

State of Florida



Public Service Commission
-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: January 24, 2003
TO: Kay Flynn, Bureau Chief of Records and Hearing Services, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services
FROM: Felicia R. Banks, Senior Attorney, Office of the General Counsel *FRB*
RE: Docket No. 020999-TX- Complaint of Mel Citron against Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. regarding quality of service.

Attached is a copy of the faxed letter from Mr. Mel Citron which was faxed to consumer affairs on January 22, 2003, referencing the above-referenced docket. Mr. Citron has been advised by phone that an original copy needs to be filed with the Clerk's office. A hard copy of the original should follow.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Attachment
FRB

cc: John Plescow, Division of Consumer Affairs
Kate Smith, Division of Consumer Affairs
Don McDonald, Division of Competitive Markets and Enforcement

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
00787 JAN 24 8
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Merrill Citron
1300 Funston Street
Hollywood, FL 33019
954-921-0287

RECEIVED FPSC

Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

020999-TP ORIGINAL
JAN 23 PM 3:52
COMMISSION CLERK

Regarding: FPSC 411314T

JAN 22 2003

January 16, 2003

To whom it may concern,

This is in response to your latest communication regarding my complaint with Supra Telecom about which I am quite upset.

Despite all of my efforts to communicate my difficulties and problems in writing as well as by phone, your records are apparently incomplete. This assumption is based upon the latest communication from the FPSC. The representation of the issues does not correctly reflect the reality, e.g. I was in constant contact with SUPRA as well as with the FPSC for more than one year. This is overlooked. In addition, based upon the latest FPSC communication, it appears your recommendations against my petitions ignores all of the facts and issues brought to light in all of my written and telephone communications to the FPSC staff and directors regarding the failure of SUPRA to perform on their promises for service, billing issues, and the array of service issues for which they continue to bill me. I have done my part regarding your advisements and noted, as was told to me repeatedly, that the FPSC "has no jurisdiction" in these matters with SUPRA, however, I am now in receipt, from your offices, written communication which clearly references that your office does maintain jurisdiction. Please clarify this contradiction of the previous advisories.

I am hereby requesting a copy of the taped recording of the informal hearing from October, 2002, where I clearly enumerate and discuss the issues at hand. In this tape I am told that the FPSC will listen but cannot do anything because the FPSC has no jurisdiction over SUPRA Telecom. I clearly explain that the issues were totally misrepresented by SUPRA and that the complaint was not exclusively about information calls (411 and 555-1212) but about a lack of dial tone, about my inability to make and or receive calls for weeks on end. These issues occurred before during and after the problems with the information call issue.

Specific to the information calls however, it is about the failure of SUPRA's failure to advise me until after problems arose on this one issue, that if they blocked "information calls" (which they said they could easily do but which took weeks to accomplish) that there would not be any related issues. It was apparent that SUPRA personnel did not understand what they were doing or how to do it. After the block was in place, I complained about the inability to make calls. They didn't know why there was a problem. SUPRA wrote numerous service tickets because I was unable to use my phone and they just couldn't identify the problem(s). After more than two months of multi daily

calls to their customer service area at SUPRA (each taking more than one hour to get through), Bell South called me and advised me that what SUPRA failed to do was to advise me about the effects the block would have on my service. Had SUPRA told me about the Information Call Block problems that would result, that block would never have been requested.

ORIGINAL

However as discussed and written about to the FPSC, the failures in service and was not limited to issues related to the block alone. Besides unresolved billing issues, on other occasions there simply was no dial tone, the were issues of my inability to simply use my phone which preceded this (411) issue. Virtually every service SUPRA promised me had to be disconnected because it failed to work. Voice mail prevented all inbound calls as it picked up on the first ring, on every call. When I discussed the problem with them they told me about some codes to easily control and program the voice mail features. I requested them but they didn't provide them and when they finally did, NONE of the codes worked and SUPRA staff couldn't explain why they didn't work. They kept giving me different codes. With each new person I spoke to, each gave me different and sometime contradictory information. Ultimately, after months of struggling, and many hundreds of hours on the phone with SUPRA personnel, I quest the shut off the voice mail simply because despite their "best" effort, they never were able to correct the problems. They said it could easily have been corrected but they never seemed to be able to do it. This situation alone also went on for months. Each time there was an issue, I would spend many hours on the phone with them only to be disconnected and having to retell the problems to each new (well meaning but ineffective) employee. I don't believe there was one even service with them that didn't have an issue pending. Their promise of no notice in the change over, that it would be seamless was absolutely untrue. I knew every day that there was a problem or I was unable to use my phones. The more SUPRA "worked" on my problems the worse and more they got. Even call waiting didn't work properly. Please note: during the October recorded informal conference the primary issue focused on by the SUPRA's participants was the issue of the information calls.

Your latest communication focuses emphasis on the information calls despite my previously written letters and statements and during the hearing that the information call problem represented only a fraction of the many general problems.

In your latest communication it appears there is a reference to a gap of several months where it appeared I had either accepted a settlement or ignored the situation. However, I was in regular monthly contact with your offices both in writing and by phone with Ms. Demello and more frequently (at least 6 times) with Noelia Santiago. What was accepted by me from SUPRA was the offer by phone from SUPRA'S employee and discussed with Pat Byrd, to have my bill reduced by 75% for the entire period of difficulty, because of the extreme hardship and difficulty experienced and the total lack of SUPRA service or follow through. When they failed to deliver on that promise too, it was suggested by a SUPRA employee for me to not pay my bill. The employee stated, "That's the only thing they cared about any way".

In your latest communication your letter states that the FPSC has jurisdiction over these matters. I would like to know which is fact, do you or don't you have jurisdiction. I have been advised both ways.

By the way, SUPRA is billing me as a current customer with current monthly usage charges and is billing me for monthly service.

Please respond.

Sincerely,

Merrill Citron

ORIGINAL