# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

COMPTEL

1900 M Street, N.W., Ste. 800

Washington, D.C. 20036-3508,

Plaintiff,

V.

Civil Action No.

Federal Communications Commission

445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.

Washington, D.C. 20554-0005,

Defendant.

### COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5
U.S.C. § 552, as amended, to compel production of certain records relating to the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") investigation of SBC Communications, Inc.

("SBC") for violations of the FCC's rules in connection with the submission of claims for and receipt of universal service support for the New London, Connecticut Public Schools.

(FCC File No. EB-04-IH-0342). The FCC terminated its investigation of SBC upon issuance of a Order adopting a Consent Decree released on December 16, 2004. *In the Matter of SBC Communications, Inc.*, Order and Consent Decree, 19 FCC Rcd. 24014 (released December 16, 2004).

### **Jurisdiction**

This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §

552(a)(4)(B). The records which COMPTEL seeks are located at the FCC's offices in Washington, D.C. COMPTEL is a District of Columbia non-profit corporation.

#### Parties |

- 3. Plaintiff COMPTEL is the nation's oldest and largest industry association representing competitive telecommunications providers and their suppliers. COMPTEL has over 300 member companies that include competitive local exchange carriers, Internet backbone providers, and competitive providers of local and long-haul wholesale transmission service. Plaintiff COMPTEL is the requester of the withheld records.
- 4. Defendant FCC is an United States government agency and has possession of and control over the records that Plaintiff COMPTEL seeks.

#### **Statement of Facts**

- 5. On April 4, 2005, COMPTEL filed a FOIA request with the FCC for documents contained in, and relating to, the investigation of SBC in File No. EB-04-IH-0342. On August 5, 2005, the FCC's Enforcement Bureau granted in part and denied in part COMPTEL's request. The Enforcement Bureau stated its intent to withhold some of the records requested on the grounds that they were exempt from disclosure pursuant to Exemptions 4 and 5 of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(4) and (5).
- 6. On August 19, 2005, SBC filed an application for review of the Enforcement Bureau's August 5, 2005 decision to grant in part COMPTEL's FOIA request. On September 1, 2005, COMPTEL responded to SBC's application for review and asked the FCC to summarily deny the application for review. On September 6, 2005, COMPTEL filed an application for review of the FCC's decision denying its FOIA request in part. As of this date, the FCC has made no documents available to Plaintiff COMPTEL.

- The FOIA mandates that the FCC resolve appeals of its decisions within 7. 20 working days. 5 U.S.C. §552(a)(6)(A)(ii). As of October 5, 2006, the FCC has yet to make a decision on the August 19, 2005 application for review filed by SBC or the September 6, 2005 application for review filed by COMPTEL. The FCC never notified COMPTEL that it would need more than 20 working days to resolve the appeal.
- Thirteen months have passed since the FCC received COMPTEL's 8. September 6, 2005 application for review of the Enforcement Bureau's August 5, 2005 decision. The statutory 20 working day time frame for the FCC to resolve the appeal expired over one year ago. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552 (a)(6)(C)(i), any person requesting records from any agency shall be deemed to have exhausted his administrative remedies if the agency fails to comply with the 20 day time limit for resolving appeals. The FCC failed to comply with the 20 working day deadline on October 4, 2005 and as of that date, COMPTEL is deemed to have exhausted its administrative remedies. Having exhausted all administrative remedies one year ago, COMPTEL is entitled to seek judicial review.
- 9. Over eighteen months after COMPTEL filed its FOIA request, the FCC has yet to produce a single document. According to the FCC's Freedom Of Information Act Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2005 (October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005), the average FCC response time for FOIA appeals in fiscal year 2005 was 292 days—almost 15 times the statutory time limit. See "Federal Communications Commission Freedom of Information Act Annual Report Fiscal Year 2005," at 2 available at http://www.fcc.gov/foia/2005foiareport.pdf. The FCC's failure to act on COMPTEL's appeal has extended well beyond even its 292 day average response time that is already a gross violation of FOIA's statutory time limit for the FCC to act.

3

#### **Demand for Relief**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff COMPTEL respectfully requests that this Court:

- (1) compel Defendant FCC to produce to Plaintiff COMPTEL the documents requested by COMPTEL or, in the alternative, compel Defendant FCC to produce the documents requested by COMPTEL to the Court for an *in camera* inspection and resolution of COMPTEL's entitlement to the documents under FOIA;
- (2) declare that Defendant FCC's refusal to disclose the documents requested by Plaintiff COMPTEL is unlawful;
- (3) declare that Defendant FCC's conduct in failing to comply with the statutory time frames for resolving appeals of FOIA requests is unlawful;
- (4) award Plaintiff COMPTEL its costs and reasonable attorney's fees in this action as provided by 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(E); and
- (5) grant such other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

October 5, 2006

Jonathan D. Lee, DC Bar #435586

Mary C. Albert, DC Bar # 347617

COMPTEL

1900 M Street, N.W. Suite 800

How, Chille, 1

Washington, D.C. 20036-3508

202-296-6650

ilee@comptel.org

malbert@comptel.org

Counsel for Plaintiff

Document 1-2 Filed 10/05/2006

Page 1 of 26- M/8
HHK

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

(Rev.1/05 DC)				
I (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	
COMPTEL		11001	Federal Communications Commission	
			COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LI	COTTO PARTITIO AND
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		001	(IN U.S. PLAI)	NTIFF CASES ONLY) 11001  SES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF
(e) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, ANI	TELEPHONE NUMBER)		ATT	
Mary C. Albert, COMPTEL, 1900 M Street Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036		.W.,	CASE NUMBE	
(202) 296-6650	20030			ry H. Kennedy
1		DECK TYPE: FOIA/Privacy Act		
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY)		III CITIZENSI DATE STAMP: 10/05/2006		
		PTF DFT PTF DFT		
1 U.S. Government		Citizen of this State 0 1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 0 4		
2 U.S. Government		Citizen of Anoth		usiness in This State  rporated and Principal Place 0 5 0 5
	in item III)	of E		usiness in Another State
		,		eign Nation O 6 O 6
IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT				
(Place a X in one category, A-N, that best represents your cause of action and one in a corresponding Nature of Suit)				
O A. Antitrust O B. Personal Injury/		© C. Administrative Agency		O D. Temporary Restraining
Malpractice		Review		Order/Preliminary
[]		151 Medicare Act		Injunction
310 Airplane   315 Airplane   315 Airplane Product Liability   320 Assault, Libel & Slander   330 Federal Employers Liability   340 Marine   345 Marine Product Liability   350 Motor Vehicle   355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability   360 Other Personal Injury   362 Medical Malpractice   365 Product Liability   368 Asbestos Product Liability		Social Security:   861 HIA ((1395ff)     862 Black Lung (923)     863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)     864 SSID Title XVI     865 RSI (405(g)     Other Statutes     891 Agricultural Acts     892 Economic Stabilization Act     893 Environmental Matters     894 Energy Allocation Act     890 Other Statutory Actions (If Administrative Agency is Involved)		Any nature of suit from any category may
				be selected for this category of case assignment.
				*(If Antitrust, then A governs)*
				(
© E. General Civil (Other) OR © F. Pro Se General Civil				
Real Property	Bankruptcy	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Forfeiture/Penalty	
210 Land Condemnation   422 Appeal 28   220 Foreclosure   230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment   423 Withdraw		SC 158	610 Agriculture	470 Racketeer Influenced &
		2ช USC 157	620 Other Food &Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit
240 Torts to Land   Prisoner Petitions   245 Tort Product Liability   535 Death Petitions		tv	of Property 21 USC 88	
290 All Other Real Property 540 Mandam 550 Civil Righ			640 RR & Truck	850 Securities/Commodities/
Personal Property 555 Prison Co		ition	650 Airline Regs 660 Occupational	Exchange    875 Customer Challenge 12 USC
370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending Property Rights			Safety/Health	3410  900 Appeal of fee determination
380 Other Personal Property Damage 20 Copyrigh				under equal access to Justice
385 Property Damage Product Liability	830 Patent   840 Trademark   Federal Tax Suits   870 Taxes (US plaintiff or defendant   870 Taxes (US plaintiff of defendant   870 Ta		Other Statutes	950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
·			400 State Reapportionment 430 Banks & Banking	890 Other Statutory Actions (if not administrative agency
			450 Commerce/ICC	review or Privacy Act
!	A a Farral and A		Rates/etc.	

- Washington, D.C.; 88888 if plaintiff is resident of the United States but not of Washington, D.C., and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.
- CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES: This section is completed only if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section
- CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the IV. primary cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only one category. You must also select one corresponding nature of suit found under
- CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the US Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause. VI.
- VIII. RELATED CASES, IF ANY: If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.