



Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street - 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

TEL 717 237 6000
FAX 717 237 6019
www.eckertseamans.com

Deanne M. O'Dell
717.255.3744
dodell@eckertseamans.com

May 22, 2009

Via Electronic Filing

James McNulty, Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Bldg.
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Re: Richard Carion v. Global Tel*Link Corporation, Docket No. C-2008-2082598

Dear Secretary McNulty:

On behalf of Global Tel*Link Corporation enclosed for filing please find its original Motion to Compel Answer to Interrogatories and for Sanctions and Notice to Plead along with the electronic filing confirmation page with regard to the above-referenced matter. A copy has been served in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely

Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.

DMO/lww
Enclosure

cc: Hon. Louis Cocheres, w/enc.
Richard Carion, w/enc.


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this day I served a copy of Global Tel*Link Corporation's Motion to Compel Answer to Interrogatories and for Sanctions and Notice to Plead upon the persons listed below in the manner indicated in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54.

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Richard Carion #FM-4379
State Correctional Institution Huntingdon
1100 Pike St.
Huntingdon, PA 16654

Dated: May 22, 2009


Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION


RICHARD CARION #FM-4379 :
Complainant :
 :
v. : Docket No. C-2009-2082598
 :
GLOBAL TEL*LINK CORPORATION :
Respondent :

NOTICE TO PLEAD

To: Richard Carion #FM-4379
State Correctional Institution Huntingdon
1100 Pike St.
Huntingdon, PA 16654

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(g)(1) you are hereby notified to file a written response to the enclosed Motion within five (5) days from service hereof or a judgment may be entered against you.

Respectfully submitted,



Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street 8th Fl.
PO Box 1248
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1248
717.255.3744

Dated: May 22, 2009

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

RICHARD CARION #FM-4379	:	
Complainant	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2009-2082598
	:	
GLOBAL TEL*LINK CORPORATION	:	
Respondent	:	

MOTION TO COMPEL ANSWER TO INTERROGATORIES
AND FOR SANCTIONS

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(g), Global Tel*Link Corporation (“Respondent”) moves to compel answers of Richard Carion (“Complainant”) to all the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, Set I dated April 24, 2009 and seeking sanctions if Complainant fails to obey an Order issued for this purpose. In support of this motion, Respondent states as follows:

1. Respondent was served on January 6, 2008 with the above-captioned complaint. The complaint: (1) alleges violations of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the Public Utility Code; (2) violations of Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law; (3) invokes the Clayton Act; (4) alleges violation of the "anti-kick back law;" (5) "further violation by forced monopolized purchases;" (6) deprivation of "their constitutional right to equal protection;" and, (7) claims to "represent a class of individuals of family and friends of incarcerated people." Complainants seek "injunctive relief in the form of" allowing "third party long distance providers other than [Respondent]; reimbursement for calls that have been disconnected, interrupted from

August of 2007 up until the present, and that they be provided with a fair rate other than the one that is now in existence."

2. On January 23, 2009, Respondent filed an Answer to the Complaint and Preliminary Objections to the Complaint. Respondent denied the material allegations of the complaint and asserted a lack of subject matter jurisdiction over the majority of the issues raised by the Complainant. Respondent sought dismissal of the complaint.

3. By pleadings dated January 23, 2009, Complainant filed (1) "Plaintiffs Response in Opposition to the Defendants Response to the Complaint and/or any Preliminary Objections;" (2) "Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of His Response in Opposition to the Defendants' Response to the Complaint and/or Any Preliminary Objections;" (3) "Plaintiffs' Response to Motion for Leave to Accept Supplemental Preliminary Objections;" and, (4) "Plaintiffs' Response in Opposition to Defendants' Supplemental Preliminary Objections to Formal Complaint."

4. On April 24, 2009, Respondent served Complainant with its Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, Set I ("Interrogatories").¹ Pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Procedure, responses were due on May 18, 2009. Neither objections nor responses have been received to date.

5. The Commission's regulations define the permissible scope of discovery as follows:

[A] party may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of another party ...

¹ Copies of Respondent's Interrogatories are attached as Exhibit A.

52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c).

6. The only type of discovery that is not permitted is discovery which is (a) sought in bad faith; (b) would cause unreasonable annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, burden or expense; (c) relates to a matter which is privileged; and/or, (d) requires the making of an unreasonable investigation. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361.

7. Respondent's Interrogatories are clearly within the scope of permissible discovery and, therefore, Complainant should be compelled to provide responses.

8. After excising the substantial non-jurisdictional verbiage from the complaint, all that remains are the following allegations regarding inadequate service:

From Para. 10: "Plaintiff asserts that some calls are actually disconnected for any number of reasons simply because the system "thinks" that there is being a violation committed. The Plaintiff again, incurring the cost of the call that must be placed again."

From Para. 11B: "disconnected or interrupted calls on a regular basis."

From Para. 14B: "Reimbursement for calls that have been disconnected and/or interrupted between August 1st, 2007 til [sic] the present date."

9. These allegations do not provide any useful factual information to enable Respondent to sufficiently prepare for a hearing in this matter. Complainant does not provide details about the allegedly improperly disconnected calls to enable Respondent to research why the calls were disconnected. While the complaint does seem to narrow the timeframe from August 1, 2007 forward, there are no specifics of when these alleged "regularly" disconnected or interrupted calls occurred. Moreover, this is an extremely long time period of time. There are 649 days or 92 weeks between August 1, 2007 and May 11, 2009. Even if Complainant only made calls three times a week during this timeframe, that would leave 276 calls that could potentially – in Complainant's view – have been improperly disconnected. Without responding

to the Interrogatories to provide a narrowing of which calls or what timeframe is the subject of the complaint, Complainant leaves Respondent with no choice but to research each and every call that was placed in order to prepare a defense for the hearing. This is an impossible task and places a significant burden on Respondent that the Commission should not sanction.

10. The time to undertake all this research is enormous. Every call made by an inmate is recorded. To research why a certain call was disconnected, Respondent needs to first identify the call by the number called and the date and time of the call. Then Respondent needs to locate the recording of the call and assign personnel to listen to the conversation. That person then needs to transcribe the call and make a detailed record of why the call was disconnected. Respondent estimates that doing this for just one call would take at least a half hour of time. Doing this for 276 calls would equate to approximately 138 hours of time or the equivalent of almost four work weeks at 37.5 hours a week. This would be four weeks of work that an employee of Respondent would have to devote full time to preparing for just this one complaint. This is only one of ten inmate complaints – eight of which are identical and two of which are very similar in terms of this specific allegation. Requiring Respondent to undertake this type of time intensive research to prepare a defense for a total of 10 complaints (assuming 276 calls for each) would amount to 1,380 hours of time or almost 37 full work weeks spent on nothing else but researching the calls made by each of these ten inmates.

11. Allowing Complainant to force Respondent to undertake such an unreasonable and momentous task by refusing to respond to discovery cannot be permitted. On the contrary, Complainant has the burden of proof in this case² and he must be required to provide some facts to enable Respondent to adequately and reasonably prepare a defense. The Interrogatories

² 66 Pa. C.S. § 332(a).

requesting details of the calls that Complainant believes were improperly disconnected were not sought in bad faith, nor would they cause unreasonable burden nor do they require an unreasonable investigation by Complainant. Rather, they were designed to enable Respondent to better understand the underlying factual basis for the allegations of the complaint and to adequately prepare a defense. This is the entire purpose of discovery.

12. The civil practice in state court regarding pre-complaint discovery is also instructive here. The Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure envision that discovery may be used to aid in the preparation of a complaint but “under no circumstance should a plaintiff be allowed to embark upon a ‘fishing expedition’.”³ To combat use of the pre-complaint discovery process as a “fishing expedition,” Pennsylvania state courts require the plaintiff to present facts to support a reasonable belief that the evidence sought in discovery will support the allegation.⁴

13. In this case, no facts have been provided in the complaint to enable Respondent to determine the basis for the allegation that calls were improperly disconnected. Therefore, Respondent served Complainant Interrogatories aimed at getting that information. These Interrogatories are well within the Commission’s scope of permissible discovery and are necessary to enable Respondent to present a defense to the complaint. In response, Complainant refuses to provide any information and makes clear that he is relying on information from Respondent to make his case. This is a classic example of a fishing expedition which the Presiding Officer must end.

14. Complainant’s refusal to provide any factual detail on any level is an abuse of the Commission’s formal complaint process by allowing Complainant to “say anything,” “not

³ *McNeil v. Jordan*, 934 A.2d 739, 742 (Pa.Super. 2007).


⁴ *Cooper v. Frankford Health Care System, Inc.*, 960 A.2d 134, 142 (Pa.Super. 2008).

support anything,” and force the company to expend time and money in attempting to mount a near-impossible defense. Here, Complainant has not properly plead the facts underlying his claims in his complaint and he refuses respond to reasonable discovery requests seeking to elicit those facts and he is making clear that he plans to use the discovery process to force Respondent to undertake timely, extensive research to prove his case. Such a win-win course of action for complainants will result in a tsunami of complaints on the Commission's docket.

15. If Complainant, with the burden of proof, is unable or unwilling to produce any factual support of any type to show that his allegations have some foundation in reality, then his complaint should be immediately dismissed as he will not be able to meet his burden of proof.

WHEREFORE, Global Tel*Link Corporation respectfully requests that the Presiding Officer issue an order (1) compelling Complainant to provide full and complete answers to Respondent's discovery dated April 24, 2009; (2) directs that Complainant's responses be received by counsel for Respondent no later than ten (10) calendar days after the Commission issues an Order in response to this Motion; and, (3) in the event Complainant is directed by fails to respond to Respondent's Interrogatories as ordered, directs that the Formal Complaint filed in this proceeding be dismissed in its entirety, with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,



Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.
Eckert, Seamans, Cherin, Mellot, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Counsel for:
Global Tel*Link Corporation

Dated: May 22, 2009

EXHIBIT A


**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RICHARD CARION #FM-4379	:	
Complainant	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2009-2082598
	:	
GLOBAL TEL*LINK CORPORATION	:	
Respondent	:	
	:	

**GLOBAL TEL*LINK CORPORATION'S INTERROGATORIES AND
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, SET I DIRECTED TO
COMPLAINANT**

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§5.342 and §5,349, Global Tel*Link Corporation's ("GTL") hereby directs the following Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Richard Carion, Complainant in the above-captioned matter. In compliance with 52 Pa. Code § 5.342 and § 5.349, objections to the attached questions are due within ten (10) days from the date of service and answers to the attached questions are due within twenty (20) days, plus three (3) days for mailing. Therefore, your answers are due to me on or before May 17, 2009. All answers must be verified pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.342. (6) and 1.36: If you do not object and/or respond to the enclosed discovery requests, GTL may file a motion asking for sanctions, which can include the dismissal of your Formal Complaint. **YOUR RESPONSES TO THE ATTACHED QUESTIONS DO NOT GET FILED WITH THE COMMISSION OR GET SENT TO THE PRESIDING ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE.**

Regards,



Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street 8th Fl.
PO Box 1248
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1248

Dated: April 24, 2009


DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. These interrogatories are issued pursuant to Chapter 5, Title 52 of the Pennsylvania Code. Those regulations specify that you have twenty (20) days to respond, plus three (3) days for mailing. Therefore, your answers are due in this office on or before May 17, 2009.
2. Answer each Interrogatory in the space below the question or on a separate piece of paper. If someone other than yourself answers a question, indicate after each answer the name of the person who provided the answer.
3. "And" and "or" shall each be individually interpreted as meaning "and/or" and shall not be construed disjunctively to exclude any information otherwise within the scope of any specification in any Interrogatory or document request.
4. "GTL" or "Company" means Global Tel*Link Corporation or its predecessors.
5. "Commission" or "PUC" means the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.
6. "Communication" means any oral inquiry, discussion, conversation, negotiation, agreement, understanding, meeting, telephone conversation, or any other form of oral transmission of information.
7. Unless otherwise specified, "you" refers to Richard Carion.
8. "Document" includes (whether or not specifically called for) the original or any identical or non-identical copy, regardless of origin or location, of any written, recorded, transcribed, punched, taped, filmed, typewritten, or handwritten matter, however produced or reproduced, and however formal or informal.
9. "Identify," "describe," or "description," when used with respect to a person, is a request to state the following, if known: (a) the person's full name; (b) the person's present address; and (c) the person's telephone number.
10. "Identify," "describe," or "description," when used with respect to a document, is a request to state the following: (a) the nature of the document (e.g., a letter); (b) the date of the document; (c) the identity of the author of the document; (d) the identity of the addressee of the document; (e) the identity of the custodian of the document; and (f) the present location of the document
11. "Identify," "describe," or "description," when used with respect to an oral communication, is a request to state the following: (a) the means of communication (e.g., telephone); (b) the place where the communication took place; (c) the date and time of the communication; (d) the identity of the person who initiated the communication; (e) the identity of all persons who participated in the communication or who were present at the time of the communication; (f) the substance of what was said; and (g) the identity of any document (however informal) which memorializes the communication or in any way refers to it.
12. "Person" or "persons" includes any natural person(s), government agency, corporation, partnership, association, sole proprietorship, government or governmental bodies, commission, board, and any other group, organization or entity.

INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify by (a) date, (b) time, and (c) number called, all calls that you allege were improperly disconnected.
2. For each call identified in response to No. 1, please state why you believe each call was improperly disconnected.
3. For each call identified in response to No. 1, please state (a) what refund, if any, you are seeking and (b) the underlying calculation you used to determine the amount of any such refund.
4. Identify and produce copies of all documents you intend to produce at hearing to support your complaint.
5. Identify (a) all witnesses you plan to present at the hearing and (b) specifically detail the subject matter of testimony for each identified witness (this includes yourself).
6. Identify and produce copies of (a) any complaints you submitted with the Department of Corrections regarding telephone service and (b) any written resolution of such complaints. If you do not have copies of such complaints, please provide the information requested in a narrative.
7. Identify and produce copies of (a) any complaints you submitted with Global Tel*Link Corporation regarding telephone service and (b) any written resolution of such complaints. If you do not have copies of such complaints, please provide the information requested in a narrative.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Stewart, Esquire
Deanne M. O'Dell, Esquire
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Dated: April 24, 2009