, First District, shall, upon petition, review any other action of the commission.").

proceeding pending against VCI. This Petition seeks to prevent the Commission from proceeding forward with imposing sanctions and exercising jurisdiction in this case because jurisdiction over the matters at issue lies exclusively with the FCC. This Petition also seeks to forestall an impending present injury to VCI: (1) Dual prosecution by the FCC and the Commission when only the FCC has jurisdiction; and (2) the imposition of sanctions—including revocation of VCI's Certificate—by the Commission when it has no jurisdiction over the issues in this case. VCI has no other appropriate or adequate legal remedy to avoid dual prosecution and the imposition of sanctions, including the loss of its Certificate.

Courts have issued writs of prohibition in similar circumstances. *See, e.g., Florida Public Service Com'n v. Bryson*, 569 So. 2d 1253, 1254 (Fla. 1990) (writ of prohibition issued to circuit court to bar further proceedings in a suit involving gas and electricity overcharges where exclusive jurisdiction fell to Florida Public Service Commission, not circuit court); *Town of Ponce Inlet v. Dragomirecky*, 884 So. 2d 408, 410 (Fla. 1st DCA 2004) (where property owner appealed demolition order issued by town and Building Commission referred matter to Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH), writ of prohibition issued to restrain DOAH from exercising authority over owner's petition for administrative hearing and proceeding with the hearing); *Utilities, Inc. of Florida v. Corso*, 846 So. 2d 1159, 1160 (Fla. 5th DCA 2003) (prohibition is the proper remedy when a circuit court



has wrongly taken jurisdiction of matters properly within the province of the Public Service Commission). A writ of prohibition should be issued to the Commission to prevent its inappropriate exercise of jurisdiction in this case.

## II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

### A. Regulatory Background.

In 1996 Congress sought to introduce competition into once monopolized telecommunications markets through the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act"). In so doing, Congress expressed its commitment to preserving universal service<sup>3</sup> by adding section 254 to the Act, which directed the FCC to establish "Federal universal service support mechanisms," 47 U.S.C. § 254(a)(2), that are "explicit and sufficient to achieve the purposes" of preserving universal service. *Id.* § 254(e).

Congress delegated to the FCC the authority to "execute and enforce" the provisions of the Act. *Id.* § 151. It authorized the FCC to "prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary in the public interest to carry out the provisions" of the Act. *Id.* § 201(b). Congress also granted the FCC broad authority to enforce compliance with its rules through various administrative sanctions. *See id.* §§ 154(i), 159(c), 214(d), 401(b), 503(b).

The FCC established the Federal Universal Service Fund (the "Fund") to

---

<sup>3</sup> The goal of universal service is to insure that customers throughout the nation have access to an evolving range of telecommunications services.

support federal universal services programs, including three programs — the Lifeline Assistance ("Lifeline"), Lifeline Connection Assistance ("Link Up") and Toll Limitation Service ("TLS") — that provide financial support to Eligible Telecommunications Carriers ("ETCs") serving low-income consumers. 45 C.F.R. §§ 54.400-418.<sup>4</sup> Support from the Fund to provide service for low-income customers is available only to a common carrier that is designated as an ETC in the service area for which the designation is received. *See* 47 U.S.C. §§ 214(e), 254(e). Common carriers subject to the jurisdiction of a state commission are designated as ETCs by that commission. *See id.* § 214(e)(2). Carriers not subject to regulation by a state commission are designated as ETCs by the FCC. *See id.* § 214(e)(6).

Congress also provided that states may adopt state universal service programs so long as the state program is not inconsistent with the FCC's goal of preserving and advancing universal service. *See id.* § 254(f). State universal service programs must be funded through state funding mechanisms. Florida has not adopted a permanent state program. At this time, all ETCs in Florida, including VCI, are funded through the federal Fund.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Lifeline program provides certain discounts on monthly service to qualifying low-income consumers. *See id.* § 54.401. The Link Up program reduces their initial connection charges. *See id.* § 54.411. The TLS program gives eligible low-income consumers the option of having toll blocking or toll control services to be included as part of Lifeline service at no extra charge. *See id.* § 54.401(a)(3).

The Florida Legislature authorized the Commission to designate an ETC as a federal universal service provider § 364.10(3)(j), Fla. Stat. This designation is permitted under section 214(e)(2) of the Act. The Legislature also authorized the Commission to adopt rules to administer the Lifeline service provisions of section 364.10. § 364.10(3)(j), Fla. Stat. The Commission implemented section 364.10, in part, by promulgating Rule 25-4.0665, Fla. Admin. Code. This rule regulates only the manner in which ETCs provide Lifeline and Link Up services to subscribers. Consistent with this, the Legislature has empowered the Commission to investigate interstate rules of practice for or in relation to the transmission of messages or conversations taking place within Florida which in the Commission's opinion violate the Act or the FCC's orders and regulations. *See* § 364.27. The Commission's power with respect to such interstate matters is limited to referring the violations to the FCC by petition. *See id.* The Legislature has not granted the Commission the authority to impose a penalty for violations of the Act or the FCC's rules.

**B. Facts Related to Proceeding Below.**

VCI holds a certificate ("Certificate") to provide local exchange service as a competitive local telecommunications carrier that was issued by the Commission

on January 10, 2006. [AI T1]<sup>5</sup> On May 22, 2006, the Commission designated VCI as an ETC in AT&T's service area. [AI T2] VCI is funded through the federal Fund, and its conduct is governed by the Act and FCC rules.

The Proceeding Below arose from a Lifeline audit conducted by the Commission's staff ("Staff") between September and November 2007, culminating in an auditor's report issued November 19, 2007. [AI T3] VCI questioned Staff regarding the Commission's authority to audit the Lifeline program as early as September 2007, but it did not pursue the issue at that time in the interest of maintaining an amicable working relationship with Staff. [AI T4] Based on the audit findings—rather than forwarding information to the FCC to allow the FCC to determine compliance within its regulatory authority and administration of the programs—Staff formally presented its allegations and recommended penalties to the Commission, asking the Commission to initiate compliance proceedings against VCI. The Commission accepted Staff's recommendation and memorialized its decision in Order No. PSC-08-0090-PAA-TX, issued February 13, 2008.<sup>6</sup> [AI T5, T6] VCI timely filed its Protest of Proposed Agency Action and Petition for Formal Hearing on March 5, 2008, pursuant to which this matter has been set for a

---

<sup>5</sup> References to the Appendix filed with this Petition are cited as "A" following by appropriate tab and page number.

<sup>6</sup> Among the rules and statutes cited in the Commission's order are: 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(d)(1), 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(i), § 364.10(2)(b), Fla. Stat., 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(c) and Section 214(e) of the Act.

hearing on June 4, 2008. [AI T7]

Subsequently, Staff served VCI with Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents on March 31, 2008, to which VCI filed timely objections and responses on grounds that included the Commission's lack of subject matter jurisdiction. [AI T8] VCI also put the Commission on notice that it intended to file a complaint in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida requesting that court to adjudicate this issue.<sup>7</sup> [AI T8]

Staff filed a Motion to Compel on April 22, 2008, seeking to have discovery compelled by April 30. [AI T9] The Prehearing Officer issued an order to compel discovery (without hearing from VCI) on April 25, 2008, in which he stated that the Commission would decide its jurisdiction **subsequent** to the evidentiary hearing. [AI T10]

VCI challenged the Commission's jurisdiction again in a petition for reconsideration of the discovery order, which the Commission denied on May 8, 2008. [AI T11, T12] Noting VCI's intent to seek a judicial decision on its jurisdiction prior to the June 2008 hearing, the Commission nevertheless declined to reach the issue of its jurisdiction. [AI T13]

In the interim, VCI filed a motion to dismiss the proceeding for lack of subject matter jurisdiction or, in the alternative, abate the proceeding. [AI T14]

---

<sup>7</sup> VCI filed a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief with the United States District Court Northern District of Florida on May 15, 2008.

That motion is pending before the Commission. VCI has no reasonable grounds on which to expect that the Commission will grant the motion either before or after the hearing. [AI T17, T18] On May 9, 2008, VCI notified the Commission that it declined to comply with its discovery order because it was issued without delegated legislative authority. [AI T15] Staff moved to impose sanctions on May 13, 2008. [AI T16]

#### IV. ARGUMENT

"Jurisdiction" is the power of a court or tribunal to act. *State Dept. of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles v. Scott*, 583 So. 2d 785, 787 (Fla. 2d DCA 1991). Subject matter jurisdiction is the power of the court or tribunal to consider a particular kind of claim. *Chase Bank of Tex. Nat. Ass'n v. State, Dept. of Insurance*, 860 So. 2d 472, 475 (Fla. 1st DCA 2003). An administrative agency has only such power as expressly or by necessary implication is granted by legislative enactment. *Charlotte County v. General Development Utilities, Inc.*, 653 So. 2d 1081, 1085 (Fla. 1st DCA 1995); *State, Dept. of Environmental Regulation v. Falls Chase Special Taxing Dist.*, 424 So. 2d 787, 793 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982). Any reasonable doubt as to a power that is being exercised by the Commission must be resolved against exercise of that power. *Fla. Bridge Co. v. Bevis*, 363 So. 2d 799, 802 (Fla. 1978).

The Commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the Proceeding Below. The United States Congress has not and cannot confer jurisdiction on or require the Commission to adjudicate federal law pertaining to the federal universal service program. The Commission has no authority with respect to the federal universal service program other than designating ETCs and authorizing the relinquishment of such designation. The Commission is attempting to enforce federal rules which it has not and could not adopt. The Commission only would be able to enforce properly adopted state universal service program rules if such a program had been created by the Florida Legislature. The Commission is acting without jurisdiction and exceeding its delegated legislative authority in attempting to enforce unadopted rules against VCI, which violates the Florida Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") and VCI's constitutional rights to due process.

- A. THE COMMISSION LACKS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION BECAUSE NEITHER THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS NOR THE FCC CAN CONFER JURISDICTION UPON THE COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER THE FEDERAL UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM.

The United States Congress has not and cannot confer jurisdiction on the Commission to adjudicate federal law pertaining to the federal universal service program. The Commission obtains its powers and duties solely from the Florida Legislature pursuant to statute. Further, the FCC has no authority to *subdelegate* duties and obligations conferred to it by Congress to any state commission; and it

has not done so. The Commission has no jurisdiction pursuant to the Act or FCC Orders to apply federal law as to VCI or the FCC's federal universal service rules against VCI.

1. Congress Did Not Specify A Role For State Commissions With Respect To ETCs Other Than Designation And Relinquishment Of Designation.

Federal law, 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2), sets forth a state commission's primary responsibility with respect to universal service, namely designation of ETCs:

A State commission shall upon its own motion or upon request designate a common carrier that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) as an eligible telecommunications carrier for a service area designated by the State commission. 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 (1)....<sup>8</sup>

The Act also provides for a state commission to permit an ETC to relinquish its designation under 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(4).

---

<sup>8</sup> Paragraph (1) merely provides that ETCs:

(A) offer the services that are supported by Federal universal service support mechanisms under section 254(c) of this title, either using its own facilities or a combination of its own facilities and resale of another carrier's services (including the services offered by another eligible telecommunications carrier); and

(B) advertise the availability of such services and the charges therefor using media of general distribution.



Section 254(f) of the Act permits states to adopt a state universal service program by "adopt[ing] regulations not inconsistent with the [FCC's] rules to preserve and advance universal service," determining the method by which ETCs will contribute to the preservation and enhancement of universal service, and adopting regulations to preserve and advance universal services within that state. 47 U.S.C. § 254(f). Both the FCC and federal courts construe section 254(f) to apply to regulations promulgated by states for **state** universal service funding mechanisms only. The FCC found that section 254(f) merely imposes an obligation on carriers within a state to contribute if the state establishes universal service programs. *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service High-Cost Universal Service Support*, 2005 WL 3369905, 20 FCC Rcd 19,731, 19,739 (F.C.C., Dec 09, 2005). Federal Courts agree with the FCC's interpretation of the language in section 254(f). *See Sprint Spectrum, L.P. v. State Corp. Com'n of State of Kan.*, 149 F.3d 1058, 1061 (10th Cir. 1998) (Section 254(f) empowers states to require ETCs that provide intrastate services to contribute financially to state universal service mechanisms); *WWC Holding Co., Inc. v. Sopkin*, 488 F.3d 1262, 1271 (10th Cir. 2007) (Section 254(f) authorizes a state to create its own universal service standards only to the extent that a state is providing state funding to meet those standards.)

The Act does not provide for or contemplate post-ETC-designation duties for state commissions under the federal program. Congress could have prescribed a larger role for state commissions with respect to the federal universal service program but did not.<sup>9</sup>

b. The FCC Did Not and Cannot Subdelegate Authority Delegated To It By Congress To Third-Parties, Such As State Commissions.

The FCC did not and cannot empower the Commission under the Act. In the Act, Congress delegated to the FCC specific duties and obligations. For example, Congress delegated to the FCC the authority to "execute and enforce" the provisions of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 151, and to "prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary in the public interest to carry out the provisions" of the Act. *Id.* § 201(b). *See National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services*, 545 U.S. 967, 980-81 (2005). Congress also granted the FCC broad authority to enforce compliance with its rules through various administrative sanctions. *See* 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 159(c), 214(d), 225(e), 401(b), 503(b).

However, in the Act, Congress delegated authority solely to the FCC to promulgate rules to implement the new universal service requirements in accordance with universal service principles enumerated in the statute. *See id.* § 254(a),(b). Congress did not delegate to the FCC the authority to *subdelegate* to

---

<sup>9</sup> Compare sections 251, 252, and 271 of the Act, in which Congress prescribed a larger role for state commissions.

state commissions its universal service rulemaking or its enforcement authority. Thus, not only has the FCC not subdelegated its section 254(a) authority or power to determine violations of its universal service rules to the Commission, but also any attempt by the FCC to do so would be contrary to federal law.

Federal courts have provided guidance as to what duties may and may not be delegated to third-parties, such as state commissions, as well as the state commission's proper role with respect to federal agency decision-making. In *United States Telecom Ass'n v. F.C.C.*, 359 F.3d 554, 565 (D.C. Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 543 U.S. 925 (2004) the court determined that the FCC could not lawfully subdelegate its authority under section 251(d)(2) to "determine which network elements shall be made available to [competitive local telecommunications carriers] on an unbundled basis." The court stated that subdelegations to parties other than federal agencies are presumed to be improper unless expressly authorized by Congress. *See id.* Nowhere in the Act does Congress expressly authorize a non-federal agency to make decisions with respect to the federal universal service fund or ETCs. Any attempt by the FCC to subdelegate its section 254(a) authority or its power to determine violations of its universal service rules to state commissions would be unlawful.

B. THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE HAS NOT GRANTED AND CANNOT GRANT THE COMMISSION THE AUTHORITY TO ADMINISTER THE FEDERAL FUND OR OVERSEE ETC'S'

OPERATIONS OR RESCIND AN ETC UNDER THE FEDERAL PROGRAM.

1. The Commission Does Not Have Subject Matter Jurisdiction As To Federal Universal Service Issues. Nothing In Chapter 364 Authorizes The Commission To Enforce Federal Law Pertaining To ETCs or the FCC's Universal Service Rules.

"State agencies, as well as federal agencies, are only empowered by the statutes pursuant to which they were created." *Supra Telecommunications v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*, 2003 WL 22964278, at \*2 (Fla. P.S.C. 2003). The Commission may not *presume* legislative grants of authority. The Legislature has never conferred upon the Commission any general authority to regulate public utilities, including telephone companies. *City of Cape Coral v. GAC Utilities, Inc. of Florida*, 281 So. 2d 493, 496 (Fla. 1973). Because the Commission derives its power from the Legislature, jurisdiction requires a grant of legislature authority. *Sprint-Florida, Inc. v. Jaber*, 885 So. 2d 286, 290 (Fla. 2004). The Commission concedes this point. *See, e.g., Supra Telecommunications*, 2003 WL 22964278 at \*2 ("State agencies, as well as federal agencies, are only empowered by the statutes pursuant to which they were created"); *In re AT&T Communications*, 213 P.U.R.4th 383, 387 (Fla. P.S.C. 2001).

The Commission must have statutory authority in Chapter 364 to enforce federal law or the FCC's universal service rules against VCI. Because no such

statute exists in Chapter 364, the Commission does not have subject matter jurisdiction to enforce federal law or the FCC's universal service rules.

2. No Statute In Chapter 364 Expressly Or Impliedly Grants The Commission Authority To Enforce Federal Law Or Rules Against VCI.

a. Section 364.10(2) Does Not Vest The Commission With Authority To Enforce Federal Law Or The FCC's Rules

The Commission is vested with authority under section 364.10(2) only to *designate* ETCs for purposes of the federal Fund.

(2) (a) ... an eligible telecommunications carrier shall provide a Lifeline Assistance Plan to qualified residential subscribers, as defined in a commission-approved tariff or price list, and a preferential rate to eligible facilities as provided for in part II. *For the purposes of this section, the term "eligible telecommunications carrier" means a telecommunications company, as defined by s. 364.02, which is designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier by the commission pursuant to 47 C.F.R. s. 54.201.*

(Emphasis added). The Commission attempts to base subject matter jurisdiction to enforce federal law and rules on the above reference to 47 C.F.R § 54.201. Section 364.10 does not specify the Commission's authority to enforce federal law and rules. It is clear from the plain language of the statute that the Legislature only authorized the Commission to designate ETCs, not enforce federal law and rules — that responsibility rests with the FCC, not the Commission. The remainder of section 364.10 also does not vest the Commission with authority to enforce federal laws or the FCC's rules.

The Florida Legislature knew and desired to limit the Commission's duties and obligations with respect to ETCs, evidenced by other instances where the Legislature explicitly directed state agencies to comply with federal law. For example, section 421.55 requires compliance with the federal Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987, and section 403.061 explicitly authorizes the Florida Department of Environmental Regulation to adopt rules and regulations consistent with federal law.<sup>10</sup> The Legislature attached no similar requirement to section 364.10.

b. Section 364.012(1) Does Not Vest The Commission With Authority To Enforce Federal Law Or The FCC's Rules.

Section 364.012(1) directs the Commission to maintain liaisons with federal agencies whose policies and rulemaking affect Florida jurisdictional telecommunications companies and encourages the Commission to participate in federal agency authority proceedings. This statute permits the Commission to keep abreast of developments in federal law and federal regulations and to file comments in federal proceedings affecting Floridian ETCs. It does not, however, authorize the Commission to expend state funds to administer the federal universal service program, enforce federal law, or enforce the FCC's universal service rules.

---

<sup>10</sup> Pursuant to section 403.061, the "department [of public health] shall have the power and duty to control and prohibit pollution. . . (7) . . . Any rule adopted pursuant to this act shall be consistent with the provisions of federal law. . . ." § 403.061(7).

{TL158579;1}

c. Sections 120.80 And 364.025 Do Not Vest The Commission With Authority To Enforce Federal Law Or The FCC's Rules.

The Commission's reliance on sections 120.80(13)(d) and 364.025 for the Commission's jurisdiction to enforce federal law or the FCC's rules is similarly misplaced. Section 364.025 is precisely the sort of state law mechanism that Congress contemplated in section 254 of the Act when it authorized states to adopt state universal service programs. It instructs the Commission in the establishment of an interim state universal service mechanism and allows for the possibility of a permanent mechanism to be established by the Legislature.<sup>11</sup> This mechanism is, however, entirely separate and apart from the federal program.<sup>12</sup> It also allows the Commission to designate competitive carriers as "carriers of last resort" under the

---

<sup>11</sup> The Legislature contemplated the possibility of a permanent mechanism to be established by January 1, 2009. Notably, the 2008 Legislative session concluded without the establishment of a permanent state funding mechanism.

<sup>12</sup> In Docket No. 950696-TP, *In Re: Determination of funding for universal service and carrier of last resort responsibilities*, the Commission established an interim mechanism for maintaining and funding universal service objectives and carrier of last resort obligations for a transitional period not to exceed January 1, 2000, in accordance with the new section 364.025. By Order No. PSC-95-1592-FOF-TP, issued December 27, 1995, the Commission took final action, which included, in part, the establishment of an interim state universal service funding mechanism that provided carriers should fund universal service objectives through markups on the services they offer. This mechanism, and the contemplated permanent mechanism that has not come to pass, were intended to fund the additional obligations it was anticipated that incumbent carriers would incur as the carriers of last resort.

state law, a designation that shares similarities with, but is not identical to ETC designation.

Nor does the APA grant such authority. Section 120.80(13)(d) authorizes the Commission to employ "procedures" consistent with the Act when it is "implementing" provisions of the Act that it is authorized to implement. Clearly, section 120.80(13)(d) is not a jurisdictional grant. It simply allows the Commission to use procedures similar to those employed by the FCC under the Act when it is authorized and obligated "to give practical effect to" the Act.

- d. The Legislature Has Not Enacted A Law With The Same Provisions As 47 U.S.C. § 214(e) Pertaining To Eligible ETCs That It Seeks To Enforce Here.

The Legislature has not enacted a law with provisions that are the same as or even similar to section 214(e) of the Act that the Commission seeks to enforce against VCI. Neither has the Legislature authorized the Commission to regulate ETCs or administer the universal service program "as authorized by federal law." The term "federal law" is mentioned in three (3) statutes found in Chapter 364. Two of the three statutes provide that certain types of services are either exempt from oversight by the Commission,<sup>13</sup> or free of state regulation altogether,<sup>14</sup> *except*

---

<sup>13</sup> § 364.011.

<sup>14</sup> § 364.013, Fla. Stat.



*as specifically authorized by federal law.* In the third statute, the Legislature addresses Lifeline providers, not the Commission. § 364.10(3)(a), Fla. Stat.

- e. Sections 364.01(1)(2) And (4) Do Not Grant The Commission The Authority To Enforce Federal Law Or The FCC's Universal Service Rules Against VCI.

Sections 364.01(1) and (2) give the Commission authority to exercise powers conferred by Chapter 364 and exclusive jurisdiction to regulate telecommunications companies pertaining to matters set forth in Chapter 364. Sections 364.01(1) and (2) must be read with in conjunction with subsection (4). Section 364.01(4) enumerates the reasons for the Commission to exercise jurisdiction conferred in Chapter 364.<sup>15</sup> However, the Legislature adopted at least one statute governing competitive telecommunication carriers (of which ETCs are a subset) that implements a less stringent regulatory scheme than that developed for incumbent local exchange carriers. Specifically, section 364.337(5) provides that the Commission has continuing jurisdiction over competitive

---

<sup>15</sup> In sum: (a) to protect the public health, safety and welfare by ensuring that basic local telecommunications services are available to all consumers in the state at reasonable and affordable prices; (b) encourage competition; (c) ensure that monopoly services continue to be subject to price, rate and service regulation; (d) promote competition; (e) encourage providers to introduce new services; (f) eliminate rules or regulations that delay or impair competition; (g) ensure the fair treatment of all providers; (h) recognize the continuing emergency of a competitive telecommunications environment through flexible regulatory treatment of competitive local telecommunications services; and (i) continue to act as a surrogate for competition for monopoly services. § 364.337(4), Fla. Stat.

telecommunication carriers *only* for the purposes of (1) establishing reasonable service quality criteria; (2) assuring resolution of service complaints, and (3) ensuring the fair treatment of all telecommunications providers in the telecommunications marketplace. Section 364.337 also exempts competitive telecommunication carriers from many other provisions of Chapter 364. The Commission, then, can exercise its exclusive jurisdiction over matters in Chapter 364, with respect to competitive telecommunication carriers, only for the limited purposes set forth in section 354.337.

The Commission also cannot rely on section 364.01 for authority to enforce federal law and FCC rules against VCI because it is impossible for the Commission to exercise *exclusive* jurisdiction over ETCs. The federal universal service program administered by the FCC under section 254 of the Act cannot be within the exclusive purview of the Commission, and the Legislature has not enacted a state universal service program.

The law favors a reasonable interpretation of statutes and one which avoids an absurd result. *See, e.g., Goehring v. Broward Builders Exchange, Inc.*, 222 So. 2d 801, 802 (Fla. 4th DCA), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 222 So. 2d 801 (Fla. 1969). Because the Commission cannot exercise exclusive jurisdiction over a federal program and has no specific authority elsewhere in Chapter 364 to regulate ETCs,

it would be absurd to imply that section 364.01 grants the Commission authority to enforce federal law pertaining to ETCs or the FCC's universal service rules.

C. THE COMMISSION DOES NOT HAVE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS NOT ENACTED A STATUTE PERMITTING THE COMMISSION TO ADOPT THE FCC UNIVERSAL SERVICE RULES IT SEEKS TO ENFORCE AGAINST VCI AND NO SUCH RULES HAVE BEEN ADOPTED.

1. The Florida Legislature Did Not<sup>16</sup> Enact A Statute Authorizing The Commission To Adopt The Federal Rules It Seeks To Enforce Against VCI And No Such Rules Were Adopted.

The Legislature granted the Commission the authority to adopt rules only to administer the provisions of section 364.10, providing: "The commission shall adopt rules to administer this section." § 364.10(3)(j). The Commission adopted rule 25-4.0665, but it does not seek to enforce this rule against VCI. Indeed neither the Proposed Agency Action Order nor Staff's testimony allege that VCI violated any of the provisions of rule 25-4.0665.<sup>17</sup> Instead, the Commission seeks to enforce against VCI federal universal service rules that the Legislature has not

---

<sup>16</sup> As stated above, the Legislature could not authorize the Commission to adopt the federal rules. The Legislature is only authorized to adopt a Florida universal service program which is similar to, but separate from, the federal program.

<sup>17</sup> In sum, this rule requires ETCs to (1) provide 60 days' written notice of termination of Lifeline service; (2) reinstate terminated customers who subsequently prove eligibility; (3) participate in the Lifeline service automatic enrollment process; and (4) provide current Lifeline service company information to the Universal Service Administrative Company for posting on its website. Rule 25-4.0665, Fla. Admin. Code.

granted the Commission the authority to adopt and that the Commission has not adopted.

2. The Commission Cannot Enforce Unadopted Rules Or Law Not Enacted By the Legislature Against VCI. The Commission's Attempt To Do So Violates The APA.

The APA provides: "Rulemaking is not a matter of agency discretion. Each agency statement defined as a rule by § 120.52 shall be adopted by the rulemaking procedure provided by this section as soon as feasible and practical." § 120.54(1)(a). The APA "places an affirmative duty on the part of all state agencies to codify their policies in rules adopted in the formal rulemaking process." *Florida Dept. of Business and Professional Regulation, Div. of Pari-Mutuel Wagering v. Investment Corp. of Palm Beach*, 747 So. 2d 374, 380 (Fla. 1999) (quoting *St. Johns River Water Management Dist. v. Consolidated-Tomoka Land Co.*, 717 So. 2d 72, 80 (Fla. 1st DCA 1998)). A clear purpose of the rulemaking provisions of the APA "is to force or require agencies into the rule adoption process." *Osceola Fish Farmers Ass'n, Inc. v. Division of Administrative Hearings*, 830 So. 2d 932, 934 (Fla. 4th DCA 2002).

The Commission has not adopted the FCC's universal service rules it seeks to enforce against VCI, and it is without authority to do so. Yet the Commission, by the Proceeding Below, persists in attempting to enforce the unadopted rules despite the APA's clear requirements. The Commission cannot eschew the

requisite rulemaking in favor of simply enforcing FCC rules against VCI in an adjudication. These FCC rules are agency statements of general applicability, falling within the meaning of the term "rule" defined in section 120.52(15). The Commission's attempt to enforce the FCC's universal service rules on an ad hoc basis constitutes an invalid agency action taken without rulemaking, in violation of section 120.56(4).<sup>18</sup> *See Kerper v. Department of Environmental Protection*, 894 So. 2d 1006, 1010 (Fla. 5th DCA 2005).

3. The Enforcement Of The FCC's Rules Violates Section 364.27 And Constitutes An Invalid Exercise Of Delegated Legislative Authority.

Under section 364.27, the Commission only is empowered to investigate interstate rules of practice for or in relation to the transmission of messages or conversations taking place within Florida which in the Commission's opinion violate the Act or the FCC's orders and regulations. *See* § 364.27. The Commission's power with respect to such interstate matters is limited to referring the violations to the FCC by petition. *See id.* The Legislature has not granted the Commission the authority to impose a penalty for violations of the Act or the FCC's rules. *See id.* That limitation on the Commission's authority clearly expresses the Legislature's intent that the Commission not enforce the Act or the FCC's rules, and that it not impose a penalty for carrier practices that violate federal law.

---

<sup>18</sup> VCI does not waive its right to bring a complaint under section 120.56(4).  
{TL158579;1}

The Commission's belief that VCI may have violated the FCC's rules should have led it to do no more than file a complaint with the FCC under Section 208(a) of the Act. The Commission has clearly exceeded the limit on its jurisdiction imposed by section 364.27 by attempting to penalize VCI for alleged violations of section 214(e) of the Act and the FCC's rules. If it wanted to enforce the FCC's rules—assuming for the sake of argument that the Commission had authority to do so—the Commission should have adopted those rules in the rulemaking process required by the APA. *See* § 120.54(6). Having failed to do so, the Commission is left without any authority beyond the specific powers given it by section 364.27. It grossly exceeded those powers by attempting to penalize VCI for its alleged violations of federal law instead of referring the matter to the FCC as required by law.

4. By Seeking To Enforce Unadopted Rules And Law Not Enacted By The Legislature, The Commission Is Violating VCI's Due Process Rights.

The Commission's attempt to enforce against VCI the provisions of federal law not enacted by the Legislature and enforce rules it has not adopted constitutes a violation of VCI's due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Section 9 of the Florida Constitution. The Commission's ETC designation confers upon VCI the right to obtain reimbursement from the Fund and, as such, constitutes a property right. The

Commission cannot deprive VCI of property without due process of law, which includes notice and an opportunity to be heard. To deprive VCI of its property rights, the Legislature and the Commission must provide VCI with notice of the circumstances under which VCI can be deprived of this property right. Florida law fails to provide VCI with this notice.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons expressed, the Commission does not have subject matter jurisdiction over the Proceeding Below, may not enforce federal laws and FCC Rules against VCI. Accordingly, VCI requests this Court to issue a writ of prohibition requiring the Commission from proceeding with the Proceeding Below.

Respectfully submitted,



**KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS** (0949396)

**NANCY M. WALLACE** (0065897)

**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**

106 East College Ave., Suite 1200

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Telephone: (850) 224-9634

Telecopier: (850) 222-0103

katherine.giddings@akerman.com

**Attorneys for Petitioner, Vilaire  
Communications, Inc.**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Writ of Prohibition, ~~along with redacted copies of the referenced materials,~~ have been served via hand delivery to the Commission via its Clerk: Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32309; and the persons listed below this 15th day of May, 2008:

Lee Eng Tan, Senior Attorney Florida Public Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 LTan@psc.state.fl.us Counsel for the Commission	Michael Cooke, General Counsel Florida Public Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 Counsel for the Commission
Adam Teitzman, Supervising Attorney Florida Public Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us Counsel for the Commission	Beth Salak, Director/Competitive Markets and Enforcement 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 bsalak@psc.state.fl.us



\_\_\_\_\_  
**KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS**

**CERTIFICATE OF FONT SIZE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this Petition complies with the font standards, i.e., Times New Roman 14-point font, as set forth in Rule 9.100 Florida Appellate Rules of Procedure.



\_\_\_\_\_  
**KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS**