

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the application of)
ACCXX COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, for a license to)
provide basic local exchange service throughout the)
state of Michigan in the zone and exchange areas)
served by Verizon North Inc., Contel of the South,)
Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and SBC Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-13940

In the matter of the application of)
ARBROS COMMUNICATIONS LICENSING)
COMPANY CENTRAL, LLC, for a license to)
provide basic local exchange service in the exchanges)
currently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon)
North Inc., and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a)
Verizon North Systems.)
_____)

Case No. U-12808

In the matter of the application of)
ATLAS COMMUNICATIONS, LTD., for a license)
to provide local exchange services in the LATA)
exchanges currently served by Ameritech Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-12084

In the matter of the application of)
BUILDING COMMUNICATIONS, INC., d/b/a BCI,)
for a license to provide basic local exchange)
service in certain cities and townships in the)
southeast Michigan LATA.)
_____)

Case No. U-11246

In the matter of the application of)
CAT COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL,)
INC., for a license to provide resold local exchange)
telecommunications services in the exchange areas)
of Ameritech Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-12356

In the matter of the application of)
CCCMI, INC., d/b/a CONNECT!, for a license to)
provide resold and facilities-based local exchange)
telecommunications service throughout the state)
of Michigan in the exchange areas of Ameritech)
Michigan and GTE North Incorporated.)
_____)

Case No. U-12014

In the matter of the application of)
CI² INC., d/b/a COMPUTER INTELLIGENCE² INC.,)
for a license to provide local exchange telecommuni-)
cations services throughout the state of Michigan)
in the exchange areas of Ameritech Michigan, GTE)
North Incorporated, and GTE Systems of Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-12239

In the matter of the application of)
CYPRESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
CORPORATION, d/b/a CYTEL, for a license to)
provide basic local exchange services in LATA)
exchanges currently served by Ameritech Michigan)
in southeast Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-11248

In the matter of the application of)
GLOBETEL, INC., for a permanent license to)
provide basic local exchange service throughout)
the state of Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-15068

In the matter of the application of)
GROUP LONG DISTANCE, INC., for a license)
to provide basic local exchange service in various)
Detroit LATA exchanges served by Ameritech)
Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-11738

In the matter of the application of)
HORIZON TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.,)
d/b/a VOYAGER TELECOMMUNICATIONS,)
for a license to provide resold and dedicated local)
exchange telecommunications services throughout)
the lower peninsula of the state of Michigan in)
certain exchanges currently served by Ameritech)
Michigan and GTE North Incorporated.)
_____)

Case No. U-12156

In the matter of the application of	)	
COMPUTER BUSINESS SCIENCES, INC., for a	)	
license to provide local exchange service on a	)	
facilities basis throughout the state of Michigan in	)	Case No. U-11972
the exchange areas of Ameritech Michigan and	)	
GTE North Incorporated.	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
IPVOICE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., for a	)	
license to provide basic local exchange service	)	Case No. U-12556
throughout the state of Michigan in all zone and	)	
exchange areas served by Verizon North Inc.,	)	
Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a GTE Systems	)	
of Michigan, and Ameritech Michigan.	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
MABEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC., for a license	)	
to provide basic local exchange services in the zone	)	Case No. U-13672
and exchange areas throughout the state of Michigan	)	
presently served by SBC Ameritech Michigan, and	)	
Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc.,	)	
d/b/a Verizon North Systems.	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
METRO TELECONNECT COMPANIES, INC.,	)	
for a license to provide basic local exchange service	)	
in all of the exchanges currently served by Ameritech	)	Case No. U-13366
Michigan, Verizon North Inc., and Contel of the	)	
South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, throughout	)	
the state of Michigan.	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
MICHTEL, INC., for a license to provide basic	)	
local exchange service in various Detroit LATA	)	Case No. U-11730
exchanges served by Ameritech Michigan.	)	
	)	

In the matter of the application of	)	
NATIONSLINE MICHIGAN, INC. , for a	)	
license to provide basic local exchange service	)	
throughout the state of Michigan in the zone and	)	Case No. U-14335
exchange areas served by Verizon North Inc. and	)	
Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North	)	
Systems, and SBC Michigan.	)	
_____	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
ESSEX COMMUNICATIONS, INC. , d/b/a eLEC	)	
COMMUNICATIONS , for a license to provide	)	
basic local exchange service throughout the state	)	
of Michigan in the zones and exchanges served by	)	Case No. U-12468
GTE North Incorporated, Contel of the South, Inc.,	)	
d/b/a GTE Systems of Michigan, and Ameritech	)	
Michigan.	)	
_____	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
NTERA, INC. , for a license to provide basic	)	
local exchange service throughout the state of	)	
Michigan in the zones and exchanges served by	)	Case No. U-13081
Verizon North Inc., Verizon North Systems,	)	
and Ameritech Michigan.	)	
_____	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
ONESTAR LONG DISTANCE, INC. , for a license	)	
to provide basic local exchange service in the zone	)	
and exchange areas throughout the Michigan LATAs	)	Case No. U-13423
presently served by Ameritech Michigan.	)	
_____	)	
	)	
In the matter of the application of	)	
PACIFIC CENTREX SERVICES, INC. , for	)	
a license to provide local exchange services	)	
in the LATA exchanges currently served by	)	Case No. U-13937
SBC Michigan and Verizon North Inc. and Contel	)	
of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems.	)	
_____	)	

In the matter of the application of)
PHONE EXPRESS MICHIGAN INC., for a)
license to provide basic local exchange service)
in the zone and exchange areas throughout)
the lower peninsula LATA presently served by)
SBC Michigan and Verizon North Inc. and Contel)
of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems.)
_____)

Case No. U-14475

In the matter of the application of)
PREMIERE NETWORK SERVICES, INC.,)
for a license to provide basic local exchange)
service in exchanges of Ameritech Michigan)
and GTE North Incorporated in a geographic)
area concentrated in Detroit, Grand Rapids,)
Lansing, Flint, and Kalamazoo.)
_____)

Case No. U-12628

In the matter of the application of)
QUALITY TELEPHONE INC. for a license to)
provide basic local exchange service in)
selected exchanges served by Verizon North Inc.)
and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North)
Systems, CenturyTel of Michigan, Inc., CenturyTel)
Midwest--Michigan, Inc., CenturyTel of Northern)
Michigan, Inc., CenturyTel of Upper Michigan, Inc.,)
and AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-14675

In the matter of the application of)
SURETEL, INC., for the issuance of a license to)
provide basic local exchange service in the Muskegon)
Exchange served by GTE North Incorporated and the)
Belleville, Benton Harbor, Centerline, Detroit, Flint,)
Livonia, Plymouth, Pontiac, Romulus, Roseville,)
Royal Oak, St. Joseph, Southfield, Trenton, Warren,)
Wayne, Wyandotte, and Ypsilanti exchanges served)
by Ameritech Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-11717

In the matter of the application of)
TELERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., for a)
license to provide basic local exchange service)
in the exchanges currently served by Ameritech)
Michigan, Verizon North Inc., and Contel)
of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems.)
_____)

Case No. U-12603

In the matter of the application of)
TRULY CLEAR COMMUNICATIONS INC.)
for a license to provide resold and facilities-based)
switched and dedicated local exchange telecommuni-)
cations service throughout the state of Michigan in)
the exchange areas served by Ameritech Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-12378

In the matter of the application of)
VOTA TELEPHONE LLC, d/b/a VOTATEL,)
for a license to provide basic local exchange service)
in the zone and exchange areas served by Verizon)
North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a)
Verizon North Systems, SBC Michigan, CenturyTel)
of Michigan, Inc., CenturyTel Midwest—Michigan,)
Inc., CenturyTel of Upper Michigan, Inc.,)
CenturyTel of Northern Michigan, Inc., Island)
Telephone Company, Shiawassee Telephone)
Company, Chatham Telephone Company, Wolverine)
Telephone Company, Communications Corporation,)
and Frontier Communications of Michigan, Inc.)
_____)

Case No. U-14540

In the matter of the application of)
WINSTAR WIRELESS OF MICHIGAN, INC.,)
for a license to provide basic local exchange)
service on both a resold and a facilities)
basis in certain exchanges.)
_____)

Case No. U-11037

In the matter of the application of)
YGNITION NETWORKS, INC., for a license to)
provide local exchange services throughout the state)
of Michigan in the zone and exchange areas served)
by Verizon North Inc., Contel of the South, Inc.,)
d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and AT&T Michigan.)
_____)

Case No. U-15052

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion,)
 to commence formal basic local exchange service)
 license revocation proceedings against ACCXX)
 Communications, LLC, ARBROS Communications)
 Licensing Company Central, LLC, Atlas)
 Communications, LTD., Building Communications,)
 Inc., d/b/a BCI, CAT Communications International,)
 Inc., CCCMI, Inc., d/b/a Connect!, CI² Inc., d/b/a)
 Computer Intelligence² Inc., Cypress)
 Telecommunications Corporation, d/b/a Cytel,)
 Globetel, Inc., Group Long Distance, Inc., Horizon)
 Telecommunications, Inc., d/b/a Voyager)
 Telecommunications, Computer Business Sciences,)
 Inc., IPVoice Communications, Inc., Mabel)
 Communications, Inc., Metro Teleconnect Companies,))
 Inc., MichTel Inc., NationsLine Michigan, Inc., Essex)
 Communications, Inc., d/b/a eLEC Communications,)
 NTERA, Inc., OneStar Long Distance, Inc., Pacific)
 Centrex Services, Inc., Phone Express Michigan Inc.,)
 Premiere Network Services, Inc., Quality Telephone)
 Inc., Suretel, Inc., Telera Communications, Inc.,)
 Truly Clear Communications Inc., Vota Telephone)
 LLC, d/b/a Votatel, Winstar Wireless of Michigan,)
 Inc., and Ygnition Networks, Inc.)
 _____)

Case No. U-16072

At the December 1, 2009 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing, Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman
 Hon. Monica Martinez, Commissioner
 Hon. Steven A. Transeth, Commissioner

ORDER

In each of the above separately captioned proceedings, the Commission granted the named applicant a license to provide basic local exchange service in Michigan pursuant to the licensing provisions set forth in the Michigan Telecommunications Act, 1991 PA 179, MCL 484.2101 *et*

seq.¹ Acquisition of a license to provide basic local exchange service carries with it certain responsibilities, including, but not limited to, the duty to “comply with all federal and state requirements regarding truth in billing, E 9-1-1 services, and primary basic local exchange service.” MCL 484.2305b(c). Moreover, providers of basic local exchange service are obligated to obey the lawful orders of the Commission and to respond promptly to reasonable requests from the Commission Staff (Staff).

The providers listed in the case captions of this proceeding have been grossly deficient in attending to the statutory and regulatory responsibilities of licensed basic local exchange service providers.

MCL 484.2205 authorizes the Commission to revoke a provider’s license to provide basic local exchange service. In Michigan, a formal action to revoke a license must be preceded by an informal notice to the licensee of the intended action and an opportunity for the licensee “to show compliance with all lawful requirements for retention of the license.” MCL 24.292; *Rogers v Cosmetology Board*, 68 Mich App 751; 244 NW2d 20 (1976).

On May 21, 2009, Robin Ancona, Director of the Commission’s Telecommunications Division, sent a letter to each of these 30 licensees. The licensees were advised that the purpose of the May 21, 2009 letter was to ascertain “whether your company wishes to retain [its] license” to provide basic local exchange service in Michigan. In each letter, the licensee was notified of past unsuccessful attempts by the Staff to contact the licensee by regular mail, telephone, and e-mail. The letters informed these providers to “respond to this inquiry no later than 45 days from the date of this letter and indicate if the company intends to retain its license and is providing service, or has ceased operations.” Finally, each letter notified the licensee that “[i]f no response is received,

¹Computer Business Sciences, Inc., Michtel Inc., Essex Communications, Inc., and Winstar Wireless of Michigan, Inc., are now known, respectively, as IG2, Inc., Michtel Communications, LLC, New Rochelle Telephone Corp., and Winstar Communications, LLC.

the Commission will take the necessary steps to commence the process of revoking [its] license.” To date, none of the 30 providers have responded to Ms. Ancona’s letter. At best, the Staff received email contacts in which the company did not object to its license being revoked, but declined to take the minimal steps necessary to surrender its license.

Finding that the preliminary steps for license revocations required by MCL 24.292 and *Rogers v Cosmetology Board*, supra, had been completed, the Commission issued an order on August 25, 2009, commencing formal proceedings to revoke the licenses of the providers listed in the captions of this proceeding. In the August 25 order, the Commission directed each listed provider that wished to retain its license to provide basic local exchange service to file an intervention in Case No. U-16072 by September 24, 2009, and to appear at an October 15, 2009 joint hearing before Administrative Law Judge Daniel E. Nickerson, Jr. (ALJ). In the August 25 order, the Commission further warned the listed providers that, if they failed to attend the hearing, then the ALJ would, after receipt of testimony and exhibits from the Staff, render a Proposal for Decision (PFD) with regard to the issue of whether each absent provider’s license to provide basic local exchange service should be revoked immediately by the Commission.

A hearing was held on October 15, 2009. No provider attended. The Staff’s testimony and exhibits were received into evidence. The Staff’s evidence demonstrated that the 30 listed providers are not providing basic local exchange service, and no longer possess sufficient technical, financial, and managerial resources and abilities to provide basic local exchange service within Michigan. See, MCL 484.2303(1); 1 Tr 12-18. At the conclusion of the hearing the ALJ issued an oral PFD recommending that the Commission revoke the license to provide basic local exchange service held by each of the listed providers. Notice of the oral PFD, accompanied by copies of the relevant pages of the transcript, was served on all parties on November 3, 2009. Exceptions were due November 17, 2009. No exceptions were filed.

The Commission adopts the PFD and finds that each provider listed in the captions to this proceeding has failed to meet the statutory and regulatory responsibilities of providers of basic local exchange service, and the license of each listed provider is hereby revoked.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. The license to provide basic local exchange service for each of the following providers is revoked: ACCXX Communications, LLC, ARBROS Communications Licensing Company Central, LLC, Atlas Communications, LTD., Building Communications, Inc., d/b/a BCI, CAT Communications International, Inc., CCCMI, Inc., d/b/a Connect!, CI² Inc., d/b/a Computer Intelligence² Inc., Cypress Telecommunications Corporation, d/b/a Cytel, Globetel, Inc., Group Long Distance, Inc., Horizon Telecommunications, Inc., d/b/a Voyager Telecommunications, Computer Business Sciences, Inc., IPVoice Communications, Inc., Mabel Communications, Inc., Metro Teleconnect Companies, Inc., MichTel Inc., NationsLine Michigan, Inc., Essex Communications, Inc., d/b/a eLEC Communications, NTERA, Inc., OneStar Long Distance, Inc., Pacific Centrex Services, Inc., Phone Express Michigan Inc., Premiere Network Services, Inc., Quality Telephone Inc., Suretel, Inc., Telera Communications, Inc., Truly Clear Communications Inc., Vota Telephone LLC, d/b/a Votatel, Winstar Wireless of Michigan, Inc., and Ygnition Networks, Inc.

B. The Commission Staff will work with the North American Numbering Plan Administrator to ensure that numbers currently assigned to the listed providers, if any, are properly reclaimed.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so by the filing of a claim of appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals within 30 days of the issuance of this order, pursuant to MCL 484.2203(12).

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman

Monica Martinez, Commissioner

Steven A. Transeth, Commissioner

By its action of December 1, 2009.

Mary Jo Kunkle, Executive Secretary

P R O O F O F S E R V I C E

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Case No. U-12468

County of Ingham)

Mignon Middlebrook being duly sworn, deposes and says that on December 1, 2009 A.D. she served a copy of the attached Commission orders by first class mail, postage prepaid, or by inter-departmental mail, to the persons as shown on the attached service list.

Mignon Middlebrook

Subscribed and sworn to before me
This 1st day of December 2009

Gloria Pearl Jones
Notary Public, Ingham County, MI
My Commission Expires June 5, 2016

Essex Acquisition Corp.
No Address on File
No City-State-Zip on File

WESLY MINELLA
48 S. SERVICE RD.
3RD FLOOR
MELVILLE NY 11747-

Daniel E. Nickerson, Jr.
Michigan Public Service Commission
6545 Mercantile Way
Suite 14
Lansing MI 48911

CAROL RUTGERS
860 TERRACE STREET
P.O. BOX 269
MUSKEGON MI 49443-0269