

Marguerite McLean

100340-TP

From: Bruette Davis [bdavis@kagmlaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 29, 2010 3:47 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Adam Teitzman; Charles Murphy; Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Subject: Docket No. 100340-TP
Attachments: Bellerud 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
jmoyle@kagmlaw.com

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

Bruette Davis
bdavis@kagmlaw.com



**Keefe, Anchors
Gordon & Moyle**

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

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

16208 JUL 29 9

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

7/29/2010

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

Bellerud Communications, LLC's Motion to Quash Subpoena

Bellerud Communications, LLC (Bellerud), 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 Bellerud 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 Bellerud is the subject of this motion.¹

¹ 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 Bellerud 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 Bellerud. 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. 5th 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. Bellerud 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,” Bellerud has no idea and has been not put on any notice as to what is being investigated. Fundamental requirements of due process mandate that Bellerud 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, Bellerud has received an extensive subpoena request with no information as to what facts, claims or alleged violations Staff believes are at issue. Bellerud 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 Bellerud 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 Bellerud on notice of its concerns, none of the documents sought can be relevant to an undisclosed investigation.

13. Further, Bellerud can make no assessment as to the relevance of any of the documents sought. As just one example, in Request No. 6, Staff seeks 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, Bellerud does not have any way to assess Staff's requests. However, one thing is certain, Bellerud 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 Bellerud is aware or on notice. *Thus, as to each and every request in the subpoena, Bellerud objects on the grounds of relevance and overbreadth.*

15. Finally, as described in detail below, it would cost Bellerud thousands of dollars to respond to this subpoena. Before such resources are expended, Bellerud is entitled to understand what the issues are which Staff seeks to review.

16. Bellerud 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

17. The subpoena directs that the documents at issue be produced at the Commission's offices in Tallahassee. Bellerud 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.

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

Request No. 1

19. In Request No. 1, Staff seeks specific and extensive customer information for customers in eight states and Florida. First, Bellerud 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.

20. Further, the request is overly broad and burdensome and oppressive. The request is burdensome as it would require extensive work on the part of Bellerud to collect and provide the information requested. To respond to this request would require Bellerud to contact its database vendor, request information, review all information collected, redact all CPNI information, prepare for hearing on objections, prepare a custom report for each required field pertaining to the information requested, and prepare the report and review it for accuracy. This would take approximately 80 man hours at a total cost of approximately \$2,500.00 plus costs from vendors and attorney fees. 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 Bellerud expend time and resources on a request that would encompass thousands of customers.

21. Bellerud does not have any Lifeline customers in Florida.

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

23. Finally, Bellerud 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.

24. Bellerud also objects because this request seeks confidential proprietary customer information.

Request No. 2

25. Request No. 2 seeks copies of Florida Lifeline certification records for all Lifeline customers. Bellerud does not have any Florida Lifeline customers.

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

Request No. 3

27. Request No. 3 seeks copies of all notices sent to customers terminated for nonpayment. Bellerud does not have any Lifeline customers in Florida. This 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 Bellerud expend time and resources on a request that would encompass hundreds of customers.

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

Request No. 4

29. Request No. 4 seeks the names of customers who have moved from Bellerud to another company and a copy of the authorization request. This request is overbroad, burdensome and oppressive.

30. Bellerud does not have any Florida Lifeline customers. Further, the entire request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Request No. 5

31. Request No. 5 seeks a copy of all corporate minutes of Bellerud, including stockholder and Board of Director meetings. Bellerud objects to this request because it is over

broad, oppressive and not limited in any way by subject matter. Again, since Bellerud 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. Furthermore, Bellerud is a Texas limited liability company -- under Texas law no meetings or minutes are required.

32. Further, as noted above, the entire request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which Bellerud 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

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

34. Bellerud 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 Bellerud vehemently objects to being required to produce such highly sensitive documents without a compelling showing from Staff that such documents are relevant to the matter at issue, which has yet to be identified.

² 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).

35. Further, since Bellerud 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.

36. Last, as noted above, the entire request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which Bellerud 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

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

38. Bellerud further objects because such information as to Bellerud 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

39. Request No. 8 seeks documents provided to underlying carriers certifying compliance with certain Commission requirements regarding Lifeline/Link Up programs. Bellerud objects as this request is overbroad and vague as it does not specify what "Commission requirements" are pertinent.

40. Further, Staff should already be in receipt of such information. The request is burdensome as it would require extensive work on the part of Bellerud to collect and provide the

information requested. If Bellerud is to compile all of this information it would take considerable research and time to the effect of 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 Bellerud expend time and resources on a request that would encompass many documents.

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

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

43. Finally, Bellerud 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

44. Request No. 9 seeks all 499-A and 499-Q forms filed by Bellerud 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 Bellerud is aware. This request seeks information irrelevant to these proceedings and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

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

46. Bellerud 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

47. Request No. 10 seeks copies of any outside auditor reports and opinions for the last year. Bellerud objects to this request as it is over broad, oppressive and in no way limited by subject matter. Again, since Bellerud 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.

48. The request seeks irrelevant information because it is not related to any facts or allegations of which Bellerud 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

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

50. 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.

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

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

Conclusion

53. As described in detail above, the very broad requests contained in the Bellerud subpoena are irrelevant, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive and harassing. This is particularly the case in light of the fact that Bellerud 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.

54. Nonetheless, Bellerud 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.

55. Bellerud 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. Bellerud stands fully ready to participate promptly in such a meeting.

WHEREFORE, Bellerud requests that the Commission enter an order quashing the Bellerud 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

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

Attorneys for Bellerud Communications, LLC

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 29th 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
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: Bellerud Communications, LLC c/o Registered Agent of INCORP SERVICES, INC., 17888 67th Court
North Loxahatchee FL 33470

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
Chief Deputy Commission Clerk

(SEAL)

Adam Teltzman
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 Monday, July 19, 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 Bellerud Communications, LLC (Bellerud) 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 Bellerud 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 Bellerud employees, officers, directors, and owners employed during the period June 2009 through May 2010, along with their job descriptions.

ATTACHMENT A (Cont.)

8. If an underlying carrier provides Lifeline discounted wholesale services to Bellerud, provide a copy of the certification given to each underlying carrier that Bellerud 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 Bellerud for the period June 2009 through May 2010.
11. Provide copies of the purchase agreements between ATMS and Bellerud Acquisition Group, LLC, and Bellerud Acquisition Group, LLC and Bellerud Communications, LLC.