STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION JEFFERSON CITY September 18, 2001

CASE NO: TO-2002-72

Office of the Public Counsel P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Paul S. DeFord, Esq. Lathrop & Gage, L.C. 2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 2800 Kansas City, MO 64108 General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Legal Department
TDS Telecommunications Corporation
P. O. Box 22995
9737 Cogdill Road, Suite 230
Knoxville, TN 37933-0995

Enclosed find certified copy of an ORDER in the above-numbered case(s).

Sincerely,

Dale Hardy Roberts

Hoke Hored Roberts

Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

Uncertified Copies:

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Application of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.)	
for Approval of Interconnection Agreement)	Case No. TO-2002-72

THIRD ORDER DIRECTING FILING

On August 22, 2001, the Missouri Public Service Commission ordered AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., to cure, no later than September 4, 2001, the deficiencies in its application for approval of an interconnection agreement with the following incumbent local exchange telephone companies: TDS Telecommunications Corporation, individually and as agent for its parent and affiliate companies, i.e., New London Telephone Company, Orchard Farm Telephone Company, and The Stoutland Telephone Company.

AT&T Wireless did not comply with that order. As a result, on September 12, 2001, the Commission again ordered AT&T Wireless to comply with its order of August 22, 2001, no later than September 14, 2001. In its order of September 12, 2001, the Commission also added a new requirement for AT&T Wireless to comply with. Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.050(3)(B) applies when an act ordered by the Commission to be done within a specified time is not done within that specified time. The rule requires that the party failing to act must provide excusable neglect before the Commission will allow the act to be done out of time. The rule states:

When an act is required...to be done by order...of the commission at or within a specified time, the commission, at its discretion, may..., [a]fter the expiration of the specified period, permit the act to be done where the failure to act was the result of excusable neglect.

ľ

Thus, in its order of September 12, 2001, the Commission required AT&T Wireless to demonstrate how its failure to comply with the Commission's order of August 22, 2001, was the result of excusable neglect.

On September 14, 2001, AT&T Wireless filed a supplement to its original application, complying with the order of the Commission issued on August 22, 2001.

AT&T Wireless, however, did not comply with that part of the Commission's order of September 12, 2001, in explaining how its failure to comply with the Commission's order of August 22, 2001, was the result of excusable neglect. The pleading stated: "Counsel for [AT&T Wireless] did not become aware of the Order Directing Filing until September 11, 2001, when a member of the Commission Staff initiated contact to determine the status of the required filing." This is not a statement demonstrating excusable neglect.

AT&T Wireless is admonished to follow the Commission's orders. Failure to do so may result in the case being dismissed. Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.116 gives the grounds upon which the Commission may dismiss an application. Subsection (3) of that rule states that the Commission may dismiss a party from a case if the party has failed to comply with a Commission order. The subsection states: "A party may be dismissed from a case for failure to comply with any order issued by the commission...."

The Commission will, for the third time, order AT&T Wireless to comply with its orders.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., must file, no later than September 21, 2001, a supplemental pleading in compliance with this order that supplies the information requested in the Commission's order of September 12, 2001, i.e., a demonstration of

excusable neglect on the part of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., for its noncompliance with the order issued August 22, 2001.

2. That this order will become effective on September 18, 2001.

BY THE COMMISSION

Hok Hard Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(SEAL)

4

Bill Hopkins, Senior Regulatory Law Judge, by delegation of authority under Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri, on this 18th day of September, 2001.

5162		AIL RECEIPT Only; No Insurance	Cov	erage Provided)			₹ eř
3699	Postage Certified Fee	\$					
9000 055E PPDS	Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required) Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required) Total Postage & Fees Nerge (Please Print Cle Street, Apt. No.; or PO 3345 Syra City, State, 21P+4 PS Form 3800, July 1	early) (To be completed by a red Box No.	your <u>RETURN ADDRESS</u> completed on the reverse side?	eard to you. Attach this form to the fr permit. Write 'Return Receipt Re. The Return Receipt will delivered. 3. Article Addressed	nd 4b. Iress on the reverse of this form so ont of the mailpiece, or on the back equested on the mailpiece below the show to whom the article was delived. EFOND, ESP. GAGE, L.C. H. Blud. Ste. 3 144, MO 64108	that we can return this if space does not the article number. ered and the date 4a. Article N 70993 4b. Service Registers Return Rec 7. Date of De	220000931,99,51625 Type ad
				PS Form 3811 , Dec	ember 1994		Domestic Return Receipt

STATE OF MISSOURI

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson City,

Missouri, this 18th day of Sept. 2001.

Hoke Hored Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts

Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge