

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Formal)	Application Nos. FC-1349
Complaint of Sprint)	
Communications Company LP,)	
Overland Park, Kansas, v.)	
Arapahoe Telephone Company,)	
Blair; Benkelman Telephone)	
Company, Inc., Benkelman;)	
Cambridge Telephone Company,)	
Cambridge; Cozad Telephone)	
Company, Cozad; Diller Telephone)	ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR
Company, Diller; Hartman)	EXTENSION
Telephone Exchanges, Inc.,)	
Benkelman; Henderson Cooperative)	
Telephone Company, Henderson;)	
Hershey Cooperative Telephone)	
Company, Hershey; Southeast)	
Nebraska Communications, Inc.,)	
Falls City and Wauneta Telephone)	
Company, Benkelman; alleging)	
unfair and unreasonable)	
intrastate switched access rates)	
and inefficient network)	
architecture.)	Entered: December 29, 2010

BY THE HEARING OFFICER:

On December 14, 2010, Sprint Communications Company, L.P., ("Sprint") filed a Formal Complaint against Arapahoe Telephone Company; Benkelman Telephone Company, Inc.; Cambridge Telephone Company; Cozad Telephone Company; Diller Telephone Company; Hartman Telephone Exchanges, Inc.; Henderson Cooperative Telephone Company; Hershey Cooperative Telephone Company; Southeast Nebraska Communications, Inc.; and Wauneta Telephone Company, (collectively "Respondents"), alleging unfair and unreasonable intrastate switched access rates and inefficient network architecture. The Commission docketed the Formal Complaint as Application No. FC-1349.

Commission Rules of Procedure set a deadline for the Respondents to file a Statement of Satisfaction or an Answer to a Formal Complaint.¹ Accordingly, the deadline to file a Statement of Satisfaction was established as December 30, 2010 and the deadline to file an Answer was established as January 4, 2011.

On December 28, 2010, Sprint filed a motion to expand the time for response to the Formal Complaint, of both the deadline to file a Statement of Satisfaction and Answer. Sprint stated that it and the Respondents were currently engaged in negotiations regarding the issues that are the substance of the Formal Complaint.

Finally, Sprint was authorized to inform the Commission that the requested extension of time to respond was agreeable to the Counsel

¹ See Neb. Admin. Code, Title 291, Ch. 1 § 05.08(A), (B), and (C).


for the Respondents. Sprint requested that the deadline to file a Statement of Satisfaction be extended to January 17, 2011, with Sprint's Notice of Acceptance due by January 20, 2011. In the event no Statement of Satisfaction is filed, Respondents would have until January 24, 2011, to file an Answer. If Sprint does not file a Notice of Acceptance of any Statement of Satisfaction filed by a Respondent, the Respondent would have until February 3, 2011, to file an Answer.

I find that the extension of time to respond in the above-captioned Formal Complaint as requested by Sprint in its Motion and outlined above, should be granted.

O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Hearing Officer that the Motion by Sprint Communications Company, L.P. to expand the time to respond to the above-captioned Formal Complaint be, and is hereby, granted. Respondents have until **Monday, January 17, 2011**, to file a Statement of Satisfaction. Sprint shall have until **Thursday, January 20, 2011**, to file a Notice of Acceptance to any Statements of Satisfaction filed by a Respondent. If a Respondent does not file a Statement of Satisfaction, the deadline for Respondents to file an Answer shall be **Monday, January 24, 2011**. In the event Sprint does not file a Notice of Acceptance to any Statement of Satisfaction filed by any Respondent, the Respondent shall have until **Thursday, February 3, 2011**, to file an Answer.

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska this 29th day of December, 2010.



BY:

Frank E. Landis
HEARING OFFICER