LAW OFFICES

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE P.O. BOX 456 JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456

TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166 FACSIMILE (573) 635-0427

DEAN L. COOPER MARK G. ANDERSON GREGORY C. MITCHELL BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY BRIAN K. BOGARD DIANA C. FARR JANET E. WHEELER

OF COUNSEL RICHARD T. CIOTTONE

October 15, 2002

Secretary Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

OCT 1 5 2002

Case No. TC-2002-1077 Re:

Missouri Public Service Commission

Dear Mr. Roberts:

DAVID V.G. BRYDON JAMES C. SWEARENGEN

GARY W. DUFFY

PAUL A. BOUDREAU SONDRA B. MORGAN

CHARLES E. SMARR

WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III

JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON

Enclosed for filing please find an original and eight copies of Petitioners' Response to Respondents' Motion to Strike Prefiled Direct Testimony.

Please see that this filing is brought to the attention of the appropriate Commission personnel. If there are any questions regarding this filing, please give me a call. I thank you in advance for your attention to and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

WRE/da **Enclosures**

Parties of Record cc:

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FILEDS
OCT 1 5 2002

BPS Telephone Company, et al.,)	OCT 1 5 2002
Complainants,)))	Service Commission Case No. TT-2002-1077
vs.)	Case No. TT-2002-1077
VoiceStream Wireless Corporation, et al.,)	
Respondents.)	

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO STRIKE PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY

COME NOW the Complainants, BPS Telephone Company, et al.¹ (the "Complainants"), and, in opposition to Respondents' Motion to Strike Prefiled Direct Testimony, state to the Missouri Public Service Commission (the "Commission") as follows:

- 1. On October 4, 2002, Respondents Western Wireless Corporation and T-Mobile USA, Inc. (f/k/a VoiceStream Wireless Corporation) (the "Respondents") filed their Motion to Strike Prefiled Direct Testimony. In their Motion, Respondents objected to the admissibility of certain portions of the direct testimony filed by Petitioners on August 26, 2002, on the basis of hearsay.
- 3. A statement is not hearsay unless the statement is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. If the proponent of a statement can demonstrate that the statement is logically relevant on any other theory, the statement is nonhearsay.

¹ BPS Telephone Company, Cass County Telephone Company, Citizens Telephone Company of Higginsville, Missouri, Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Fidelity Communications Services I, Inc., Fidelity Telephone Company, Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation, Green Hills Telephone Corporation, Holway Telephone Company, IAMO Telephone Company, Kingdom Telephone Company, K.L.M. Telephone Co., Lathrop Telephone Company and Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company.

- 3. Generally, each of the items listed as impermissible hearsay in Respondents' Motion to Strike either falls within a permitted exception to the hearsay rule or does not fall within the definition of hearsay, all as fully detailed below. Further, pursuant to RSMo. §386.410.1, the Commission is not bound by the technical rules of evidence.
- 4. Petitioners' grounds for opposition to each of the Respondents' objections to the prefiled direct testimony are as follows:

David N. Beier
(on behalf of Fidelity
Telephone Company)

Page 6, Lines 10-11 The sentence in line 10 beginning with "I spoke with someone" is a nonhearsay statement, in that it is the direct, personal statement of Mr. Beier, and is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Fidelity to resolve the subject dispute with VoiceStream prior to filing a Complaint. The second sentence beginning with "I was" is also logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Fidelity to resolve the subject dispute with VoiceStream, is not being offered for the truth of the matter asserted, and, therefore, is not impermissible hearsay.

Brian L. Cornelius (on behalf of Citizens Telephone Company) Page 9, Lines 17-22 Although the testimony involves a statement by Kathie Munson, an out-of-court declarant, concerning a conversation with Chris Sikes, a VoiceStream employee, the statement is not being offered to prove the truth thereof. The testimony is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Citizens to resolve the subject dispute with VoiceStream prior to filing a Complaint and explains the actions of Citizens in sending the letters attached as Schedules 2 and 3.

Brian L. Cornelius (on behalf of Citizens Telephone Company) Schedule No. 2, first paragraph

Although the letter includes a statement by an outof-court declarant, Kathie Munson, that portion of
the letter is not being offered to prove the truth of
the statement. The statements made by both Ms.
Munson and VoiceStream employee Chris Sikes are
not offered in testimony to prove the truth of those
statements, and, therefore, are not impermissible
hearsay. The fact of each the statements is logically
relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Citizens
to resolve the subject dispute and explains the
actions of Citizens in sending the letter attached as
Schedule 2; the truth of the facts in each of the
statements is irrelevant. Further, the letter is
admissible as a business record.

Brian L. Cornelius (on behalf of Citizens Telephone Company) Schedule No. 3

Although the letter includes a statement by an outof-court declarant, Kathie Munson, that portion of
the letter is not being offered to prove the truth of
the statement. The statements made by both Ms.
Munson and VoiceStream employee Chris Sikes are
not offered in testimony to prove the truth of those
statements, and, therefore, are not impermissible
hearsay. The fact of each the statements is logically
relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Citizens
to resolve the subject dispute and explains the
actions of Citizens in sending the letter attached as
Schedule 2; the truth of the facts in each of the
statements is irrelevant. Further, the letter is
admissible as a business record.

Bill Rohde (on behalf of Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company)

Page 8, Lines 2-4 Although the testimony involves a statement by Jim Lyon, an out-of-court declarant, concerning a conversation with Ira Summit, a VoiceStream employee, the statement is not being offered to prove the truth thereof. The testimony is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Mark Twain to resolve the subject dispute with VoiceStream prior to filing a Complaint.

Randall H. Boyd (on behalf of Kingdom Telephone Company)	Page 5, Lines 13-15	Although the testimony includes a statement made by John Calhoun, a Western Wireless employee, the statement is not being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. The fact of the statement is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Kingdom to resolve the subject dispute and explains the actions of Kingdom in sending all future bills and invoices to VoiceStream, as opposed to Western; the truth of the facts in Mr. Calhoun's statement is irrelevant.
Randall H. Boyd (on behalf of Kingdom Telephone Company)	Page 6, Lines 6-7	Although the testimony includes a statement made by John Calhoun, a Western Wireless employee, the statement is not being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. The fact of the statement is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Kingdom to resolve the subject dispute and explains the actions of Kingdom in sending all future bills and invoices to VoiceStream, as opposed to Western; the truth of the facts in Mr. Calhoun's statement is irrelevant.
Randall H. Boyd (on behalf of Kingdom Telephone Company)	Schedule 2	Although the letter includes a statement made by John Calhoun, a Western Wireless employee, the statement is not being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. The fact of the statement is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Kingdom to resolve the subject dispute and explains the actions of Kingdom in sending all future bills and invoices to VoiceStream, as opposed to Western; the truth of the facts in Mr. Calhoun's statement is irrelevant. Further, the letter is admissible as a business record.

Randall H. Boyd (on behalf of Kingdom Telephone Company) Schedule 3, first paragraph

Although the letter includes a statement made by John Calhoun, a Western Wireless employee, the statement is not being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. The fact of the statement is logically relevant to the issue of the steps taken by Kingdom to resolve the subject dispute and explains the actions of Kingdom in sending all future bills and invoices to VoiceStream, as opposed to Western; the truth of the facts in Mr. Calhoun's statement is irrelevant. Further, the letter is admissible as a business record.

WHEREFORE, Petitioners request that the Respondents' Motion to Strike be denied and that the Petitioners' Direct Testimony be taken in whole as a part of the record in this proceeding.

Respectfully Submitted,

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.

By:

W.R. England, III Diana C. Farr

Mo. Bar 23975 Mo. Bar 50527

312 East Capitol Avenue

P.O. Box 456

Jefferson City, MO 65102

573-635-7166 (telephone)

573-634-7431 (facsimile)

Email: trip@brydonlaw.com dfarr@brydonlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR COMPLAINANTS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was mailed or hand-delivered, this day of October, 2002 to:

Bruce Bates Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Michael Dandino Office of Public Counsel P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Director of Regulatory Affairs VoiceStream Wireless Corporation 3650 131st Ave. SE, Suite 200 Bellevue, Washington 98006

Gene DeJordy
Executive Director of Legal Affairs
Western Wireless Corporation
3650 131st Ave. SE, Suite 400
Bellevue, Washington 98006

Mark P. Johnson Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111

Leo Bub Southwestern Bell Telephone Company One Bell Center, Room 3520 St. Louis, MO 63101

W. R. England,