## State of Florida



## **Bublic Service Comm**

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULE TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE:

June 29, 2000

TO:

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYÓ)

FROM:

DIVISION OF REGULATORY OVERSIGHT (WILLIAMS

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (CALDWELL)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 991665-TI - APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE TO

PROVIDE INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PILGRIM TELEPHONE, INC.

AGENDA: 07/11/00 - REGULAR AGENDA - PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION -

INTERESTED PERSONS MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: NONE

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\DRO\WP\991665.RCM

## CASE BACKGROUND

On November 3, 1999, Pilgrim Telephone, Inc. filed an application for a certificate to provide interexchange telecommunications service in Florida. To date however, the company has not submitted the required tariff information to have a complete application on file with this Commission.

Therefore, staff is recommending that Pilgrim Telephone, Inc.'s application for a certification to operate as an INTEREXCHANGE telecommunications service provider in Florida be denied.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07933 JUN 29日

Docket No. 991665-TI
July 11, 2000

## STAFF DISCUSSION

ISSUE 1: Should a certificate be granted to PILGRIM TELEPHONE, INC. to provide interexchange telecommunication service within the State of Florida?

<u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> No. Staff recommends that the Commission deny PILGRIM TELEPHONE, INC.'s application to provide interexchange telecommunications service within the State of Florida.

<u>STAFF ANALYSIS:</u> Rule 25-24.485, Tariffs, Florida Administrative Code, provides:

(1) (a) Each company shall maintain on file with the Commission tariffs which set forth all of the rates and charges for customer services, the different services available to subscribers and the conditions and circumstances under which service will be furnished.......

PILGRIM TELEPHONE, INC. has failed to forward to this Commission a completed tariff. Further, staff requested in a letter, dated January 4, 2000, and in a e-mail request that this information must be provided. To date, nothing has been received.

Therefore, staff recommends that this application be denied.

ISSUE 2: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, this docket should be closed upon issuance of a Consummating Order unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's Proposed Agency Action files a written protest within 21 days of the issuance date of the Proposed Agency Action. (Caldwell)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Whether staff's recommendation on Issue 1 is approved or denied, the results will be a proposed agency action order. If no timely protest to the proposed agency action is filed within 21 days of the date of issuance of the Order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of the Consummating Order.