



Leo J. Bub
General Attorney

AT&T Missouri
One AT&T Center
Room 3518
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

T: 314.235.2508
F: 314.247.0014
leo.bub@att.com

Filed via EFIS

July 20, 2012

Secretary of the Commission
Missouri Public Service Commission
P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360

Re: Halo Wireless, Inc. v. Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc. et al.
Case No. TC-2012-0331 – Notice of Supplemental Authorities - Georgia and South Carolina

Dear Secretary of the Commission:

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, d/b/a AT&T Missouri (“AT&T Missouri”), respectfully submits the attached orders issued by the Georgia and South Carolina Public Service Commissions on July 17, 2012, as Supplemental Authority in current proceeding before the Missouri Commission in Case No. TC-2012-0331:

In Re: Complaint of TDS TELECOM on Behalf of Its Subsidiaries Blue Ridge Telephone & Telegraph Company, Inc., Nelson Ball Ground Telephone Company, and Quincy Telephone Company Against Halo Wireless, Inc., Transcom Enhanced Services, Inc. and Other Affiliates for Failure to Pay Terminating Intrastate Access Charges for Traffic and for Expedited Declaratory Relief and Authority to Cease Termination of Traffic, Order on Complaints, Docket No. 34219 (Georgia Pub. Serv. Comm. July 17, 2012).

In Re: Complaint and Petition for Relief of BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v. Halo Wireless, Incorporated for Breach of the Parties, Interconnection Agreement, Order Granting Relief Against Halo Wireless, Docket No. 2011-304-C, Order No. 2012-516 (Pub. Serv. Comm. of S. Carolina July 17, 2012).

As reflected in the attached Orders, the Georgia and South Carolina Commissions found, among other matters, that Halo had materially breached the interconnection agreement with AT&T by sending landline-originated traffic to AT&T and inserting incorrect Charge Number (CN) information on calls, and held AT&T should be excused from further performance under the interconnection agreement and may stop accepting

Secretary of the Commission
July 20, 2012
Page 2

traffic from Halo. The Commissions also ruled that Halo is liable for applicable access charges, without quantifying the precise amount, which they ruled should be left up to the bankruptcy court to determine.

Very truly yours,



Leo J. Bub

cc: All Parties of Record

Attachments