

I would like to vehemently voice my opposition to this proceeding (17-108:Restoring Internet Freedom). I support Title 2 oversight of ISPs and I support net neutrality. I have a hard time understanding how this subject has once again come up after several previous attempts at the exact same thing. Evidence that these regulations are needed are in that past as ISPs and mobile service providers have attempted on several occasions to favor certain products and service over others because of business deals that had been made. Some examples have been listed below:

- Madison River Communications was blocking VOIP services. The FCC put a stop to it. (<https://transition.fcc.gov/eb/Orders/2005/DA-05-543A2.html>)
- AT&T was having Skype and other VOIPs blocked (<https://www.wired.com/2009/10/iphone-att-skype/>)
- MetroPCS tried to block all streaming except YouTube. (<https://gigaom.com/2011/01/04/metropcs-lte-plans-charge-more-for-skype-and-streaming/>)
- AT&T, Sprint, and Verizon were blocking access to Google Wallet (http://money.cnn.com/2011/12/06/technology/verizon_blocks_google_wallet/index.htm)
- Verizon was demanding google block tethering apps on android because it let owners avoid their \$20 tethering fee. (<http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/31/technology/verizon-tethering-apps/index.htm>)
- AT&T - tried to block access to FaceTime unless customers paid more money. (https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-tech/post/atandt-lifts-facetime-restrictions-on-apple-iphones/2012/11/08/cbec36de-29de-11e2-b4e0-346287b7e56c_blog.html?utm_term=.49f9d2dc5202)
- Verizon literally stated that the only thing stopping them from favoring some content providers over other providers were the net neutrality rules in place. (<https://www.freepress.net/blog/2013/09/10/legal-gymnastics-ensue-oral-arguments-verizon-vs-fcc>)

Even if the ISPs say they won't do the things that these rules prevent, then why do we need to remove them at all?

-Ryan M. Deming