

Marguerite McLean

100340-TP

**From:** Bruette Davis [bdavis@kagmlaw.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 29, 2010 3:44 PM  
**To:** Filings@psc.state.fl.us  
**Cc:** Adam Teitzman; Charles Murphy; Vicki Gordon Kaufman  
**Subject:** Docket No. 100340-TP  
**Attachments:** All American Motion to Quash Subpoena 7.29.10.pdf

In accordance with the electronic filing procedures of the Florida Public Service Commission, the following filing is made:

- a. The name, address, telephone number and email for the person responsible for the filing is:

Vicki Gordon Kaufman  
 Jon C. Moyle, Jr.  
 Keefe Anchors Gordon & Moyle  
 118 North Gadsden Street  
 Tallahassee, FL 32301  
 (850) 681-3828  
[vkaufman@kagmlaw.com](mailto:vkaufman@kagmlaw.com)  
[jmoyle@kagmlaw.com](mailto:jmoyle@kagmlaw.com)

- b. This filing is made in Docket No. 100340-TP.
- c. The document is filed on behalf of All American Telecom, Inc.
- d. The total pages in the document are 17 pages.
- e. The attached document is All American Telecom, Inc.'s Motion to Quash Subpoena.

Bruette Davis  
[bdavis@kagmlaw.com](mailto:bdavis@kagmlaw.com)



Keefe, Anchors, Gordon and Moyle, P.A.  
 The Perkins House  
 118 N. Gadsden St.  
 Tallahassee, FL 32301  
 850-681-3828 (Voice)  
 850-681-8788 (Fax)  
[www.kagmlaw.com](http://www.kagmlaw.com)

The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and may be subject to the attorney client privilege or may constitute privileged work product. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent or employee responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify us by telephone or return e-mail immediately. Thank you.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

106201 JUL 29 09

7/29/2010

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In re: Investigation of Associated  
Telecommunications Management  
Services, LLC (ATMS) companies  
For compliance with Chapter 25-  
24, F.A.C., and applicable lifeline,  
Eligible telecommunication carrier, and  
Universal service requirements.

---

Docket No. 100340-TP

Filed: July 29, 2010

**All American Telecom, Inc.'s Motion to Quash Subpoena**

All American Telecom, Inc. (All American) pursuant to section 120.569(2)(k)1, Florida Statutes, rule 1.410(c), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, and rule 28-106.212, Florida Administrative Code, hereby objects to and moves to quash the Commission Staff subpoena served on All American on or about July 2, 2010. (Exhibit A).

**Background**

1. This docket was opened on June 28, 2010. A review of the docket file shows that Staff has filed two documents since the docket was opened. The first is a form entitled "Request to Establish Docket" in which Commission Staff requested that this docket be opened and be styled an investigation. There is no documentation accompanying the request and, in fact, the request states that supporting documentation will "be provided with the recommendation." Thus, no reason, justification or information is provided as to why Staff requests that an investigation be instituted.

2. The second document, filed the next day, is a request that a number of subpoenas be issued, requiring various companies to produce a vast array of documents on July 19, 2010. The subpoena to All American is the subject of this motion.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Similar, though not identical, subpoenas were issued to other companies and similar motions to quash are filed simultaneously herewith.

3. Neither of these documents provides any information as to what the subject of the investigation is or what Commission Staff thinks may be at issue. Given the breadth of the subpoena, it is impossible to tell what Staff is attempting to investigate.

4. Upon receipt of the subpoena, legal Staff was contacted regarding the subject of the investigation, in an attempt to narrow the requests and resolve any issues with which Staff may be concerned. However, Staff preferred to proceed with the subpoena and All American is still unaware of what the explicit subject matter of the investigation is.

#### **Relevance and Scope of A Subpoena**

5. A subpoena is not a blanket vehicle by which to request a broad and vast array of documents which are not tied in any way to matters at issue in a proceeding. However, that appears to be exactly what Commission Staff has done with the subpoena served on All American. This is impermissible and thus, the subpoena must be quashed in its entirety.

6. Information sought in a subpoena must be relevant and cannot be unreasonable or burdensome. This standard is clear from the applicable rules and statutes. For example, section 120.569(2)(k)1, Florida Statutes, addresses the issuance of subpoenas in administrative proceedings. It states that a subpoena should be quashed if the subpoena is “unreasonably broad in scope, or requires the production of irrelevant material.” The subpoena at issue here is both unreasonably broad and requires the production of irrelevant material.

7. Similarly, rule 1.410(2)(c), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, provides that a subpoena should be quashed if it is unreasonable or oppressive. The subject subpoena, as demonstrated below, is both.

8. Florida case law describes the limits on subpoena power. A subpoena must be “properly limited in scope, relevant in purpose, and specific in directive,” in order not to be

unduly burdensome.” *Check ‘N Go of Florida, Inc. v. State*, 790 So.2d 454, 460 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 2001), *rev. denied*, 817 So.2d 845 (Fla. 2002), quoting *Dean v. State*, 478 So.2d 38, 40 (Fla. 1985). Quoting the United State’s Supreme Court, the *Check ‘N Go* court counseled against “fishing expeditions” into private papers. *Id.* at 460. Further, in *Check ‘N Go*, the court stated:

A subpoena duces tecum may not lawfully require the production of a mass of books and papers, merely so that one may search through them to gather evidence; and an omnibus subpoena for all, or even a substantial part, of the books and records of the subpoenaed party is invalid.

*Id.* at 460, citations omitted. Staff’s subpoena fails to meet the necessary standards for a lawful subpoena as set forth above.

9. The United States Supreme Court has held that:

It is now settled that, when an administrative agency subpoenas corporate books or records, the Fourth Amendment requires that *the subpoena be sufficiently limited in scope, relevant in purpose, and specific in directive so that compliance will not be unreasonably burdensome.*

*See v. City of Seattle*, 387 U.S. 541, 544 (1967), footnote omitted, emphasis added. The Staff subpoena fails to meet this standard because, as described below, the subpoena is not sufficiently limited in scope or relevant in purpose.

10. All American is extremely concerned with and objects to the expansive and overbroad nature of the documents sought in the subpoena which is the subject of this motion. Though this docket is styled as an “investigation,” All American has no idea and has been not put on any notice as to what is being investigated. Fundamental requirements of due process mandate that All American be put on notice of the specific subject matter of the investigation and any allegations related thereto. Otherwise, it cannot appropriately respond to the subpoena nor otherwise evaluate the materials being requested.

11. Instead, All American has received an extensive subpoena request with no information as to what facts, claims or alleged violations Staff believes are at issue. All American should not be required to produce reams of documents without being advised specifically as to what the Commission Staff thinks the subject matter of investigation is.

12. It is beyond dispute that subpoenas may only seek relevant information related to the merits of the inquiry. None of the requests in the subject subpoena can meet this basic standard. Because All American has no idea what the Commission Staff is attempting to investigate or why, the scope and breadth of the subpoena cannot, on its face, meet the standard of relevancy required by statute and rule. Until it is clear what Staff thinks is at issue in this docket and puts All American on notice of its concerns, none of the documents sought can be relevant to an undisclosed investigation.

13. Further, All American can make no assessment as to the relevance of any of the *documents sought*. As just one example, in Request No. 5, Staff seeks "all corporate minutes of All American including stockholder meetings and Board of Director meetings from June 2009 through May 2010." Many items are discussed at stockholder and director meetings; most, if not all, are unlikely to be related to matters to be reviewed in this docket. A similarly expansive request is made for state and federal income tax returns. These requests are in no way limited in scope or subject and because the subject of the investigation is not known, All American does not have any way to assess Staff's requests. However, one thing is certain, All American is not required to blindly produce documents in the face of an undesignated and undisclosed investigation.

14. At this point, the subpoena appears to be an overly broad attempt by Staff to access reams of documents which are not related to any problem or set of facts of which All

American is aware or on notice. *Thus, as to each and every request in the subpoena, All American objects on the grounds of relevance and overbreadth.*

15. All American is willing to work with Staff to provide relevant documents when it is appraised of and has an understanding of the nature of the inquiry in which Staff is engaged.

**Place of Production**

16. The subpoena directs that the documents at issue be produced at the Commission's offices in Tallahassee. All American objects to the place designated for production as such records, to the extent they exist, are not located in Tallahassee. It would be burdensome and oppressive to transport them to Tallahassee. If any production does occur, after clarification of the matters at issue in this docket, such production should occur where the records are located. See rule 1.350(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.

17. Each specific request is discussed below and incorporates paragraphs 1-16 above.

**Request No. 1**

18. In Request No. 1, Staff seeks specific and extensive customer information for customers in eight states and Florida. First, All American objects to this request on the grounds that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to subpoena the documents pertaining to information outside of Florida. Commission Staff seeks a great deal of specific information regarding customers in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over operations in states other than Florida nor the ability to request information as to customers outside its jurisdiction. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. All American to date has no customers and has not engaged in business.

19. In addition, as noted above, the request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware.

20. Finally, All American objects to producing the requested documents because documents concerning Lifeline matters, in Florida and outside Florida, are matters of federal law outside of this Commission's jurisdiction.

### **Request No. 2**

21. Request No. 2 seeks copies of Lifeline certification records for all Lifeline customers. All American has no customers and has not engaged in business.

22. Further, as noted above, the request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. All American has no customers and to date has not engaged in business.

23. Finally, All American objects to producing the requested documents because documents concerning Lifeline matters are matters of federal law outside of this Commission's jurisdiction.

24. All American also objects to the extent this request seeks information outside of Florida.

### **Request No. 3**

25. Request No. 3 seeks copies of all notices sent to customers terminated for nonpayment. All American has no customers and has not engaged in business.

26. Further, as noted above, the request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks

information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

27. Finally, All American objects to producing the requested documents because documents concerning Lifeline matters are matters of federal law outside of this Commission's jurisdiction.

#### **Request No. 4**

28. Request No. 4 seeks the names of customers who have moved from All American to another company and a copy of the authorization request. As a preliminary matter, the request to compile a list of customers who have changed providers is not cognizable within a subpoena duces tecum without deposition which is a request to produce documents. The first part of Request No. 4 requests All American to provide a list of companies to whom a customer may have moved. This would require the creation of information and thus is not a proper request for a subpoena duces tecum.

29. Further, All American has no customers and to date has not engaged in business.

30. The second part of the request, for a copy of the customer's authorization, is irrelevant. All American has no customers and to date has not engaged in business.

31. Further, as noted above, the entire request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

32. Finally, All American objects to producing the requested documents because documents concerning Lifeline matters are matters of federal law outside of this Commission's jurisdiction.



#### Request No. 5

33. Request No. 5 seeks a copy of all corporate minutes of All American, including stockholder and Board of Director meetings. All American objects to this request because it is over broad, oppressive and not limited in any way by subject matter. Again, since All American does not know what is being investigated, it does not know what minutes, if any exist, might bear on the investigation. It is highly unlikely that *all* corporate minutes, if any, will have any bearing on this matter.

34. Further, as noted above, the entire request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

#### Request No. 6

35. Request No. 6 seeks All American's federal and Florida state tax returns for the last two years. First, as with the other requests, All American objects on the basis of relevance. There has been absolutely no showing made that All American's federal and state income tax returns are relevant in any way to this proceeding.<sup>2</sup>

36. All American further objects to this request as it is over broad, oppressive and harassing. No showing has been made as to what income tax returns might have to do with this matter and All American vehemently objects to being required to produce such highly sensitive

---

<sup>2</sup> Income tax returns are subject to production *only* if they are relevant. *Cabanas v. Ford, Armenteros, Manucy, Inc.*, 727 So.2d 1100, 1102 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1999).

documents without a compelling showing from Staff that such documents are relevant to the matter at issue, which has yet to be identified.

37. Further, since All American does not know what is being investigated, it does not know how or in what way its income tax returns might have any bearing on any matter within the Commission's jurisdiction. It is highly unlikely that such returns will have any bearing on this matter.

38. Last, as noted above, the entire request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

#### **Request No. 7**

39. Request No. 7 seeks information about All American employees, officers, directors and owners. The request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

40. All American further objects because such information as to All American employees, in particular, because it is irrelevant, unduly burdensome, not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and an invasion of the privacy interests and rights of those employees.

#### **Request No. 8**

41. Request No. 8 seeks documents provided to underlying carriers certifying compliance with certain Commission requirements regarding Lifeline/Link Up programs. All

American objects as this request is overbroad and vague as it does not specify what "Commission requirements" are pertinent.

42. Further, Staff should already be in receipt of such information. If All American is to compile all of this information it would take considerable research and time and 100 or more man hours with the cost in the excess of \$2,500.00. Such a request is particularly burdensome and oppressive in light of the lack of any connection of this information to the undisclosed purpose of this docket. The subpoena provides absolutely no justification for the requirement that All American expend time and resources on a request that would encompass many documents.

43. In addition, this request appears to seek documents outside of Florida. If it does, such a request is outside the Commission's jurisdiction.

44. Further, the request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

45. Finally, All American objects to producing the requested documents because documents concerning Lifeline/Link Up matters are matters of federal law outside of this Commission's jurisdiction.

#### **Request No. 9**

46. Request No. 9 seeks all 499-A and 499-Q forms filed by All American for the past two and one half years. The request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

47. Further, the request appears to seek documents from outside of Florida. Such a request is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction.

48. All American further objects to producing the requested documents because documents concerning the Universal Service Administrative Company, in Florida and outside Florida, are matters of federal law outside of this Commission's jurisdiction.

#### **Request No. 10**

49. Request No. 10 seeks copies of any outside auditor reports and opinions for the last year. All American objects to this request as it is over broad, oppressive and in no way limited by subject matter. Again, since All American does not know what is being investigated, it does not know what auditor reports or opinions, if any, and if any such reports exist, might bear on the investigation. It is highly unlikely that all such reports and minutes, if any, will have any bearing on this matter.

50. The request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

#### **Request No. 11**

51. Request No. 11 seeks copies of purchase agreements between other entities and All American. This request is overbroad and oppressive as it is not limited in any way in time or scope.

52. Such a request is also objectionable because it seeks highly confidential proprietary business information which is irrelevant to any matters within the Commission's jurisdiction.

53. Further, the request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which All American is aware. And, it is difficult to envision how such documents have any relevance or relation to any matter within the Commission's jurisdiction.

54. Finally, this request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

#### Conclusion

55. As described in detail above, the very broad requests contained in the All American subpoena are irrelevant, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. This is particularly the case in light of the fact that All American has not in any way been apprised of the subject matter which the Commission Staff seeks to investigate. It is inappropriate for a subpoena to be issued which has no relation to delineated matters under consideration by the Commission. Such a subpoena forces the entity receiving the subpoena to guess at what the subject matter of concern may be and violates fundamental due process rights to be apprised of allegations concerning it.

56. Nonetheless, All American is committed to cooperating with the Commission Staff when it is apprised of and fully understands exactly what the subject matter of this docket is and can determine which documents pertain to such subject matter.

57. All American further suggests that a meeting with Commission Staff would be a productive first step to understanding Staff's concerns, working with Staff to narrow the documents requested, and resolving any potential issues. All American stands fully ready to participate promptly in such a meeting.

**WHEREFORE**, All American requests that the Commission enter an order quashing the All American subpoena in its entirety.

s/ Vicki Gordon Kaufman  
Vicki Gordon Kaufman  
Keefe Anchors Gordon & Moyle, PA  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: (850) 681-3828  
Facsimile: (850) 681-8788  
[vkaufman@kagmlaw.com](mailto:vkaufman@kagmlaw.com)

Christina B. Sutch  
Associated Telecommunications Management  
Services, LLC  
In-House General Counsel  
6905 N. Wickham Road, Suite 403  
Melbourne, FL 32940  
Telephone: (321) 373-1360  
Facsimile: (321) 275-4877  
[legal@telecomgroup.com](mailto:legal@telecomgroup.com)

Attorneys for All American Telecom, Inc.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Quash has been furnished by electronic mail and US Mail this 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2010 to the following:

Adam Teitzman  
Charles Murphy  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
[ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us)  
[cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us)

s/ Vicki Gordon Kaufman

Vicki Gordon Kaufman

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**IN RE: Docket No. 100340-TP Investigation )  
of Associated Telecommunications )  
Management Services, LLC (ATMS) )  
companies for compliance with Chapter 25- )  
24, F.A.C., and applicable lifeline, eligible )  
telecommunication carrier, and universal )  
service requirements. )**

**SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM  
WITHOUT DEPOSITION**

**THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

**TO: David L. Galner Jr., Vice President, All American Telecom, Inc., 23110 State Road 54, #308,  
Lutz FL 33549**

**YOU ARE COMMANDED** to appear at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399, on July 19, 2010, by 5:00 p.m., or at such other time and place as may be mutually agreed upon by counsel, and to have with you at that time and place the following:

The documents listed in Attachment A.

These items will be inspected and may be copied at that time. You will not be required to surrender the original items. You may comply with this subpoena by providing legible copies of the items to be produced to the attorney whose name appears on this subpoena on or before the scheduled date of production. You may mail or deliver the copies to the attorney whose name appears on this subpoena and thereby eliminate your appearance at the time and place specified above. You have the right to object to the production pursuant to this subpoena at any time before production by giving written notice to the attorney whose name appears on this subpoena. THIS WILL NOT BE A DEPOSITION. NO TESTIMONY WILL BE TAKEN.

**YOU ARE SUBPOENAED** by the following attorney to (1) appear as specified, or (2) furnish the records instead of appearing as provided above, and, unless excused from this subpoena by this attorney or the Commission, you shall respond to this subpoena as directed.

**DATED July 1, 2010**

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk  
Office of Commission Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission

By: Dorothy Menasco  
Dorothy Menasco  
Chief Deputy Commission Clerk

**(SEAL)**

Adam Teitzman  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850  
Attorney for Florida Public Service  
Commission



**ATTACHMENT A**

Provide responses to each of the following questions and provide the requested documents on or before Thursday, July 15, 2010. Your company may avail itself of the statutory confidential provisions of Section 364.183, Florida Statutes, and Rule 25-22.006, Florida Administrative Code, if it believes it is necessary to comply with this subpoena.

1. Provide the following customer information for each Lifeline customer for the months of January 2010 through May 2010 in the states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee:
  - a) Customer Name
  - b) Customer Address
  - c) Customer Telephone Number
  - d) Date customer became a Lifeline customer
  - e) Date customer ceased being a Lifeline customer (If no longer a Lifeline customer)
  - f) If customer was disconnected, the reason customer was disconnected
2. Provide copies of the Lifeline certification records which provide proof of Lifeline eligibility for each Florida Lifeline customer receiving service from January 2010 through May 2010. Include self-certification and/or income completed certification forms.
3. Provide copies of all written notices sent to Florida customers who have been terminated for nonpayment of bills for telephone service during the period of January 2010 through May 2010.
4. If a Florida Lifeline subscriber has been moved from All American Telecom, Inc. (All American) to another Associated Telecommunications Management Service (ATMS) company during the period of January 2010 through May 2010, provide the name of the company each customer was moved to and provide a copy of each customer's authorization to do so.
5. Provide a copy of all corporate minutes of All American including stockholder meetings and Board of Director meetings from June 2009 through May 2010.
6. Provide copies of all Federal and State of Florida income tax returns filed in the last two years.
7. Provide a list of all All American employees, officers, directors, and owners employed during the period June 2009 through May 2010, along with their job descriptions.

**ATTACHMENT A**

8. If an underlying carrier provides Lifeline discounted wholesale services to All American, provide a copy of the certification given to each underlying carrier that All American is complying with all Commission requirements governing the Lifeline/Link Up programs as required by 47 CFR §54.417(b).
9. Provide copies of all 499-A and 499-Q forms filed with the Universal Service Administrative Company for 2008 through May 2010.
10. Provide copies of any outside auditor reports and opinions for All American Telecom for the period June 2009, through May 2010.
11. Provide copies of the purchase agreements between ATMS and All American Acquisition Group, LLC, and All American Acquisition Group, LLC and All American Telecom, Inc.