

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF CINCINNATI BELL TELEPHONE)
COMPANY TO PROVIDE "CALL BLOCKING" SERVICE) CASE NO.
FOR ALL DIRECT-DIALED "DIAL-IT" TYPE) 89-252
SERVICES)

O R D E R

On July 19, 1989, Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company ("Cincinnati Bell") filed a proposed tariff to establish a call-blocking option that would allow Cincinnati Bell's billing and collection services customers to block the origination of all direct-dialed calls to "dial-it" services. On September 8, 1989, the Commission suspended the proposed tariff because of concerns about fairness, pricing, and consistency of Commission policies. This proposed tariff provides that information providers of 900/700 "dial-it" type services can order call-blocking from Cincinnati Bell to be applied to an end-user's access line where the end-user has not paid the 900/700 bill.

The Commission finds that the denial of access to information providers to whom the end-user owes no debt unreasonably disadvantages end-users and information providers and therefore is inconsistent with KRS 278.170. KRS 278.170(1) provides that:

No utility shall, as to rates or service, give any unreasonable preference or advantage to

any person or subject any person to any unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage, or establish or maintain any unreasonable difference between localities or between classes of service for doing a like and contemporaneous service under the same or substantially the same conditions.

Further, KRS 278.170(3) specifically states that "The commission may determine any question of fact arising under this section." Accordingly, the Commission finds that it is not in the public interest to permit a tariff which allows blocking of all 900/700 type services to an end-user based on the end-user's failure to pay an amount owed to a particular information provider.


Additionally, the Commission has two other concerns about the proposed call-blocking tariff. As proposed, the information provider must "certify" to Cincinnati Bell that notification was given to a customer of possible call-blocking. However, the tariff does not specify what form this certification is to take.


Also, the proposed tariff states that the blocking of the "dial-it" type services will only be removed by Cincinnati Bell upon notification from the information provider. There is no alternate way for an end-user to demonstrate to Cincinnati Bell that the information provider's bill has been paid and thus have the blocking removed.

Having reviewed the proposed tariff and having been otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that the proposed tariff contains unreasonable conditions of service and HEREBY ORDERS that Cincinnati Bell's proposed tariff to establish call-blocking be rejected.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 16th day of February, 1990.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


Chairman


Vice Chairman

Commissioner

ATTEST:


Executive Director