ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

)

In re: Complaint by Capital Services of South Florida, Inc. against Intermedia Communications Inc. regarding failure to comply with contract for telecommunications services.

ACK

EAG

11

OTH _

LEG Serlel

DOCKET NO. 980520-TP FILED: May 5, 1998

INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS INC.'S MOTION TO ABATE OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE STAY

Respondent Intermedia Communications Inc. (Intermedia) moves for an order of this Commission abating or, in the alternative, staying this action. In support thereof, Intermedia states as follows:

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. This matter arises from the Carrier Services agreement (Agreement) between Intermedia and Capital Services of South Florida, Inc. (Capital Services). The Agreement established the terms and conditions under which Intermedia would provide certain wholesale long distance voice, data and related services (LD Services) to Capital Services and under which Capital Services would pay Intermedia for those LD Services.

CLE 3. The dispute is the subject of two lawsuits currently CIR filed in two separate circuit courts:

> a. CAPITAL SERVICES OF SOUTH FLORIDA, INC., Plaintiff, vs. INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Defendant, CASE NO. 98-1932, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA; and

 OPC
 _______b.
 INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Plaintiff, vs. CAPITAL

 RCH
 _______sERVICES OF SOUTH FLORIDA, INC., Defendant, CASE NO. 98

 SCC
 _______2689 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL

 CIRCUIT IN AND FOR HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY FLORIDA

 WAS
 _______RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

05056 MAY-58

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

4. Capital Services now purchases from another carrier the wholesale long distance voice, data and related services that were the subject of the Agreement.

THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION LACKS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER THIS DISPUTE

No Power To Act As A Court.

, `

5. The gravamen of the complaint is a request that the Commission adjudicate the contractual dispute between Capital Services and Intermedia. The nature of the complaint can be seen clearly from the relief requested. Specifically, in its request for relief the complaint requests that the Commission do the following¹:

- a. determine a reasonable estimate of the amounts owed pending resolution of the dispute;
- b. determine the correct amount of the disputed billings;
- c. compel Intermedia to accept as payment in full the amount so ascertained by the Commission regarding the disputed billing;
- d. prevent Intermedia from continuing to interrupt service to Capital Services on account of disputed billings during the pendency of the complaint [i.e., compel Intermedia to provide service];
- e. take cognizance of this complaint;
- f. fine or otherwise discipline Intermedia for its violation of . . . rules and statutes; and
- g. grant such other relief as may be within the Commission's powers.

Complaint, page 4.

6. In items 5a. through 5d., Capital Services simply asks

¹ This list of requested action is quoted from the complaint, but in a different sequence.

the Commission to be a civil court by adjudicating the disputed amounts and granting Capital Services both legal and equitable relief. There is no basis under Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, for the Commission to grant this requested relief. These powers to grant such relief are judicial powers reserved to the state courts under Article V of the Constitution of the State of Florida. Stated conversely, if a legislative agency were to modify or abrogate contracts in the exercise of its delegated legislative power, the result would be an unconstitutional legislative impairment of contract. Thus adjusidcation of contract rights is reserved to the courts. See e.g., Telco Communications Co. v. Clark, 695 So.2d 304 (Fla. 1997) (Commission has no authority to adjuicate contracts); United Telephone Company of Florida v. Public Service Commission, 496 So.2d 116 (Fla. 1986) (substantially identical statutory precursor to Section 364.03, Florida Statutes, does not give Commission jurisdiction to alter contractual relationship between telephone companies); Winter Springs Development Corporation v. Florida Power Corporation, 402 So.2d 1225 (Fla. 5th DCA 1981) (adminstrative body not empowered to award money damages for breach of contract); cf Southern Bell Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Florida Pub. Serv. Comm'n, 453 So.2d 780 (Fla. 1984) (a previously existing statutory section, 364.07(2), Fla. Stat. (1981), specifically allowed Commission to "adjudicate" disputes over toll settlement agreements and order change in future course of dealings).

7. The apparent foundation for this invitation to ultra

3

<u>vires</u> action is Capital Services' allegation that Intermedia has violated certain state regulations with respect to the provision of service and Capital Service's corresponding demand for sanctions against Intermedia. It is apparent from the above listing of the relief requested, however, that Capital Services has not brought this complaint for the purposes of having the Commission sanction Intermedia; it could have achieved the same purpose with a letter to the Division of Consumer Affairs or to the Division of Communications. Rather, the purpose of this complaint is to invite the Commission to act like a court by resolving a contractual dispute. The Commission must decline.

No Jurisdiction Over Interstate and International Service

8. The Service involved in this dispute is overwhelmingly interstate and international in nature, and the relief requested cannot be granted without attempting to determine matters in dispute beyond the Commission's jurisdiction over intrastate service. Under Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, does not have the jurisdiction to address carrier to carrier disputes over nonpayment for interstate and international services, and, to reiterate, this is exactly what Capital Services has requested.

9. Capital Services cannot create the jurisdiction for the Commission over the interstate and international services by alleging that this matter involves the alleged violation of regulations applicable only to intrastate service. The Commission is a creature of statute, and its jurisdiction must be well grounded in its enabling legislation. Moreover, any doubt about

4

the extent of that jurisdiction must be resolved against its exercise. <u>Florida Bridge Company v. Hawkins</u>, 363 So.2d 799 (Fla. 1978); <u>Radio Telephone Communications</u>, <u>Inc. v. Southeastern</u> <u>Telephone Co.</u>, 170 So.2d 577 (Fla. 1965).

.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above, Intermedia respectfully requests that the Commission enter an order abating this action, or in the alternative, staying it until the actions in the circuit courts have been resolved.

Guell

Patrick Knight Wiggins Wiggins & Villacorta, P.A. 2145 Delta Boulevard Suite 200 Post Office Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, Florida 32302 (850) 385-6007 Telephone (850) 385-6008 Facsimile

Counsel for Intermedia Communications Inc.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail to the following this 5th day of May, 1998:

Catherine Bedell Division of Legal Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Daniel C. Brown Katz, Kutter Law Firm Highpoint Center, Suite 1200 106 East College Avenue Tallahassee, Florida 32301

•

David T. Knight Hill, Ward & Henderson 101 East Kennedy Boulevard Suite 3700 Tampa, Florida 33602

Patricia T. Kurlin General Counsel Intermedia Communications Inc. 3625 Queen Palm Drive Tampa, Florida 33619

Knight Wiggins

Patri