JUN 07 2004 11:41 FR MISSOURI LEGAL

#### 314 247 0014 TO MOPSC

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

		FTI	MICI.
Appeals	Pail	12	$\sim$
	LJB		
	ARC		
	26 M		
September T	erm,	200	2

# No. 01-1511

AT&T Corporation, Appellant

ν.

Federal Communications Commission, Appellee

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT			
FILED	₩ <b>9</b> ₩ 1 8 2002		
	CLERK		

Appeal from an Order of the Federal Communications Commission

BEFORE: GINSBURG, Chief Judge, and EDWARDS and GARLAND, Circuit Judges.

## JUDGMENT

This appeal was considered on the record compiled before the Federal Communications Commission and on the briefs filed by the parties. It is hereby

**ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the Commission's Order be affirmed. The decision in this case is controlled by our opinion in *WorldCom, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission*, No. 01-1198, 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 22009 (Oct. 22, 2002), in which the appellant made the same basic arguments as does AT&T here. In that case, we rejected a challenge to the Commission's use of New York UNE rates as a benchmark in a § 271 proceeding for Massachusetts. We found that the Commission's reliance upon the states' processes of rate revision and correction provided "reasonable grounds to be satisfied that the disputed rates were unlikely to exceed the range of TELRIC compliance." *Id.* at \*12, slip op. at 8. The same is true in this case.

In the prior case we also acknowledged that "[a]t some point, WorldCom's argument plainly must become a winner. In a market with falling costs, ancient UNE rates cannot serve as a valid benchmark." *Id.* at \*11, slip op. at 7. In this case, however, AT&T has not made a showing that the Texas UNE rates were so antiquated that the Commission's reliance upon the rate revision processes in Texas and Missouri was arbitrary and capricious.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

### <u>Per Curiam</u>

FOR THE COURT: Mark J. Langer, Clerk BY:

96%

Michael C. McGrail Deputy Clerk