

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of )  
)  
Kurtis J. Kintzel, Keanan Kintzel, and all )  
Entities by which they do business before the )  
Federal Communications Commission )  
)  
Resellers of Telecommunications Services )  
)  
To: Presiding Officer, Richard L. Sippel )  
(Chief ALJ) )

EB Docket No. 07-197

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV 14 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**ANSWERS TO ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S REQUEST FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS**  
**AND GENUINENESS OF DOCUMENTS TO KURTIS J. KINTZEL**

The party, by his undersigned counsel, hereby answers the Request for Admissions and Genuineness of Documents propounded by the Enforcement Bureau as follows:

- a. The information supplied in these Answers is true to the best of the party's knowledge, information, and belief;
- b. The word usage and sentence structure may be those of the attorney who in fact prepared these Answers and does not purport to be that of the executing party; and
- c. Discovery is not complete; the party reserves the right to supplement its Answers if additional information comes to its attention.

Answers

1. "BOI entered into a consent decree with the Commission dated on or about February 13, 2004 (the "Consent Decree") in connection with a proceeding under EB Docket No. 03-85."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

2. "The Companies are signatories to the Consent Decree."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

3. "You are BOI's Chairman of the Board."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

4. "You have been Chairman of the Board of BOI during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

5. "You are BOI's president."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

6. "You have been BOI's president during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

7. "You hold a 72 percent equity interest in BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

8. "You have held a majority equity interest in BOI during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

9. "Keanan Kintzel is BOI's Secretary/Treasurer."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

10. "Keanan Kintzel has been BOI's Secretary/Treasurer during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

11. "Keanan Kintzel is a director of BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

12. "Keanan Kintzel has been a director of BOI during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

13. "Keanan Kintzel holds a 26 percent equity interest in BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

14. "Keanan Kintzel has held a minority equity interest in BOI from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

15. "You are Buzz's Chairman of the Board."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

16. "You have been Chairman of the Board of Buzz Telecom from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

17. "You have been President of Buzz during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: *Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.*

18. "You hold a 72 percent equity interest in Buzz."

Answer: *Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.*

19. "You have held a majority equity interest in Buzz from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: *Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.*

20. "Keanan Kintzel is Buzz's Secretary."

Answer: *Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.*

21. "Keanan Kintzel has been Secretary of Buzz Telecom from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

22. "Keanan Kintzel is a director of Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

23. "Keanan Kintzel holds a 26 percent equity interest in Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

24. "Keanan Kintzel has held a minority equity interest in Buzz from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

25. "You are a director of Avatar."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify

piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.

The question should be directed to the corporation.

26. "You have been a director of Avatar during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

27. "You hold a 72 percent equity interest in Avatar."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

28. "You have held a majority equity interest in Avatar from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

29. "Keanan Kintzel is a director of Avatar."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify

piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.

The question should be directed to the corporation.

30. "Keanan Kintzel has been a director of Avatar during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

31. "Keanan Kintzel holds a 26 percent equity interest in Avatar."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

32. "Keanan Kintzel has held a minority equity interest in Avatar from February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

33. "You and Keanan Kintzel are brothers."

Answer: Objection; the question is irrelevant. The Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.

34. *"You are responsible for overseeing the financial management of BOI."*

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

35. "You have been responsible for overseeing the financial management of BOI during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

36. "Keanan Kintzel is responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

37. "Keanan Kinzel has been responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of BOI during the period February 11, 2004 through November 2006."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

38. "Keanan Kintzel has been responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of BOI during the period December 2006 through the present. You are responsible for overseeing the financial management of Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

39. "You are responsible for overseeing the financial management of Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

40. "You have been responsible for overseeing the financial management of Buzz during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

41. "You are responsible for overseeing the regulatory compliance of BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

42. "You have been responsible for overseeing the regulatory compliance of BOI during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

43. "You are responsible for overseeing the regulatory compliance of Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

44. "You have been responsible for overseeing the regulatory compliance of Buzz during the period February 11, 2004 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

45. "Keanan Kintzel is responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

46. "Keanan Kintzel has been responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of Buzz during the period February 11, 2004 through November 2006."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

47. "Keanan Kintzel has been responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of Buzz during the period December 2006 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

48. "You had to approve all scripts used by telemarketers to market Buzz during the period February 11, 2004 through November 2006."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

49. "You have had to approve all scripts used by telemarketers to market Buzz during the period December 2006 through the present."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify

*piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.*

The question should be directed to the corporation.

50. "Attachment A is a true and accurate copy of the Consent Decree."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

51. "The signature that appears on Attachment A on behalf of Business Options, Inc., U.S. Bell, Inc./Link Technologies, Buzz Telecom Corporation and Avatar Enterprises, Inc. belongs to You."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

52. "You had authority to sign the document appearing in Attachment A on behalf of BOI, US Bell, Buzz and Avatar."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

53. "You had authority to sign the document that appears as Attachment A on behalf of the Companies."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

54. "Attachment B is a true and accurate copy of a letter, dated December 20, 2006 from Trent B. Harkrader, Deputy Chief, Investigations & Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, to Kurtis J. Kintzel, Business Options, Inc."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

55. "BOI received a copy of Attachment B on or about December 20, 2006."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

56. "Attachment C is a true and accurate copy of BOI's response, dated January 17, 2007, to the LOI (Attachment B hereto), without attached documents."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

57. "One or more officers of BOI personally prepared the document which is appended hereto as Attachment C."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

58. "One or more officers of BOI personally reviewed the document which is appended hereto as Attachment C for truthfulness, completeness, and correctness before it was filed with the Commission."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

59. "Attachment D is a true and accurate copy of the declaration of Kurtis Kintzel dated February 9, 2007."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

60. "One or more officers of BOI personally prepared the document which is appended hereto as Attachment D."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify

*piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.*

The question should be directed to the corporation.

61. "One or more officers of BOI personally reviewed the document which is appended hereto as Attachment D for truthfulness, completeness, and correctness before it was filed with the Commission."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.

The question should be directed to the corporation.

62. "The signature that appears on Attachment D belongs to you."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.

The question should be directed to the corporation.

63. "At the time you signed Attachment D, you were the Chief Executive Officer of BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper.

The question should be directed to the corporation.

64. "At the time you signed Attachment D, you were the Chief Executive Officer of Buzz."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

65. "At the time you signed Attachment D, Buzz was an affiliate of BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

66. "At the time you signed Attachment D, Buzz shared common ownership with BOI."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

67. "Attachment E is a true and accurate copy of an e-mail, dated January 30, 2007 from Brian M. Hendricks, Attorney Advisor, Investigations & Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, to You, excluding attachments."


Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

68. "You received a copy of Attachment E on or about January 30, 2007."

Answer: *Objection; the question is improper because directed to Kurtis J. Kintzel* individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

**SWORN STATEMENT**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the information supplied in the foregoing Answers is true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. The word choice and sentence structure may be those of the attorney and does not purport to be that of the executing parties. Discovery is not complete; the parties reserve the right to supplement their Answers if additional information comes to their attention.

  
Kurtis J. Kintzel 11/13/07

Catherine Park 11/13/07

Catherine Park, Esq. (DC Bar # 492812)  
The Law Office of Catherine Park  
2300 M Street, NW, Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Phone: (202) 973-6479

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent for filing on this 14<sup>th</sup> day of November 2007, by hand delivery, to the following:

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE  
Suite 110  
Washington, D.C. 20002

And served by U.S. Mail, First Class, on the following:

Richard L. Sippel, Chief Administrative Law Judge  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room 1-C861  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Hillary DeNigro, Chief  
Michele Levy Berlove, Attorney  
Investigations & Hearings Division, Enforcement Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room 4-C330  
Washington, D.C. 20554

*Catherine Park*

---

Catherine Park

# **EXHIBIT 4**

**THE LAW OFFICE OF CATHERINE PARK**

2800 M STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037

DUPLICATE FILE COPY ORIGINAL

PHONE: (202) 978-6470  
FAX: (866) 747-7566

E-MAIL: CATHERINE.PARK@CPARKLAW.COM  
WEBSITE: WWW.CPARKLAW.COM

November 14, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE  
Suite 110  
Washington, D.C. 20002

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV 14 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

RE: Answers to Request for Admissions, Keanan Kintzel; EB Docket No. 07-197

Dear Madame Secretary:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of parties Kurtis J. Kintzel, Keanan Kintzel, and all other Entities by which they do business before the Federal Communications Commission, is the original and 6 copies of the Answers to the Enforcement Bureau's Request for Admission of Facts and Genuineness of Documents to Keanan Kintzel in the above-referenced matter.

Sincerely,

*Catherine Park, Esq.*  
Catherine Park, Esq.

Enclosures: Original + 6 Copies

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

076

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of )  
)  
Kurtis J. Kintzel, Keanan Kintzel, and all ) EB Docket No. 07-197  
Entities by which they do business before the )  
Federal Communications Commission )  
)  
Resellers of Telecommunications Services )  
)  
To: Presiding Officer, Richard L. Sippel )  
(Chief ALJ) )

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**NOV 14 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**ANSWERS TO ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S REQUEST FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS  
AND GENUINENESS OF DOCUMENTS TO KEANAN KINTZEL**

The party, by his undersigned counsel, hereby answers the Request for Admissions and Genuineness of Documents propounded by the Enforcement Bureau as follows:

- a. The information supplied in these Answers is true to the best of the party's knowledge, information, and belief;
- b. The word usage and sentence structure may be those of the attorney who in fact prepared these Answers and does not purport to be that of the executing party; and
- c. Discovery is not complete; the party reserves the right to supplement its Answers if additional information comes to its attention.

**Answers**

1. "BOI entered into a consent decree with the Commission dated on or about February 13, 2004 (the "Consent Decree") in connection with a proceeding under EB Docket No. 03-85."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Keanan Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

2. "Buzz entered into the Consent Decree."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Keanan Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.

3. "The Companies are signatories to the Consent Decree."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Keanan Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporations.

4. "Kurtis J. Kintzel is BOI's Chairman of the Board."

Answer: Objection; the question is improper because directed to Keanan Kintzel individually, although the Order to Show Cause does not allege any facts that would justify piercing the corporate veil under existing law, or that would otherwise make the question proper. The question should be directed to the corporation.