

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
STATE OF MISSOURI**

Halo Wireless, Inc.,	§	
	§	
Complainant,	§	Case No. TC-2012-0331
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
Choctaw Telephone Cooperative, Inc., et al.,	§	
	§	
Respondents.	§	

**HALO WIRELESS, INC.’S  
OBJECTIONS TO DIRECT TESTIMONY OF AMANDA MOLINA**

Halo Wireless, Inc. (“Halo”) hereby objects to and moves to exclude or strike the proposed Direct Testimony of Amanda Molina on behalf of Choctaw Telephone Company and MoKan Dial Inc. (collectively “Choctaw”), as follows:

**I. Legal Standards**

Procedures in contested cases are governed by section 536.070 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri (RSMo 2000), as supplemented by 4 CSR 240-2.130. Under these provisions, the “[p]rocedural formalities in contested cases generally include...adherence to evidentiary rules, § 536.070.” *Cade v. State*, 990 S.W.2d 32, 37 (Mo.App.1999) (citing *see Hagely v. Board of Educ. of Webster Groves Sch. Dist.*, 841 S.W.2d 663, 668 (Mo. banc 1992)). Therefore, “[s]tatements in violation of evidentiary rules do not qualify as competent and substantial evidence” in administrative proceedings “when proper objection is made and preserved.” *Concord Publ'g House, Inc. v. Dir. of Revenue*, 916 S.W.2d 186, 195 (Mo. banc 1996).

## **II. Summary and General Objections**

In addition, to the extent that that Ms. Molina's statements are offered as factual testimony as to whether Halo terminates traffic, the amount, of such traffic, or the nature of such traffic, Choctaw has failed to establish a foundation of personal knowledge or reliance on admissible hearsay. Alternatively, to the extent that Ms. Molina's statements are offered as expert testimony as to whether Halo terminates traffic, the amount, of such traffic, or the nature of such traffic, Choctaw has failed to establish a foundation showing that the testimony is reliable, including: the basis for Ms. Molina's opinion and the underlying data supporting the opinion; that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field. Finally, Halo objects to the testimony to the extent it purports to offer any alleged facts, opinions, or conclusions regarding any of the Counterclaims asserted by AT&T Missouri against Halo in the above captioned matter relating to the alleged breach of the ICA between Halo and AT&T Missouri. Such testimony is neither relevant nor probative because its is being offered on behalf of a party who is a stranger to the ICA and has no actual knowledge or standing to offer testimony regarding AT&T's Missouri's claims.

## **III. Reservation of Objections**

Halo hereby requests any data or other information underlying Ms. Molina's testimony (to the extent not previously provided). Halo reserves the right to make any additional objections that may be appropriate after review of such information.

#### **IV. Specific Objections to Lines 4:20-5:3**

Halo objects that the written documents referred to by Ms. Molina are the best evidence of the purported facts adduced by Ms. Molina, and statements offered to contradict the terms of the written documents violate the parol evidence rule. Halo further objects to Ms. Molina's testimony as hearsay, to the extent that it could be read as being offered to prove the truth of any matter asserted in such documents.

#### **V. Specific Objections to Lines 5:4-13**

Halo objects that Ms. Molina's testimony relies on hearsay for which Choctaw has not provided a foundation for admissibility. Halo further objects that the documents relied on by Ms. Molina are the best evidence of their contents. In addition, to the extent that the testimony could be construed as substantive testimony as to whether Halo's traffic is "landline-originated," Halo objects that Ms. Molina is testifying to a conclusion of law that is not helpful, not relevant, not reliable, and that she is not qualified to provide.

#### **VI. Specific Objections to Lines 5:16-22**

Halo objects that Ms. Molina's testimony relies on hearsay for which Choctaw has not provided a foundation for admissibility. Halo further objects that the documents referred to are the best evidence of their contents. In addition, to the extent that the testimony could be construed as substantive testimony that Choctaw was entitled to payment from Halo, under "access tariffs or other," Halo objects that Ms. Molina is testifying to a conclusion of law that is not helpful, not relevant, not reliable, and that she is not qualified to provide.

**VII. Specific Objections to Lines 6:14-7:4**

Halo objects that Ms. Molina's testimony relies on hearsay for which Choctaw has not provided a foundation for admissibility. Halo further objects that the documents relied on by Ms. Molina are the best evidence of their contents.

**VIII. Specific Objections to Lines 7:5-10**

Halo objects that the testimony is based on documents that are the best evidence of their contents.

**IX. Specific Objections to Lines 7:11-21**

Halo objects that Ms. Molina's testimony relies on hearsay for which Choctaw has not provided a foundation for admissibility. Halo further objects that the documents referred to are the best evidence of their contents. In addition, to the extent that the testimony could be construed as substantive testimony as to whether Halo's traffic is "landline-originated" or "wireless-originated," Halo objects that Ms. Molina is testifying to a conclusion of law that is not helpful, not relevant, not reliable, and that she is not qualified to provide.

**X. Specific Objections to Lines 7:22-8:2**

Ms. Molina provides neither fact testimony nor expert testimony, but instead states conclusions of law that are not helpful, are not relevant, are not reliable, and that Ms. Molina is not qualified to provide. Halo further objects that Ms. Molina's testimony is based on hearsay for which Choctaw has not provided a foundation for admissibility. In addition, to the extent the testimony is based on documents, such documents are the best evidence of their contents.

**XI. Specific Objections to Lines 8:17-22**

Halo objects that Ms. Molina's testimony relies on hearsay for which Choctaw has not provided a foundation for admissibility. Halo further objects that the documents referred to are the best evidence of their contents.

**XII. Specific Objections to Lines 9:8-20**

To the extent that that Ms. Molina's statements are offered as factual testimony as to whether Halo terminates traffic, the amount, of such traffic, or the nature of such traffic, Choctaw has failed to establish a foundation of personal knowledge or reliance on admissible hearsay. To the extent that that Ms. Molina's statements are offered as expert testimony as to whether Halo terminates traffic, the amount, of such traffic, or the nature of such traffic, Choctaw has failed to establish a foundation showing that the testimony is reliable, including: the basis for Ms. Molina's opinion and the underlying data supporting the opinion; that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field. In addition, to the extent Ms. Molina's testimony attempts to incorporate the traffic study provided as Attachments E and F, Halo's objects that such studies are inadmissible as Choctaw has failed to lay foundation establishing that they are admissible hearsay. Further Halo, objects that Choctaw has failed to show that Attachments E and F are admissible expert work product, as Choctaw has failed to lay a foundation showing: the basis for the opinion and the underlying data supporting the opinion; that the document is based on

reliable principles and methodology; that the document is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the document is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

### **XIII. Specific Objections to Lines 10:4-11**

To the extent that that Ms. Molina's statements are offered as factual testimony as to whether Halo terminates traffic, the amount, of such traffic, or the nature of such traffic, Choctaw has failed to establish a foundation of personal knowledge or reliance on admissible hearsay. To the extent that that Ms. Molina's statements are offered as expert testimony as to whether Halo terminates traffic, the amount, of such traffic, or the nature of such traffic, Choctaw has failed to establish a foundation showing that the testimony is reliable, including: the basis for Ms. Molina's opinion and the underlying data supporting the opinion; that the testimony is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the testimony is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the testimony is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field. In addition, to the extent Ms. Molina's testimony attempts to incorporate the traffic studies provided as Attachments E and F, Halo's objects that such studies are inadmissible as Choctaw has failed to lay foundation establishing that they are admissible hearsay. Further Halo, objects that Choctaw has failed to show that the traffic studies (Attachments E and F) are admissible expert work product, as Choctaw has failed to lay a foundation showing: the

basis for the expert opinion and the underlying data supporting the opinion; that the document is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the document is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the document is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

### **Objections to Exhibits**

Halo objects to Ms. Molina's exhibits as hearsay, to the extent that they are offered to prove the truth of any matter asserted therein.

Halo objects that Attachments E and F are inadmissible as Choctaw has failed to lay foundation establishing that they are admissible hearsay. Further, even if Attachments E and F were subject to a hearsay exception, Halo objects that Choctaw has failed to show that Attachments E and F are admissible expert work product, as Choctaw has failed to lay a foundation showing: the basis for the opinion and the underlying data supporting the opinion; that the document is based on reliable principles and methodology; that the document is based on reliable foundational assumption and data; that the document is based on reliable reasoning that would allow the methodology to be applied to the foundational data underlying the testimony; and that the data relied upon is of the type that is reasonably relied upon by experts in the appropriate field.

### **XIV. Conclusion**

For the reasons discussed above, Halo respectfully requests that the Commission enter an order sustaining Halo's objections and striking or excluding, as applicable, the direct testimony and work product of Amanda Molina.

DATED: June 25, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Daniel R. Young

**LOUIS A. HUBER, III**

Missouri State Bar No. 28447

**DANIEL R. YOUNG**

Missouri State Bar No. 34742

**SCHLEE, HUBER, MCMULLEN &  
KRAUSE, P.C.**

4050 Pennsylvania, Suite 300

P.O. Box 32430

Kansas City, MO 64171-5430

Telephone: (816) 931-3500

Facsimile: (816) 931-3553

**STEVEN H. THOMAS**

Texas State Bar No. 19868890

**TROY P. MAJOUÉ**

Texas State Bar No. 24067738

**MCGUIRE, CRADDOCK & STROTHER,  
P.C.**

2501 N. Harwood, Suite 1800

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: (214) 954-6800

Facsimile: (214) 954-6850

**W. SCOTT MCCOLLOUGH**

Texas State Bar No. 13434100

**MCCOLLOUGH|HENRY, P.C.**

1250 S. Capital of Texas Hwy,  
Bldg 2-235

West Lake Hills, TX 78746

Telephone: (512) 888-1112

Facsimile: (512) 692-2522

*Attorneys for Halo Wireless, Inc.*



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2012, the foregoing document has been filed with the Missouri Public Service Commission electronic filing system and that true and correct copies of the foregoing have been served upon all counsel of record by electronic mail.

s/ Daniel R. Young  
**DANIEL R. YOUNG**