BRUSSELS

CLEVELAND

DAYTON

WASHINGTON DE VED DOCKETAGO

February 15, 2007

Via Hand Delivery

Ms. Reneé J. Jenkins
Director of Administration
Secretary of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

RE: <u>In the Matter of the Complaint of Treemasters Tree Service, Inc. v. Verizon North Inc.</u>; PUCO Case No. 07-77-TP-CSS

Dear Ms. Jenkins:

Enclosed are an original and ten (10) copies of an Answer and Affirmative Defenses, to be filed in connection with the above-referenced matter on behalf of Verizon North Inc. Given the severe weather conditions of February 14, 2007, the undersigned counsel requests that this Answer be considered timely-filed.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

Carolyn S. Flahive

Enclosure

cc: Scott Farkas, Attorney Examiner

Carof State

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file current delivered in the regular course of business. Technician POP Date Processed 2/15/07

Carolyn, Flahive@ThompsonHine.com Fax 614.469.3361 Phone 614.469.3294

dhj 536040.1

BEFORE

		RECO
		PUCENED DOCKETING DIS
	BEFORE	CA , CAF.
	TIES COMMISSION OF OHIO	DI PH 3 PAY 3 PAY 3 PAY 3 PAY SO DI
In the Matter of the Complaint of)	(C) (3)
Treemasters Tree Service, Inc.,)	
)	
Complainant)	
) Case No. 07-77-TP-CS	SS
v.)	
)	
Verizon North Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES OF VERIZON NORTH INC.

Verizon North Inc. ("Verizon"), through its counsel, respectfully answers the Complaint of Treemasters Tree Service, Inc. ("Complainant") and raises its affirmative defenses thereto as follows:

A. **ANSWER**

- 1. Verizon lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of the portions of the Complaint regarding the "service address," and therefore denies them, except that Verizon admits that Complainant is not the customer at the service address.
- 2. Verizon lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of the portions of the Complaint regarding a "low wire" contacting Complainant's truck while entering a driveway at the service address on October 4, 2006 and therefore denies them. Answering further, Verizon denies that the

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("Commission") has jurisdiction over the subject matter of and relief requested in the Complaint.

- Verizon denies that it is liable to Complainant for reimbursement for damages to its truck.
- 4. Verizon denies that it has violated the law, including but not limited to the National Electric Safety Code and the rules and regulations of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.
- 5. Verizon denies that it has provided inadequate service by not maintaining wires properly.

B. <u>AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES</u>

- 1. <u>Lack of Standing.</u> The Complaint explicitly concedes that Complainant is not the customer at the service address at issue in the Complaint. Complainant therefore lacks standing to bring the Complaint against Verizon for events at the service address.
- 2. No Violation of R.C. § 4905.26. The Complaint fails to state grounds for a complaint against Verizon pursuant to R.C. § 4905.26 because Complainant has not alleged any violation of any rules, regulations or laws that would constitute a violation of R.C. § 4905.26, which is limited to rates and services. Complainant attempts to allege a tort claim, and is therefore not entitled to relief under R.C. § 4905.26. Because Complainant has not shown that Verizon has taken any unlawful actions under R.C. § 4905.26, the Complaint should be dismissed.

As detailed in the accompanying Memorandum in Support of Verizon North Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss, the Commission has no jurisdiction over Complainant's claim for reimbursement for damages to its truck because the Commission lacks jurisdiction over such alleged injuries or to award such damages. Because the Commission has no authority to award the relief sought, the Commission lacks jurisdiction over the Complaint and the relief requested therein. The Complaint should therefore be dismissed.

4. Impermissible Corporate Representation Under O.A.C. 4901-1-08(A).

The Complaint must be dismissed because Complainant is a corporation and therefore must be represented by an attorney. However, a corporate "representative," and not an attorney, filed the Complaint. Because this violates O.A.C. 4901-1-08(A), which prohibits a non-attorney from representing a corporation, the Complaint must be dismissed.

WHEREFORE, Verizon North Inc. requests that the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice.

Dated: February 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

VERIZON NORTH INC.

Thomas E. Lodge

Carolyn S. Flahive

THOMPSON HINE LLP

10 West Broad Street, Suite 700

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3435

(614) 469-3200

(614) 469-3361 FAX

Tom.Lodge@thompsonhine.com

Carolyn.Flahive@thompsonhine.com

A. Randall Vogelzang General Counsel Verizon Great Lakes Region 600 Hidden Ridge, HQE02J27 Irving, TX 75038 (972) 718-2170 (972) 718-0936 FAX randy.vogelzang@verizon.com

Of Counsel:

Deborah Kuhn Assistant General Counsel Verizon Great Lakes Region 205 North Michigan Avenue Suite 1100 Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 260-3326 (312) 470-5571 FAX deborah.kuhn@verizon.com

Its Attorneys

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have forwarded a copy of the foregoing Answer and Affirmative Defenses of Verizon North Inc. upon:

Jeff Bumbulis Treemasters Tree Service, Inc. 7784 Spencer Lake Road Medina, OH 44256

by U.S. mail this 15th day of February, 2007.

Carolyn S. Flahive