

FILED²

Missouri Public
Service Commission

VS.

Company Name: mcl Respondent

JT. LOUIS, MO 63111

See attached letter

3. The Complainant has taken the following steps to present this complaint to the Respondent:

WHEREFORE, Complainant now requests the following relief:

3/25/04
Date

Manu Puri
Signature of Complainant

Attach additional pages, as necessary.
Attach copies of any supporting documentation.

**THE PERRON
LAW FIRM**
a professional corporation

Martin L. Perron
Maria V. Perron

♦
Missouri and Illinois

RECEIVED
MAR 29 2004

**CUSTOMER SERVICES
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

275 North Lindbergh Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63141-7809
(314) 993-4261
Facsimile (314) 993-3367

March 26, 2004

Ms. Tracy Leonberger
Consumer Services Specialist II
Missouri Public Service Commission
P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Re: MCI Account: 5CV62705

Dear Ms. Leonberger:

I am in receipt of your response to my correspondence of March 3, 2004 concerning my MCI account as referenced above. First, you incorrectly addressed your letter to Mr. Perron rather than the undersigned. While I appreciate your investigation into my complaint, I believe you have oversimplified the facts and ignored my key concerns. I was solicited by MCI to switch my local and long distance service. The representative assured me lower rates and more efficient service. They also promised there would be no interruption in any of my telephone services. These representations turned out to be false. My service was interrupted and I was without voicemail as well as other services until I finally switched to SBC.

Contrary to the information provided by MCI, I did initially contract for voicemail. This is clear from the notes I took during the initial phone conversation with an MCI representative. Several days passed without the services being activated. I contacted MCI numerous times to get the matter resolved and find out when the services I had contracted for would be activated. There was no direct way to speak to a human voice at MCI. Whenever I would call, I had to listen to a series of recorded menus and was placed on hold for several minutes at a time before finally speaking with a representative. More often than not the representative again placed me on hold in order to access my account and there were times when I was holding for more than 15-20 minutes. During these intervals, I was interrupted with my own work and it was necessary to call back at a later time. When I finally did speak with someone with any authority, I was told that my order was still being processed and that it would still be a week or two before service was activated. I waited but still no results. I made a third round of phone calls to MCI. This time I was told that they had initiated a

The Perron Law Firm

Ms. Tracy Leonberger


March 26, 2004

Page 2

new computer system and it would take additional time for my order to be processed. At this point I became thoroughly frustrated and decided to switch to SBC. They now want me to pay \$105.41 for services provided from January 20, 2004 through February 6, 2004. I do not feel obliged to pay this sum for 16 days of receiving inadequate and inept service.

I recently received a subsequent bill from MCI charging me interest for the unpaid balance as well as an additional \$6.17 for my long distance service. I am perfectly willing to pay the \$6.17, however, I continue to contest the payment of the remaining amount. I wish to pursue this dispute through your agency. I strongly feel that MCI uses aggressive sales and marketing practices, and misrepresents services thereby inducing customers to switch only to discover that the services they were promised are not as they were described. I also believe that MCI should not be charging interest on an outstanding invoice when there is a pending billing dispute. I welcome your further investigation into this matter.

Sincerely,



Maria V. Perron

MVP/dwr

cc: Lynn A. Williams
MCI Agency Relations