

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition on Behalf of) DOCKET NO. 910163-TL
Citizens of the State of Florida)
to Initiate Investigation into)
the Integrity of SOUTHERN BELL)
TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH)
COMPANY'S Repair Service)
Activities and Reports.)
_____)
In Re: Comprehensive Review of) DOCKET NO. 920260-TL
the Revenue Requirements and)
Rate Stabilization Plan of)
SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND)
TELEGRAPH COMPANY.)
_____)
In Re: Show cause proceeding) DOCKET NO. 900960-TL
against SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE)
AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY for)
misbilling customers.)
_____)
In Re: Investigation into) DOCKET NO. 910727-TL
SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND) ORDER NO. PSC-93-0592-FOF-TL
TELEGRAPH COMPANY'S compliance) ISSUED: April 15, 1993
with Rule 25-4.110(2), F.A.C.,)
Rebates.)
_____)

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

J. Terry Deason, Chairman
Thomas M. Beard
Susan F. Clark
Luis J. Lauredo
Julia L. Johnson

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR REVIEW

By the Commission:

BACKGROUND

Order No. PSC-93-0334-PCO-TL (Order), issued by the Prehearing Officer on March 4, 1993, in the above consolidated docket, granted Public Counsel's Motion To Compel BellSouth Telecommunications' Vice President Network - South Area C. J. Sanders and BellSouth

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04104 APR 15 83

FPSO-RECORDS/REPORTING

Telecommunications General Manager - Human Resources C. L. Cuthbertson, Jr., to answer deposition questions.

On March 15, 1993, Southern Bell filed a Motion For Review of the Prehearing Officer's Order by the full Commission. On March 25, 1993, Public Counsel filed its Response thereto.

DISCUSSION

Southern Bell has not identified in the Order error of fact or law that would meet the appropriate standard for reconsideration or review. Diamond Cab Co. of Miami v. King, 146 So.2d 889 (Fla. 1962); Pingree v. Quaintance, 399 So.2d 161 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981); Order No. PSC-92-0339-FOF-TL (5/13/92).

During a deposition of C. J. Sanders and C. L. Cuthbertson, Jr., BellSouth Telecommunications' Vice President Network - South Area and General Manager - Human Resources, respectively, Southern Bell objected to questions asked by Public Counsel concerning employee discipline matters. The objections were based on a claim that information about these matters was privileged from discovery under the attorney-client and work-product doctrines.

We have already held that the underlying documents comprising handwritten notes, witness statements and summaries were not privileged from discovery. Order Nos. PSC-93-0292-FOF-TL (2/23/93); PSC-93-0517-FOF-TL (4/6/93). Accordingly, Southern Bell's reiteration here of its disagreement with Order Nos. PSC-93-0151-CFO-TL and PSC-93-0294-PCO-TL (2/23/93), review of which we denied in the February 23, 1993 and April 6, 1993 orders, does not identify an issue of fact or law that the Prehearing Officer overlooked or an error requiring review. Though Southern Bell further argues that the deposition questions represented an attempt by Public Counsel to force the deponents to divulge privileged information, that argument is inconsistent with the Commission's previous holding that the documents were not privileged.

Finally, as noted in Upjohn Co. v. United States, 449 U.S. 383, 395, the attorney-client privilege "extends only to communications and not to facts." Therefore, even were the documents privileged communications, the deposition questions would not be precluded by the attorney-client privilege. Upjohn, supra. Similarly, even had the documents been found to be privileged work-product, the deposition questions would not have been precluded. United States v. Pepper's Steel and Alloys, Inc., 132 F.R.D., 695,

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0592-FOF-TL
DOCKETS NOS. 910163-TL, 920260-TL, 900960-TL, 910727-TL
PAGE 3


699 (S.D. Fla. 1990); Surf Drugs, Inc. v. Vermette, 236 So.2d, 108, 113 & n. 15 (Fla. 1970).

In view of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Southern Bell's Motion For Review of Order No. PSC-93-0334-PCO-TL be denied. It is further

ORDERED that this docket remain open.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 15th day of April, 1993.



STEVE TRIBBLE, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0592-FOF-TL
DOCKETS NOS. 910163-TL, 920260-TL, 900960-TL, 910727-TL
PAGE 4

Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or sewer utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900 (a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.