

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
JEFFERSON CITY
November 16, 1999**

CASE NO: TC-2000-60


Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 7800
Jefferson City, MO 65102

General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Linda K. Gardner
Sprint
5454 W. 110th Street
Overland Park, KS 66211

Enclosed find certified copy of an ORDER in the above-numbered case(s).

Sincerely,


Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

Uncertified Copy:

Christopher G. Miller
606 East High Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Christopher G. Miller,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	<u>Case No. TC-2000-60</u>
)	
Sprint Missouri, Inc., d/b/a Sprint,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER DIRECTING FILING

Christopher G. Miller (Complainant) filed a complaint against Sprint Missouri, Inc., d/b/a Sprint (Sprint), on July 29, 1999, regarding unauthorized inside maintenance wire charges. Complainant requested that Sprint provide a letter of explanation and refund the inside wire maintenance charge and the late payment charge. Complainant also stated that Sprint should be required to have a customer's written permission before adding this charge instead of automatically adding it to the bill. The Commission issued notice of the complaint on August 6, 1999.

Sprint filed an Answer and Notice of Satisfaction, in Part, of Complaint on August 20, 1999, admitting that it inadvertently left the inside wire maintenance service on Complainant's account when it changed the phone number for Complainant. However, Sprint stated that it issued a credit of \$16.60 on July 30, 1999, and that this credit would appear on Complainant's bill within 60 days of the issuance date, depending upon billing cycles. Sprint further alleged that it

sent a letter of explanation to Complainant, and attached a copy of this letter. Sprint contended that it complies with all applicable slamming and cramming requirements, and that this was a simple error which was promptly corrected when it was brought to Sprint's attention. Sprint argued that there is no basis in law or fact to require Sprint to delay service to its customers by requiring written permission before services are provided or changed.

On October 3, 1999, The Commission issued a notice which indicated that the Complainant could file a response to Sprint's Answer and Notice of Satisfaction, in Part, no later than November 3, 1999. Although the Complainant did not file a response, the Commission finds that there are factual issues in dispute; therefore, the Commission will not dismiss the complaint at this time, but will instead direct that the Commission's Staff conduct an investigation. Staff shall file a memorandum setting out the results of the investigation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the Staff of the Commission shall conduct an investigation of the facts alleged in the complaint and file a memorandum report of its findings no later than December 16, 1999.

2. That Sprint Missouri, Inc., d/b/a Sprint, and Complainant may file their responses to Staff's memorandum no later than January 17, 2000.

3. That this order shall become effective on November 16, 1999.

BY THE COMMISSION



Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Vicky Ruth, Regulatory Law Judge,
by delegation of authority pursuant
to 4 CSR 240-2.120(1) (November 30,
1995) and Section 386.240, RSMo 1994.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 16th day of November, 1999.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and
I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.**

**WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson
City, Missouri, this 16th day of November 1999.**

Dale Hardy Roberts

**Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge**

