PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired
JAMES C. SWEARENGEN
WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III
JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON
GARY W. DUFFY
PAUL A. BOUDREAU
CHARLES E. SMARR
DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE
P.O. BOX 456
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166
FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY
DIANA C. CARTER
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN
JAMIE J. COX
L. RUSSELL MITTEN
ERIN L. WISEMAN
JOHN D. BORGMEYER

COUNSEL GREGORY C. MITCHELL

January 26, 2011

VIA EMAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Mr. John Marks General Counsel Halo Wireless 3437 W. 7th Street, Suite 127 Forth Worth, TX 76107 JAN 28 2011

Re: Re

Request for Interconnection & Compensation Arrangements

Dear Mr. Marks:

Our firm represents the following Local Exchange Companies (LECs) in the state of Missouri.

Goodman Telephone Company
Granby Telephone Company
Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation
Lathrop Telephone Company
McDonald County Telephone Company
Oregon Farmers Mutual Telephone Company
Ozark Telephone Company
Seneca Telephone Company

These LECs have recently received billing records from their tandem provider, AT&T Missouri, indicating that Halo Wireless (Halo) is sending traffic through the AT&T tandems in Missouri, over the LEC-to-LEC (or Feature Group C) network for ultimate termination to customers served by these LECs. Currently, Halo has no agreement with any of these LECs to terminate this traffic.

Accordingly, these LECs request that Halo Wireless begin negotiations, pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, to establish appropriate interconnection arrangements (including reciprocal compensation) for the intraMTA wireless traffic that Halo Wireless is terminating to them.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and indicate Halo's willingness to begin negotiations towards an interconnection agreement for the exchange of, and compensation for, intraMTA wireless traffic. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

W.R. England, II

WRE/da

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166 FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired 312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE

JAMES C. SWEARENGEN P.O. BOX 456

WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456

GARY W. DUFFY
PAUL A. BOUDREAU
CHARLES E. SMARR

JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON

DEAN L. COOPER

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY
DIANA C. CARTER
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN
JAMIE J. COX
L. RUSSELL MITTEN
ERIN L. WISEMAN
JOHN D, BORGMEYER

COUNSEL

GREGORY C. MITCHELL

February 17, 2011

VIA EMAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Mr. John Marks General Counsel Halo Wireless 3437 W. 7th Street, Suite 127 Forth Worth, TX 76107

Re: Request for Interconnection & Compensation Arrangements

Dear Mr. Marks:

Previously we have sent you requests on behalf of the following Local Exchange Companies (LECs) to begin negotiations with Halo Wireless (Halo) toward an Interconnection Agreement pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996:

Citizens Telephone Company
Green Hills Telephone Corporation
Green Hills Telecommunication Services

January 26, 2011

December 30, 2010

Letter Sent

Goodman Telephone Company
Granby Telephone Company
Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation
Lathrop Telephone Company
McDonald County Telephone Company
Oregon Farmers Mutual Telephone Company
Ozark Telephone Company
Seneca Telephone Company

Rock Port Telephone Company

January 27, 2011

Page 2 of 2 February 17, 2011

In addition to the above, several other LECs that we represent have recently received billing records from their tandem provider, AT&T Missouri, indicating that Halo is sending traffic to the AT&T tandems in Missouri over the LEC-to-LEC (or Feature Group C) network for ultimate termination to customers served by these LECs. Currently, Halo has no agreement with any of these LECs to terminate this traffic.

Accordingly, the following LECs request that Halo begin negotiations, pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, to establish appropriate interconnection agreements (including reciprocal compensation) for the local (i.e., intraMTA) wireless traffic that Halo Wireless is terminating to them.

Ellington Telephone Company
Farber Telephone Company
Fidelity Telephone Company
Fidelity Communications Services I
Fidelity Communications Services II
Holway Telephone Company
Iamo Telephone Company
KLM Telephone Company
KLM Telephone Company
Le-Ru Telephone Company
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company
Mark Twain Communications Company
New Florence Telephone Company
Steelville Telephone Exchange, Inc.

In response to our earlier correspondence, you have questioned the procedures that these LECs are pursuing to request negotiations. Accordingly, let me make it clear that these LECs seek to initiate negotiations toward an interconnection agreement pursuant to Sections 251 and 252, as envisioned by the FCC in its 2005 T-Mobile decision. Therefore, if voluntary negotiations are unsuccessful, these LECs are willing to submit to arbitration before the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Accordingly, please acknowledge receipt of this letter and indicate Halo Wireless' willingness to begin negotiations towards an interconnection agreement for the exchange of, and compensation for, local (intraMTA) wireless traffic. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

W.R. England I

WRE/da

LAW OFFICES

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired JAMES C. SWEARENGEN WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON GARY W. DUFFY PAUL A. BOUDREAU CHARLES E. SMARR

DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE
P.O. BOX 456

DEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166
FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY
DIANA C. CARTER
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN
JAMIE J. COX
L. RUSSELL MITTEN
ERIN L. WISEMAN
JOHN D. BORGMEYER

COUNSEL GREGORY C. MITCHELL

February 25, 2011

VIA EMAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS

MAR - 1 2011

Mr. John Marks General Counsel Halo Wireless 3437 W. 7th Street, Suite 127 Forth Worth, TX 76107

Re:

Request for Interconnection & Compensation Arrangements

Dear Mr. Marks:

Previously we have sent you requests on behalf of the following Local Exchange Companies (LECs) to begin negotiations with Halo Wireless (Halo) toward an Interconnection Agreement pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996:

Citizens Telephone Company Green Hills Telephone Corporation Green Hills Telecommunication Services

December 30, 2010

Letter Sent

Goodman Telephone Company

January 26, 2011

Granby Telephone Company

Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation
Lathrop Telephone Company
McDonald County Telephone Company
Oregon Farmers Mutual Telephone Company
Ozark Telephone Company
Seneca Telephone Company

Rock Port Telephone Company

January 27, 2011

Page 2 of 3 February 25, 2011

Ellington Telephone Company
Farber Telephone Company
Fidelity Telephone Company
Fidelity Communications Services I
Fidelity Communications Services II
Holway Telephone Company
Iamo Telephone Company
KLM Telephone Company
KLM Telephone Company
Le-Ru Telephone Company
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company
Mark Twain Communications Company
New Florence Telephone Company
Steelville Telephone Exchange, Inc.

February 17, 2011

In addition to the above, several other LECs that we represent have recently received billing records from their tandem provider, AT&T Missouri, indicating that Halo is sending traffic to the AT&T tandems in Missouri over the LEC-to-LEC (or Feature Group C) network for ultimate termination to customers served by these LECs. Currently, Halo has no agreement with any of these LECs to terminate this traffic.

Accordingly, the following LECs request that Halo begin negotiations, pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, to establish appropriate interconnection agreements (including reciprocal compensation) for the local (i.e., intraMTA) wireless traffic that Halo Wireless is terminating to them.

BPS Telephone Company Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc. Miller Telephone Company New London Telephone Company Orchard Farm Telephone Company Peace Valley Telephone Company, Inc. Stoutland Telephone Company

In response to our earlier correspondence, you have questioned the procedures that these LECs are pursuing to request negotiations. Accordingly, let me make it clear that these LECs seek to initiate negotiations toward an interconnection agreement pursuant to Sections 251 and 252, as envisioned by the FCC in its 2005 T-Mobile decision. Therefore, if voluntary negotiations are unsuccessful, these LECs are willing to submit to arbitration before the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Page 3 of 3 February 25, 2011

Accordingly, please acknowledge receipt of this letter and indicate Halo Wireless' willingness to begin negotiations towards an interconnection agreement for the exchange of, and compensation for, local (intraMTA) wireless traffic. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

W.R. England, III

WRE/da

Summary Approved Traffic Termination Agreements between Seneca and CMRS Providers

LEC	CMRS Provider	Docket #	IntraMTA Rate	Effective Date
Seneca	Verizon	TK-2007-0330	0.0073	2/5/2007
Seneca	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0225	0.0073	10/31/2006
Seneca	US Cellular	TO-2006-0222	0.035	11/15/2005
Seneca	Cingular	TK-2006-0533	0.0073	4/29/2005
Seneca	Sprint	TK-2007-0246	0.0074	10/30/2006
Seneca	ALLTEL	TK-2007-0125	0.0073	4/29/2005

Summary Approved Traffic Termination Agreements between Goodman and CMRS Providers

LEC	CMRS Provider	Docket #	IntraMTA Rate	Effective Date
Goodman	Verizon	TK-2007-0332	0.0168	2/5/2007
Goodman	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0224	0.0168	10/31/2006
Goodman	US Cellular	TO-2006-0222	0.035	11/15/2005
Goodman	Cingular	TK-2007-0014	0.0168	4/29/2005
Goodman	Sprint	TK-2007-0247	0.0168	10/30/2006
Goodman	ALLTEL	TK-2007-0126	0.0168	4/29/2005

Summary Approved Traffic Termination Or Interconnection Agreements between Ozark and CMRS Providers

LEC	CMRS Provider	Docket #	IntraMTA Rate	Effective Date
Ozark	Verizon	TK-2007-0331	0.0179	2/5/2007
Ozark	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0223	0.0179	10/31/2006
Ozark	US Cellular	TO-2006-0222	0.035	11/15/2005
Ozark	Cingular	TK-2006-0532	0.0179	4/29/2005
Ozark	Sprint	TK-2007-0243	0.018	10/30/2006
Ozark	ALLTEL	TK-2007-0127	0.0179	4/29/2005

----Original Message----

From: Trip England

Sent: Friday, March 11, 2011 1:35 PM

To: 'jmarks@halowireless.com'

Subject: Summary of RLEC Agreements with Cingular and T-Mobile

Attached per our telephone discussion is a summary of indirect interconnection Traffic Termination Agreements between our Missouri rural local exchange carrier (RLEC) clients and Cingular and/or T-Mobile. This summary was compiled some time ago, and we have not reviewed it recently. Of course, the executed agreements will control if there is any difference between this summary and the actual agreements.

Also enclosed are copies of the Agreements between Citizens Telephone Company and Cingular and T-Mobile. With the exception of the rates, traffic factors and the provision for transit traffic to Alma Telephone Company, the terms and conditions of these agreements are very similar, if not identical, to those with the other RLECs listed on the summary.

Trip

Summary of Indirect Interconnection Traffic Termination Agreements between Missouri Small Rural LECs and Cingular/T-Mobile

LEC	CMRS Provider	Docket #	IntraMTA Rate	Traffic Factor	InterMTA Factor
BPS	Cingular	TK-2006-0513	0.0093	76/24% (MTL/LTM)	32%
BPS	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0503	0.0093	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	52%
Cilizens	Cingular	TK-2006-0520	0.0073 Transit Rate 0.01	B9/11% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Citizens	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0505	0.0073	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Craw Kan	Cingular	TK-2007-0464	0.0257	79/21% (MTL/LTM)	7%
Graw Kan	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0506	0.0257	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	7%
Ellington	Cingular	TK-2006-0521	0.0277	82/18% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ellingion	T-Mobile	TK-2005-0507	0.0277	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Farber	Cingular	TK-2005-0522	0.018	86/14% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Farber	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0545	0.018	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Fidelity	Cingular	TO-2004-0445	0.035	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	None
Fidelity I (CLEC)	Cingular	TO-2004-0446	0.035	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	None
Fidelity II (CLEC)	Cingular	TO-2004-0447	0.035	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	None
Goodman	Cingular	TK-2007-0014	0.0168	78/22% (MTL/LTM)	0%
3oodman	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0224	0.0168	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Granby	Cingular	TK-2007-0011	0,0054	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Granby	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0508	0.0054	84/16% 0% (MTL/LTM)	
Grand River	Cingular	TK-2006-0523	0.0209	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	%0
Grand River	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0509	0.0209	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Green Hills	Cingular	TK-2006-0514	0,0269	87/13% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Green Hills	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0510	0,0269	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Green Hills (CLEC)	T-Mobile		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
lolway	Cingular	TK-2006-0525	0.0383	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Tolway	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0511	0.0383	B4/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
amo	Cingular	TK-2006-0526	0.041	88/12% 0% (MTL/LTM)	
amo	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0512	0.041	84/16% 0% (MTL/LTM)	
Kingdom	Cingular	TK-2008-0515		73/27% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Kingdom	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0534	0.023	B4/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
(LM	Cingular	TK-2006-0527	0.0212	87/13% (MTL/LTM)	0%
KLM	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0535	0.0212	84/16% 0% (MTL/LTM)	
athrop	Cingular	TK-2006-0528	0.0069	72/28% (MTL/LTM)	0%

Lathrop	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0536	0.0069	B4/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Le-Ru	Cingular	TK-2006-0529	0.0166	78/22% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Le-Ru	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0537	0.0166	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Mark Twain Rural	Cingular	TK-2007-0463	0.0289	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	32%
Mark Twain Rural	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0538	0.0289	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	70%
Mark Twaln (CLEC)	T-Mobile		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
McDonald County	Cingular	TK-2006-0517	0.0083	80/20% (MTL/LTM)	0%
McDonald County	T-Mobile	TK-2007-0008	0.0083	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Miller	Cingular	TK-2006-0518	0.0072	80/20% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Miller	T-Mobile	TK-2008-0546	0.0072	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
New Florence	Cingular	TK-2006-0519	0,0079	82/18% (MTL/LTM)	2%
New Florence	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0539	0.0079	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	2%
New London	Cingular	TK-2006-0154	0.01954	None	0%
New London	T-Mobile	TO-2006-0324	0.0175	65/35% (MTL/LTM)	2%
Orchard Farm	Cingular	TK-2006-0154	0.019655	None	0%
Orchard Farm	T-Mobile	TO-2006-0324	0.0175	65/35% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Oregon Farmers	Cingular	TK-2007-0012	0.0108	85/15% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Oregon Farmers	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0540	0.0108	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ozark	Cingular	TK-2006-0532	0.0179	85/15% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ozark	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0223	0.0179	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Peace Valley	Cingular	TK-2006-0530	0.0166	91/9% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Peace Valley	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0542	0.0166	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Rock Port	Cingular	TK-2006-0531	0.0273	78/22% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Rock Port	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0543	0.0273	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Seneca	Cingular	TK-2006-0533	0.0073	80/20% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Seneca	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0225	0.0073	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Steelville	Cingular	TK-2007-0013	0.0095	77/23% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Steelville	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0544	0.0095	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Stoutland	Cingular	TK-2006-0154	0.01476	None	0%
Stoutland	T-Mobile	TO-2006-0324	0.0175	65/35% (MTL/LTM)	2%

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired JAMES C. SWEARENGEN WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON GARY W. DUFFY PAUL A. BOUDREAU CHARLES E. SMARR DEAN L. COOPER 312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE
P.O. BOX 456

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166
FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY
DIANA C. CARTER
SCOTT A, HAMBLIN
JAMIE J, COX
L. RUSSELL MITTEN
ERIN L. WISEMAN

COUNSEL GREGORY C. MITCHELL

March 9, 2012

VIA EMAIL & CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. Russell Wiseman President Halo Wireless 2351 West Northwest Hwy., Suite 1204 Dallas, TX 75220

Re: Blocking of Terminating Traffic from Halo Wireless, Inc.

Seneca Telephone Company Goodman Telephone Company Ozark Telephone Company

Dear Mr. Wiseman:

This notice to commence blocking the telecommunications traffic that Halo Wireless, Inc. (Halo) is terminating to Seneca Telephone Company, Goodman Telephone Company and Ozark Telephone Company (SGO) is made pursuant to the Missouri Public Service Commission (MoPSC) Enhanced Record Exchange (ERE) Rule, 4 CSR 240, Chapter 29. Under the ERE Rule, a terminating carrier may request that the tandem carrier (in this case, AT&T Missouri) block the traffic of an originating carrier and/or traffic aggregator that has failed to fully compensate the terminating carrier for terminating compensable traffic. In addition, the MoPSC's ERE rules provide that "'InterLATA Wireline Telecommunications traffic shall not be transmitted over the LEC-to-LEC network . . . " A review of Halo's traffic reveals that a significant amount of traffic terminating from Halo is InterLATA wireline originated traffic. Also, the MoPSC's ERE rules require the originating carrier to deliver originating caller identification with each call. A review of Halo's traffic reveals that a majority, if not all, of traffic terminating from Halo lacks the correct originating caller identification.

<u>Reasons for Blocking</u>: Halo Wireless has failed to fully compensate Seneca, Goodman and Ozark for the traffic Halo is terminating to it after Halo's filing for Bankruptcy protection (post-bankruptcy traffic) in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.130(2); Halo is transmitting InterLATA

wireline telecommunications traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.010(1); and/or Halo is failing to deliver correct originating caller identification with each call it is terminating to Seneca, Goodman and Ozark in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.130(2).

Date for Blocking to Begin: April 12, 2012.

Actions Necessary to Prevent Blocking. In order for Halo Wireless to avoid having its traffic blocked on the LEC-to-LEC Network beginning on April 12, 2012, Halo must: 1) compensate Seneca, Goodman and Ozark for the post-bankruptcy traffic Halo is terminating to Seneca, Goodman and Ozark at the appropriate access rate for interexchange traffic (including interMTA wireless traffic) and the reciprocal compensation rate for intraMTA wireless traffic; 2) immediately cease and desist from transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network that terminates to Seneca, Goodman and Ozark; and 3) immediately begin providing correct originating caller identification information for each call Halo terminates to Seneca, Goodman and Ozark. These actions must be taken on or before April 10, 2012. Alternatively, Halo can use other means to terminate its traffic (other than the Missouri LEC-to-LEC network) or file a formal complaint with the MoPSC as permitted by 4 CSR 240-29.130(9).

<u>Contact Person for Further Information</u>. Seneca, Goodman and Ozark have designated W.R. England, III and Brian McCartney as contact persons for further correspondence or information regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

W.R. England, I

WRE/da

cc: Mr. John VanEschen, Missouri Public Service Commission (via email)

Mr. Leo Bub, AT&T Missouri (via email)

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired
JAMES C. SWEARENGEN
WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III
JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON
GARY W. DUFFY
PAUL A. BOUDREAU
CHARLES E. SMARR
DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE
P.O. BOX 456
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166
FACSIMILE (573) 635-0427

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY
DIANA C. CARTER
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN
JAMIE J. COX
L. RUSSELL MITTEN
ERIN L. WISEMAN
JOHN D. BORGMEYER

COUNSEL GREGORY C. MITCHELL

March 9, 2012

VIA EMAIL & CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. Leo Bub AT&T Missouri One Bell Center, Room 3520 St. Louis, MO 63101

Re: Blocking of Terminating Traffic from Halo Wireless, Inc.

- Seneca Telephone Company
- Goodman Telephone Company
 - Ozark Telephone Company

Dear Leo:

I am writing on behalf of Seneca Telephone Company, Goodman Telephone Company and Ozark Telephone Company ("SGO") to request the assistance of AT&T Missouri (AT&T) in blocking traffic from Halo Wireless, Inc. (Halo) OCN 429F, as Halo has failed to: 1) compensate Seneca, Goodman and Ozark for traffic Halo is terminating to it after Halo's filing for bankruptcy protection (post-bankruptcy traffic) and 2) comply with the Missouri Public Service Commission's (MoPSC) Enhanced Record Exchange (ERE) rules by (a) transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network and/or (b) failing to provide, or altering, originating caller identification for this traffic.

As you are aware, terminating carriers, such as Seneca, Goodman and Ozark, may request the tandem carrier, in this case AT&T, to block traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network where the originating carrier: 1) has failed to fully compensate the terminating carrier for terminating compensable traffic (see 4 CSR 240-29.130(2)); 2) is transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications over the LEC-to-LEC network in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.010(1); and/or 3) is failing to deliver the correct originating caller identification in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.130(2).

Therefore, Seneca, Goodman and Ozark request that AT&T take the necessary steps to block Halo's traffic from terminating over the LEC-to-LEC network to the following exchanges and telephone (NPA/NXX) or local routing numbers:

Company Name	Exchange(s)	Local Routing Number or NPA NXX		
Seneca Telephone Company	Seneca	417-776		
	Tiff City	417-775		
Goodman Telephone Company	Goodman	417-364-4983		
	Lanagan	417-436		
Ozark Telephone Company	Noel	417-475		
	Southwest City	417-762		

Seneca, Goodman and Ozark request that AT&T implement blocking of Halo traffic on April 12, 2012. Please let me know whether AT&T will be able to block traffic on the date requested. If you have any questions regarding this request or require additional information, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Thank you in advance for your attention to and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

W.R. England, III

WRE/da

cc: Mr. Russell Wiseman (via email and certified mail)

Mr. John VanEschen (via email)