

Exhibit 1

Opinions of Kenneth L. Wilson in Judd vs T-Netix and AT&T

1. The T-Netix P-III platform was being used at the ^{3 institutions} ~~institutions~~ in question to provide phone service to inmates in those institutions
2. The P-III platform was providing the automated operator function to inmate phones in the form of call screening, collect call set up and associated called party interactions, and billing functionality for all inmate calls at the designated institutions.
3. The P-III was making the connection to the network for each call.
4. The P-III platform was accumulating billing information on each call placed by an inmate and periodically downloading that information to a T-Netix billing processing center.
5. T-Netix was providing a service to AT&T, not just leasing equipment
6. T-Netix was the Operator Service Provider for all inmate calls in the designated institutions
7. The Local Exchange Companies (LECs) were not providing operator services for inmate calls from the designated institutions
8. T-Netix should have upgraded its P-III platform to provide rate quotes as required by the WUTC in 1991.
9. I have seen no evidence that T-Netix upgraded their platforms at these institutions to give correct rate quotes for InterLATA Intrastate calls until early in 2001.
10. During the period when the called party was receiving announcements from the P-III platform, inmates were able to hear the announcements but were not able to speak to the called party.
11. AT&T had technical oversight responsibility for the services being provided.

