COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the Matter of

THE COMPLAINT OF MRS. MARY)
BOLTON, GEORGETOWN, KENTUCKY)
AGAINST SOUTH CENTRAL BELL) CASE NO. 7805
TELEPHONE COMPANY)

ORDER

On January 24, 1979 the Commission received a letter from Mrs. Mary Bolton, Georgetown, Kentucky (Appendix "A") concerning denial of telephone service by South Central Bell Telephone Company (Company) because of a telephone bill owed by her daughter, Ms. Lucy Jackson who resides with her.

On March 22, 1980 the Commission received a letter from the Company (Appendix "B") stating, among other things, that Mrs. Bolton's service had been disconnected for non-payment and that the Company did not intend to provide service as long as Ms. Jackson continues to reside at the location and continues to owe the final bill.

The Commission, having considered the matter and being advised, on its own Motion,

ORDERS That this matter be and it hereby is set for hearing on April 28, 1980 at 10:00 a.m., Eastern Daylight Time, in the Commission's offices at Frankfort, Kentucky.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That South Central Bell Telephone Company appear at the scheduled hearing and present testimony relative to this matter.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 8th day of April, 1980.

For the Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary



JAN 24 1979

PUBLIC SERVICE

Lanuary 21, 18 Wear Sir! I don't know if, this letter will do any good, buttel saw in the desington Herald-Seader Where I could Write to this address, if you had a Telephone problem. The Droblem is that my Daughter Hast 565 telephone bel 0 Ranging over her head that is matall I her Bel . Lucy Pas had the Phone for 3or & years, and every since she has, had the Phone, she has had problemsevery month her phone till has been One Gundred dollars or risity dollars once or twice I think it Was \$78 dollars, Lung Kus always

Rept her phone biel poid, and they have had to pay the same phone twice and, she went on and paid it

to have the Phone The Those was out One year Sept 19, this year pass, Lucy had said her June bell in full and she got her July till was a 264,31 Then Dugust Bied Came in 442.99 In Sept 19, the phone was cut If. Then in October Juny got a telephone Rel for 5 14. 25 and she hadn't had a shone since Supt. And sust like Lucy would pay a fill, love month the next Month that same fiel would be on her telephone hill from Jan 77 up to June 77 Suly Ray Pail 496. 47 ope Rei. telephone. Well as you know it never leas a Private Phone that Rad that large a teleplane bill, and if some body messed up a telephone Vill like that for you all, you all hould turn over high heaven Styris Some body would look at these fiels

3

and would be honest about them they have two and 3 months Rie all in one. They would not let us have a telephone on account of July fill, but I talked to a Saw yer and he said that they auddn't Deep me from having a Phone Sufinkere because July is over 18 years Ald and am mot responsibilities for her fills Lucy is Willing to pay half of this the but 5 1/ that In nothfair because all of that hie do front felong to us ful l, don't think it is fair for her to Day a hée that some one else his tody Can look at them If Justins goldy to pake some tody suffer

APPENDIX "B"

South Central Bell

S. S. Dickson
Assistant Vice President

P. O. Box 32410 Louisville, Kentucky 40232 Phone (502) 582-8702

RECEIVED

Mr. Richard D. Heman, Jr. Secretary Public Service Commission of Kentucky Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 153P 22 1979

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Heman:

O

This is in reference to your letter of January 25, 1979, concerning Mrs. Mary Bolton of Georgetown, Kentucky.

Mrs. Bolton talked with Mr. F. L. Gerwing, on my staff, in August of 1977, concerning long distance charges on her daughter's, Ms. Lucy Jackson, telephone bill. Mr. Gerwing had personally investigated to whom the calls were made and who had placed those calls. He then talked with Ms. Jackson and she agreed that she had placed the calls. Ms. Jackson did state that some of the calls had been billed in error. Mr. Gerwing advised her to review the bill and to identify the specific calls that had been billed incorrectly. Ms. Jackson was suppose to get back in touch with us with that information and she never did.

The service was disconnected for non-payment and we have had requests for telephone service from three different people at this same location. Ms. Jackson still resides at this location and would have access to the telephone. We will not provide service as long as Ms. Jackson lives there and continues to owe us a large final bill.

If you need any further information, please let me know.

Yours very truly,

Assistant Vice Rresident