

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

RECEIVED

2012 JAN 23 AM 8:56

T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM

IN RE: :
COMPLAINT OF :
CONCORD TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, INC., :
HUMPHREYS COUNTY TELEPHONE :
COMPANY, TELlico TELEPHONE :
COMPANY, TENNESSEE TELEPHONE :
COMPANY, CROCKETT TELEPHONE : DOCKET NO.: 1100108
COMPANY, INC. PEOPLES TELEPHONE :
COMPANY, WEST TENNESSEE :
TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC., NORTH :
CENTRAL TELEPHONE COOP., INC. AND :
HIGHLAND TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, :
INC. AGAINST HALO WIRELESS, INC., :
TRANSCOM ENHANCED SERVICES, INC. :
AND OTHER AFFILIATES FOR FAILURE :
TO PAY TERMINATING INTRASTATE :
ACCESS CHARGES FOR TRAFFIC AND :
OTHER RELIEF AND AUTHORITY TO :
CEASE TERMINATION OF TRAFFIC :

OBJECTIONS TO REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF LINDA ROBINSON

Halo Wireless, Inc. ("Halo") and Transcom Enhanced Services, Inc. ("Transcom") hereby object to and move to strike the proposed Rebuttal Testimony of Linda Robinson as follows:

I. General Objections

To the extent that Ms. Robinson purports to provide fact testimony, Halo and Transcom object to such testimony to the extent that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation for Ms. Robinson's personal knowledge or reliance on admissible hearsay that would be relied on by a reasonably prudent person. Halo and Transcom further object to Ms. Robinson's expert testimony in its entirety, as such testimony is not based on reliable principles and methods and is not based on a reliable reasoning process for connecting any such methodology to the traffic at issue.

II. Reservation of Objections

Halo and Transcom have requested any data or other information underlying Ms. Robinson's testimony. However, they have not had sufficient opportunity to examine and evaluate such information. Accordingly, they reserve the right to make any additional objections that may be appropriate after review of such information.

III. Objections to Testimony at 2:17-3:14

To the extent that this testimony is intended as fact testimony, rather than an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation of personal knowledge and/or reliance on admissible hearsay that would be relied on by a reasonably prudent person. Alternatively, to the extent that such testimony is intended as an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation establishing: that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

IV. Objections to Testimony at 4:1-5:3

To the extent that this testimony is intended as fact testimony, rather than an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation of personal knowledge and/or reliance on admissible hearsay that would be relied on by a reasonably prudent person. Alternatively, to the extent that such testimony is intended as an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation establishing: that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on

reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

V. Objections to Testimony at 5:8-6:6

To the extent that this testimony is intended as fact testimony, rather than an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation of personal knowledge and/or reliance on admissible hearsay that would be relied on by a reasonably prudent person. Alternatively, to the extent that such testimony is intended as an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation establishing: that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

VI. Objections to Testimony at 6:9-7:8


To the extent that this testimony is intended as fact testimony, rather than an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation of personal knowledge and/or reliance on admissible hearsay that would be relied on by a reasonably prudent person. Alternatively, to the extent that such testimony is intended as an expert opinion, Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation establishing: that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that

would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field. Halo and Transcom further object that the statements from Vonage's filings are unreliable hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

VII. Objections to Testimony at 10:14-17

Halo and Transcom object that Complainants have failed to lay a foundation establishing: that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

Respectfully submitted,



STEVEN H. THOMAS

Texas State Bar No. 19868890

pro hac vice admission

TROY P. MAJOUÉ

Texas State Bar No. 24067738

pro hac vice admission

JENNIFER M. LARSON

Texas State Bar No. 24071167

pro hac vice admission

**McGUIRE, CRADDOCK
& STROTHER, P.C.**

2501 N. Harwood, Suite 1800

Dallas TX 75201

Phone: 214.954.6800

Fax: 214.954.6850

PAUL S. DAVIDSON

Tennessee Bar No. 011789

JAMES M. WEAVER

Tennessee Bar No. 013451
WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS, LLP
511 Union Street, Suite 2700
Nashville, TN 37219
Phone: 615-850-8942
Fax: 615-244-6804

W. SCOTT MCCOLLOUGH

Texas State Bar No. 13434100

pro hac vice admission

MATTHEW A. HENRY

Texas State Bar No. 24059121

pro hac vice admission

MCCOLLOUGH|HENRY PC

1250 S. Capital of Texas Hwy., Bldg. 2-235

West Lake Hills, TX 78746

Phone: 512.888.1112

Fax: 512.692.2522

*Attorneys for Halo Wireless, Inc.
and Transcom Enhanced Services, Inc.*


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing objections was served via hand delivery on the following counsel of record and designated contact individuals on this the 23rd day of January, 2012:

ATTORNEYS FOR CONCORD TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, INC., HUMPHREYS COUNTY TELEPHONE COMPANY, TELlico TELEPHONE COMPANY, TENNESSEE TELEPHONE COMPANY, CROCKETT TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC. PEOPLES TELEPHONE COMPANY, WEST TENNESSEE TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC., NORTH CENTRAL TELEPHONE COOP., INC. AND HIGHLAND TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.:

H. LaDon Baltimore, Esq.
FARRIS MATHEWS BOBANGO PLC
The Historic Castner-Knott Building
618 Church Street, Suite 300
Nashville, TN 37219

Norman J. Kennard, Esq.
THOMAS, LONG, NIESEN & KENNARD
212 Locust Street, Suite 500
Harrisburg, PA 17108-9500



STEVEN THOMAS