

**BEFORE THE KENTUCKY  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the matter of

Application of Competitive Carriers of the     )  
South, Inc. for a Declaratory Order            )  
Affirming that the Interconnection Regimes   ) Case No. 2015-00283  
Under KRS 278.530 and 47 U.S.C. § 251 are   )  
Technologically Neutral                         )

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

AT&T Kentucky<sup>1</sup> respectfully submits this reply in support of its request that the Commission schedule oral argument in this case.

CompSouth does not dispute that the issues in this case are predominantly legal, or that oral argument could be helpful to the Commission. It contends, however, that the parties have had “ample opportunity to state their respective positions on the issues of statutory construction” in this case and that oral argument “will result in additional – and unnecessary – cost and delay.”<sup>2</sup>

That contention is not persuasive. A litigant that wants to avoid oral argument can *always* claim that it is unnecessary and will result in cost and delay, but oral argument is nonetheless the norm in cases that present primarily legal issues. Moreover, if there is ever a case that cries out for oral argument, this is it: The three respondents oppose CompSouth’s petition for declaratory relief on disparate grounds; CompSouth acknowledges that the questions presented are questions of statutory construction; and the length of CompSouth’s brief – 62 pages – shows that there is much for the Commission to get its arms around. Furthermore, and

---

<sup>1</sup> BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC, d/b/a AT&T Kentucky

<sup>2</sup> Response to Motion for Oral Arguments at 1.

notwithstanding CompSouth's claim that the parties have had "ample opportunity" to explain their positions, the fact is that each party filed only one brief (rather than an initial brief and a response brief) and the parties agreed to dispense with the customary evidentiary hearing with the understanding that parties could request oral argument.

For the foregoing reasons, AT&T Kentucky respectfully submits that this case is ideally suited for oral argument.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cheryl R. Winn  
Waters Law Group, PLLC  
12802 Townepark Way, Suite 200  
Louisville, KY 40243  
Telephone: (502) 425-2424 Ext. 17  
Facsimile: (502) 425-9724  
Email: crwinn@waterslawgroup.com

Dennis G. Friedman  
J. Tyson Covey  
Mayer Brown LLP  
71 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 782-0600  
Email: dfriedman@mayerbrown.com  
jcovey@mayerbrown.com

#### **FILING NOTICE AND CERTIFICATE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of the same document being filed in paper medium with the Commission within two business days; that the electronic filing was transmitted to the Commission on March 29, 2017; and that there are currently no parties that the Commission has excused from participation by electronic means in this proceeding.

/s/ Cheryl R. Winn