

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the Matter of

NOTICE OF SOUTH CENTRAL BELL)TELEPHONE COMPANY OF AN)ADJUSTMENT IN ITS INTRASTATE)RATES AND CHARGES)

and

THE VOLUME USAGE MEASURED RATE)	
SERVICE AND MULTILINE SERVICE)	CASE NO.
TARIFF FILING OF SOUTH CENTRAL)	8879
BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY)	

ORDER

On October 4, 1983, Beep-Alert of Kentucky, Inc. and Reo-Cap, Inc. ("Movants"), by counsel, filed a Motion to Intervene stating, among other things, that Reo-Cap, Inc. is a customer of South Central Bell Telephone Company ("South Central Bell"), that Beep-Alert of Kentucky, Inc. is a potential customer of South Central Bell and that each has an interest in the tariffed rates that will be applicable to radio common carriers as a result of this proceeding. The Motion further states that they have recently become aware of the significant impact of the proposed increases, that they have requested a copy of the Application and that because of the voluminous nature of the rate case filing and the complexity of the legal and other issues they have not yet had the opportunity to determine the financial impact. The Motion also states that Movants require additional time (until October 28, 1983) to prepare and file testimony and exhibits.

On October 6, 1983, the Attorney General's Consumer Protection Division filed a Response to the Motion stating that the Motion is untimely, that Movants' interests are already adequately represented by the Kentucky Association of Radio Common Carriers, intervenor herein, and that, in any event, Movants have cited no compelling reason as required in the Commission's Order of Procedure entered August 10, 1983, for altering the present schedule.

On October 7, 1983, South Central Bell, by counsel, filed its Opposition to Motion to Intervene stating that the Motion is not timely, that Movants are adequately represented by the Kentucky Association of Radio Common Carriers and that intervention on the basis proposed would not permit South Central Bell adequate time to respond to intervenors' direct testimony.

The Commission, having considered the Motion, Response and Opposition to Motion and being advised, is of the opinion and finds that for good cause shown the Motion to Intervene should be sustained, and that, absent a showing of compelling reasons, the request for additional time to prepare and file testimony and exhibits should be overruled.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion be and it hereby is sustained to the extent that intervention is granted and overruled with respect to the request for additional time to file testimony and exhibits.

- 2 -



Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 13th day of October, 1983.

PUBLIC_SERVICE COMMISSION Chairman Vice Chairman Commissioner

ATTEST:

Secretary