

FILE

BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

RECEIVED-DOCKETING  
2007 FEB 20 PM 2:43  
PUCO

Steven Carp,	)	
	)	Case No. 07-91-TP-CSS
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
AT&T Ohio,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

---

ANSWER OF AT&T OHIO

---

Now comes AT&T Ohio, Respondent herein, and for its Answer to the Complaint states as follows:

1. AT&T Ohio admits that Complainant entered into agreements for Yellow Pages.
2. AT&T Ohio avers that the Commission is without jurisdiction to adjudicate the Complainant's claims regarding Yellow Pages directory listings and billing.
3. AT&T Ohio states that it is without knowledge sufficient to form a conclusion as to the specific billing problems alleged by Complainant.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.  
Technician AW Date Processed 2-20-07


4. AT&T Ohio states that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to award any form of damages to Complainant, including, but not limited to, damages reflecting loss of revenue.
5. AT&T Ohio states that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to award any form of damages under Ohio Revised Code Sections 4165.02 and 4165.03.
6. AT&T Ohio denies any other allegation of the Complainant not expressly admitted herein.
7. AT&T Ohio says that it has breached no legal duty owing Complainant and that its service and practices at all relevant times have been in full accordance with all applicable provisions of law and accepted standards within the telephone industry.
8. The Complaint fails to state reasonable grounds for proceeding to hearing as required by §4905.26, Revised Code.

Wherefore, having fully answered, Respondent requests that the Complaint be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T OHIO

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Mary Ryan Fenlon (Trial Attorney)

Jon F. Kelly

AT&T

150 East Gay Street, Rm. 4A

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 223-3302

Its Attorneys