STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION RALEIGH

DOCKET NO. EC-23, SUB 50

BLUE RIDGE ELECTRIC	
MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION Petitioner,	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS PROPERTIES, LLC'S OPPOSITION TO BREMC'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
V.	
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS PROPERTIES, LLC,	SUPPLEMENT REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AT HEARING
Respondent.)

Charter Communications Properties, LLC ("Charter"), submits this Opposition to the Motion for Leave to Supplement Rebuttal Testimony at Hearing filed by Blue Ridge Electric Membership Corporation ("Blue Ridge") on November 1, 2017. Blue Ridge's Motion is baseless, misleading, and a waste of the parties' and the Commission's time and resources, and should be denied summarily.

Blue Ridge's Motion seems intended as nothing more than an opportunistic and misguided attempt to smear and harass Charter. This motive finds support in the key facts Blue Ridge conveniently fails to mention, and the other facts it intentionally distorts. Blue Ridge, for example, fails to disclose that Charter served its complete responsive testimony and exhibits on Blue Ridge in the early evening of October 30, 2017, the day the filings were due and in compliance with its service obligations. While it is true that the filing was not "clocked in" by the clerk's office until October 31, the timing of the ministerial filing requirement did not have any impact on Blue Ridge's time for preparing rebuttal testimony. Certainly as counsel is well-aware, filings that are

SMRH:227119660.2 -1-

made with the clerk's office after 4:30 pm often-times are not processed by the clerk's office and publicly posted until the next day. Here, especially in light of the complications caused by the Cooperative's excessive use of "confidential" designations on virtually every document produced in this litigation, including on documents that clearly are not confidential—in addition to PDF filings being returned as "not searchable" despite being fully searchable on Charter's end when filed—the clerk's office would not have been able to process and post Charter's responsive testimony any sooner than Charter served it. Blue Ridge thus cannot complain of any prejudice resulting from the timing of Charter's filing, or any basis for its request for leave to supplement its to-be-filed rebuttal testimony with additional rebuttal testimony at the hearing.

The Motion also omits that Blue Ridge failed to serve its *complete* direct testimony and exhibits on Charter until the afternoon of October 17, 2017, the *day after* those filings were due, cutting into Charter's already limited time to prepare its responsive testimony. Unlike Blue Ridge, Charter assumed Blue Ridge's late service was the product of innocent mistake or inadvertence—not a "lack of respect" for Charter or the Commission—and chose not to waste the parties or the Commission's time and resources pursuing motions related to it.

Blue Ridge also suggests misleadingly that the parties adjusted the procedural schedule for Charter's benefit only—when in fact the adjustments were mutually agreeable and mutually beneficial. Blue Ridge further suggests, again misleadingly, that it somehow "gave up" valuable time to develop rebuttal testimony when the parties

SMRH:227119660.2 -2-

modified the schedule. It did not. Blue Ridge has the same time under the modified schedule to develop its rebuttal testimony as it had under the original schedule (7 days).

For the foregoing reasons, Charter requests that the Commission deny Blue Ridge's baseless Motion.

Respectfully submitted, this 3rd day of November, 2017.

Marcus W. Trathen Brooks, Pierce, McLendon, Humphrey & Leonard, LLP Wells Fargo Capitol Center 150 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1700

Raleigh, NC 27601 (919) 839-0300

mtrathen@brookspierce.com

Gardner F. Gillespie J. Aaron George Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLC 2099 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 100 Washington, DC 20006 (202) 747-1900 ggillespie@sheppardmullin.com ageorge@sheppardmullin.com

Attorneys for Respondent Charter Communications Properties, LLC.

SMRH:227119660.2 -3-

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of Charter Communications Properties, LLC's Opposition to Blue Ridge's Motion for Leave to Supplement Rebuttal Testimony at Hearing has been served by electronic mail on counsel of record in this proceeding.

This 3rd day of November, 2017.

Attorney for Charter Communications

Properties, LLC