



Suzan DeBusk Paiva  
Assistant General Counsel  
Verizon

April 18, 2013

1717 Arch Street, Floor 3 SE  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

**Via Electronic Filing**

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street – Filing Room (2 North)  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Re: Thomas Skiffington v Verizon Pennsylvania LLC;  
Docket No. C-2012-2329943; **STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

In response to the Commission's Secretarial Letter of April 12, 2013, please note that MCI Communications Services Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business ("Verizon") does not object to the complainant's request to withdraw the complaint.

If the complaint is not withdrawn, however, then it should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in the initial decision of Administrative Law Judge Barnes ("ID") (to which no exceptions were filed) because the Commission lacks jurisdiction to regulate the rates, terms and conditions of Voice over Internet Protocol ("VoIP") services by virtue of the VoIP Freedom Act, 73 P.S. §§ 2251.1-2251.6.<sup>1</sup> The ID should be adopted as the final order of the Commission.

In response to the Commission's questions, we provided the customer with a detailed written analysis of the billing, which we believe addresses the issue raised in the complaint. Please note that the customer on the accounts is not the individual Thomas Skiffington but rather a business known as Remax 440 Inc.

Very truly yours,

Suzan D. Paiva  
Counsel for Verizon Pennsylvania LLC

SDP/meb

cc: Thomas Skiffington, Remax

<sup>1</sup> See *Wildman v. Verizon Pennsylvania LLC*, Docket No. C-2013-2342700 (Final Order entered April 9, 2013) (adopting the decision of ALJ Barnes dismissing the complaint for lack of jurisdiction under the VoIP Freedom Act).