

## **Exhibit 8**

### Complaints and Investigations Information

1. In the last three years, the following formal complaints or formal regulatory actions have been initiated against Ionex Communications North, Inc. dba Birch Communications or its parent company, Birch Communications, Inc. (collectively, “Birch”) with respect to violations of state or federal requirements:

(1) On September 29, 2010, Qwest Communications Company, LLC filed an amended complaint with the Florida Public Service Commission adding Birch Communications, Inc. as a named defendant in Docket No. 090538-TP along with several other interexchange carriers, seeking unspecified “reparations” for entering into undisclosed contract service agreements outside of tariffs or price lists with select interexchange carriers and failing to make those same rates, terms and conditions available to Qwest, subjecting Qwest to unjust and unreasonable rate discrimination in violation of Sections 364.08 and 364.10 of the Florida Statute. On November 16, 2010, the Birch filed its answer, denying certain allegations and providing certain affirmative defenses to the allegations. On August 2, 2010, Qwest dismissed Birch from the proceeding.

(2) On February 4, 2011, Dixie-Net Communications, Inc. filed a complaint before the Mississippi Public Service Commission against Birch Communications, Inc. and Birch Telecom of the South, Inc. alleging the Birch companies have not paid Dixie-Net’s tariffed rates for access exchange services. On April 1, 2011, the Birch companies filed an answer and counterclaim, asserting various affirmative defenses and denying various allegations, asserting that Dixie-Net's bills are inaccurate and the rates are unlawfully applied. Birch also filed a motion for summary judgment. On September 6, 2012, summary judgment was granted in Birch’s favor.

(3) In March 2012, a formal complaint was filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission by Wanda Jackson in Docket No. F-2012-2295731. Ms. Jackson alleged that she

had been overcharged by Cordia Communications Corp. prior to the transfer of her service to Birch pursuant to an asset purchase agreement between Birch and Cordia. The parties resolved the complaint without Commission action.

(4) In November 2012, a formal complaint was filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission by AC Keinath in Docket No. F-2012-2334457 regarding a disputed tariff charge. The parties resolved the complaint without Commission action.

(5) In February 2012, a formal complaint was filed by Teresa Corman in Docket No. F-2012-2289544 regarding a balance by Cordia Communications Corp. prior to the transfer of her service to Birch pursuant to an asset purchase agreement between Birch and Cordia. The parties resolved the complaint without Commission action.

(6) In December 2011, a formal complaint was filed by Randhir Kapoor at the Texas Public Utilities Commission in Docket No. 39944 regarding early termination fees. The parties settled without Commission action.

(7) In October 2011, a formal complaint was filed in Texas containing allegations of slamming, but was resolved without Commission action.

2. Since 2010, Birch and its affiliates have not received an unfavorable ruling from any state commission with respect to slamming matters. In that same time period, Birch and its affiliates have received a handful of decisions from the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) with respect to slamming matters. This is a minimal number given the number of customer lines Birch and its affiliates currently serve. Moreover, in each of the FCC decisions, the findings against Birch were technical in nature. In each case, Birch provided a recording of its third-party verification (“TPV”) to the FCC to demonstrate the customer’s acquiescence to the change in carrier and Birch’s compliance with state and federal carrier change requirements. In

these cases, the FCC determined that the TPV did not specify each of the services to be switched (local, toll, long distance) or that the TPV did not specify each of the telephone numbers to be switched. Both of these are technical violations of the TPV rules, and do not evince any deliberate wrongdoing on the part of Birch or any intention of Birch to execute an authorized switch in provider.

(1) In March 2010, the FCC received a complaint alleging that the complainant's service provider had been changed to Birch without authorization. The FCC contacted Birch, which stated the authorization came through third-party verification. The verifier had, however, failed to confirm each telephone number being switched. The FCC ordered Birch to remove all charged incurred by the complainant for the first thirty days after the unauthorized change.

(2) In January, 2010 the FCC received a complaint alleging that the complainant's telecommunications service provider had been changed to Birch without authorization. The FCC contacted Birch, which stated the authorization came through third-party verification. The verifier had, however, failed to confirm each telephone number being switched. The FCC ordered Birch to remove all charged incurred by the complainant for the first thirty days after the unauthorized change.