



Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth

1300 NORTH 17th STREET, 11th FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209

OFFICE: (703) 812-0400
FAX: (703) 812-0486
www.fhhlaw.com
www.commlawblog.com

RETIRED MEMBERS
VINCENT J. CURTIS, JR.
RICHARD HILDRETH
GEORGE PETRUTSAS
JAMES P. RILEY

OF COUNSEL
THOMAS J. DOUGHERTY, JR.
ROBERT M. GURSS*
KATHRYN A. KLEIMAN
MITCHELL LAZARUS
TONY S. LEE
ROBERT J. SCHILL
LAURA A. STEFANI*
ROBERT M. WINTERINGHAM

ROBERT J. BUTLER
HARRY F. COLE
ANNE GOODWIN CRUMP
DONALD J. EVANS
PAUL J. FELDMAN
KEVIN M. GOLDBERG
DAVID M. JANET
FRANK R. JAZZO
M. SCOTT JOHNSON
DANIEL A. KIRKPATRICK
CHENG-YI LIU
STEPHEN T. LOVELADY
JONATHAN R. MARKMAN
SUSAN A. MARSHALL
HARRY C. MARTIN
MICHELLE A. McCLURE
MATTHEW H. McCORMICK
FRANCISCO R. MONTERO
RAYMOND J. QUIANZON
DAVINA SASHKIN
PETER TANNENWALD
JAMES U. TROUP
KATHLEEN VICTORY
HOWARD M. WEISS

* NOT ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA

April 3, 2015

DONALD J. EVANS
(703) 812-0430
EVANS@FHHLAW.COM

Ms. Rosemary McEnerg
Deputy Chief
Market Disputes Resolution Division
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: EB Docket 14-212
File No. EB-13-MD-006

Dear Rosemary:

I am writing in connection with the letter order you sent us yesterday. NTCH, Inc. feels pretty strongly that cost information is one key metric for assessing the justness and reasonableness of a rate, certainly in the context of a pure Title II services like voice roaming but also under the commercially reasonable standard that currently applies to data roaming. We therefore plan to appeal the discovery ruling insofar as it denies our request for this information across the board. However, in many instances the interrogatory ruling simply indicates that the interrogatory request is "denied" without any reason given. Since the colloquy that we had in the conference last week is not in the record anywhere, no reviewing body would be in a position to know what the basis of those rulings is. And while I think I can guess the basis for your ruling, I myself cannot be sure. Nor could I take an appeal challenging what I am guessing the basis for your ruling is.

I am therefore respectfully requesting that you supplement the ruling to indicate what the basis for your action on Interrogatories 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8, and the second half of 3 is.

With respect to Footnote 7, in our original Interrogatory 1 we requested roaming rate information for “each carrier” with whom Verizon has a roaming agreement, without limitation to domestic carriers. Verizon lodged no objection to that request on the basis that international roaming rates were for some reason excludable, and, of course, the T-Mobile decision expressly declares those rates to be relevant. I think you may have misunderstood from our phone call that a *new* request for additional information was made by NTCH on March 31. No such request was made. So in this regard we request a ruling based on the original interrogatory and the original objection to ensure that the ruling is based on what is actually before you.

Yours truly,



Donald J. Evans
Counsel for NTCH, Inc.

cc: Lisa Boehley
Tamara Preiss
Ande Lachance