

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

CENTURYLINK,

Petitioners,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 15-1099
(consolidated with Nos.
15-1063 *et al.*)

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE RAISED

In accordance with this Court's April 21, 2015 Order, petitioner CenturyLink submits this nonbinding statement of issues to be raised in this case.

In the order under review,¹ the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") reversed long-standing precedent and reclassified broadband Internet access services as telecommunications services subject to common carrier regulation under Title II of the Communications Act of 1934; asserted authority for the first time to regulate the terms on which broadband Internet access service providers interconnect with other Internet Protocol networks; and adopted a series of prophylactic rules, including an amorphous Internet "conduct standard."

¹ Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order, *Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet*, GN Docket No. 14-28, FCC 15-24 (rel. Mar. 12, 2015) ("*Order*").

The issues to be raised are:

1. Whether the FCC's reclassification of broadband Internet access service as a telecommunications service subject to common carrier regulation under Title II violates the terms of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the First and Fifth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution; or is based on an unreasonable interpretation of the statute, is arbitrary and capricious, or is otherwise contrary to law.
2. Whether the FCC's assertion of authority over the terms on which broadband Internet access providers interconnect with other Internet Protocol networks, and its decision to subject that interconnection to Title II, violate the terms of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the First and Fifth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, are based on an unreasonable interpretation of the statute, arbitrary and capricious, or otherwise contrary to law.
3. Whether the specific rules the FCC adopted, including but not limited to its Internet conduct standard, exceed the agency's authority, are arbitrary and capricious, or are otherwise contrary to law.
4. Whether the FCC, in subjecting broadband Internet access service and Internet Protocol interconnection to common carrier regulation under Title II, and in adopting specific rules pursuant to its assertions of authority over broadband

Internet access service providers, violated the notice and comment provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy M. Boucher
CENTURYLINK
1099 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 250
Washington, DC 20001
(303) 992-5751

/s/ David H. Solomon
David H. Solomon
Russell P. Hanser
WILKINSON BARKER KNAUER, LLP
2300 N Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 783-4141

Counsel for Petitioner CenturyLink

May 20, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on May 20, 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit using the appellate CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

/s/ David H. Solomon

David H. Solomon