

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

BRIAN LONGWORTH, D.C.,)
Complainant,) Case No. 09-52-TP-CSS
v.)
CHOICE ONE COMMUNICATIONS, INC. d/b/a ONE COMMUNICATIONS, Respondent.	,))))) 2009
ANSW	
Now comes Respondent, Choice One Com ("One Communications") to answer the complaint follows:	munications, Inc, d/b/a One Communications of Brian Longworth, D.C. ("Longworth") as

1. One Communications denies the allegations of sentence 1 of Longworth's complaint on

the basis that One Communications lacks sufficient information to form a belief

regarding the truth or falsity of sentence 1 of that complaint, which reads in full as

follows:

The Health First Chiropractic Clinic. Inc., ("Health First") owned and operated by Dr. Brian Longworth, D.C. ("Longworth") in Summit County, Ohio, has held and utilized the phone number known as (330) 896-8500 for approximately 10 years prior to April of 2006.

2. One Communications denies the allegations of sentence 2 of Longworth's complaint on

the basis that One Communications lacks sufficient information to form a belief

regarding the truth or falsity of sentence 2 of that complaint, which reads in full as

follows:

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 ρ Date Processed 2/(1/04)

In 2006, AT&T was the phone company providing service to Health First under the referenced phone number.

3. One Communications denies the allegations of sentence 3 of Longworth's complaint on

the basis that One Communications lacks sufficient information to form a belief

regarding the truth or falsity of that sentence, which reads in full as follows:

Following a change of office location, Longworth contacted his phone provider, AT&T, and forwarded this phone number to the new location.

4. One Communications denies the allegations of sentence 4 of Longworth's complaint on

the basis that One Communications lacks sufficient information to form a belief

regarding the truth or falsity of that sentence, which reads in full as follows:

Longworth shared office space with Dr. Keith Ungar, D.C. ("Ungar") who was the lessee of the building where Longworth moved his practice.

5. One Communications admits the allegation of sentence 5 of Longworth's complaint,

which reads as full as follows:

Choice One Communications was and is the phone service provider to Ungar and his company, Advance Pain & Wellness Center.

6. One Communications admits that Ungar contacted it and asserted that he possessed authority to act regarding the phone number at issue, but denies the remaining allegation of sentence 6 of Longworth's complaint, which reads in full as follows, on the basis that evidence exists demonstrating that Ungar possessed Longworth's express or implied consent to the actions described therein, or in the alternative, that Longworth expressly ratified Ungar's actions as described therein.

In September of 2006, Ungar contacted Choice One Communication and requested, without authority to do so, that he be placed on Longworth's account.

Further answering, One Communications attaches as Exhibit A hereto a letter of agency (LOA), signed by Ungar, in which Ungar asserts that he possesses authority to direct a Preferred Carrier Change (PIC) related to phone number (330) 896-8500 and in which Ungar directs One Communications to pursue a PIC change for that number.

7. One Communications denies the allegation of sentence 7 of Longworth's complaint, which reads in full as follows, on the basis that evidence exists demonstrating that Longworth consented to Ungar's action.

Choice One Communications, without Longworth's consent, changed the contact information and removed Longworth's name from the account.

8. One Communications denies the allegation of sentence 8 of Longworth's complaint, which reads in full as follows, on the basis that Longworth either expressly or impliedly consented to Ungar's actions or in the alternative, that Longworth expressly ratified Ungar's actions as described therein..

> Longworth never gave the authority or permission to either AT&T or Choice One Communications for anyone to change the account name or contact information on his phone number account.

9. One Communications admits that its records identify Ungar as the only account representative with authority to make changes regarding phone no. 330.896.8500 and further admits that without authorization by Ungar, it can not comply with Longworth's demand that it release the number to Longworth. Further answering One Communications denies the remaining allegation of sentence 9 of Longworth's complaint on the basis that One Communications lacks sufficient information to form a belief regarding the truth or falsity of sentence 9 of that complaint, which reads in full as follows:

Longworth subsequently left this office location in March of 2008 and requested that his original phone number (330-896-8500) be returned to him for his own business use, but both Ungar and Choice One Communications have refused his request.

10. One Communications admits that its records identify Ungar as the only account

representative with authority to make changes regarding phone no. 330.896.8500and that

its records have identified Ungar as the appropriate account representative since the date

the number was ported to it by AT&T. Further answering, One Communications affirms

that it will act according to the lawful direction of the identified account representative or

this Commission. Further answering One Communications denies the remaining

allegation of sentence 9 of Longworth's complaint on the basis that One Communications

lacks sufficient information to form a belief regarding the truth or falsity of those

allegations, which read in full as follows:

As a result of Choice One Communications' unauthorized changing of the account name and subsequent refusal to release the phone number, Longworth has lost, and continues to lose, a significant number of patients as well as thousands of dollars in revenue.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 11. To the extent that Complainant seeks money damages through its complaint, this Commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the subject matter of Complainant's allegations.
- 12. Complainant has failed to join Complainant's professional corporation as a necessary party to this action.
- 13. Complainant assumed the risk of Ungar's actions.
- 14. Complainant's claims are barred by the doctrine of estoppels.
- 15. Complainant was contributorily negligent.

- 16. Complainant is responsible for fraud against Respondent.
- 17. Complainant's claims are barred by laches.
- 18. Complainant's claims are barred by waiver.
- 19. Complainant's claims are barred by the doctrine of ratification.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael D. Dortch (0043897) KRAVITZ, BROWN & DORTCH, LLC 65 East State Street Suite 200 Columbus, OH 43215 614.464.2000 614.464.2002 <u>mdortch@kravitzllc.com</u> Attorneys for Respondent ONE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was served upon counsel for complainant by depositing the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows, this 11th day of February, 2009.

Thomas A. Skidmore, Esq. One Cascade Plaza 12th Floor Akron, OH 44308

Michael D. Dortch

31/2	2006	13:5	54	33064	4 929 2				CENT	ER FO	DR NAT	TURAL	. М				PAGE	04	
00	T. 30.	2006	3:04	РМ	CHOICE	ONE							ł	VO. 43	}4	Ρ,	5		
							LETT	er oi	F AGEN	VCY									I
I.	Sub	scriber	's billin	g name	1	. / .	k	ß		1× ,									
2.	Sut	scriber	's billin	g addre	for 1 BB: G. AS	var Leng	ura tes		lede J	<u>an</u>	ne 1		P 4	4	43	22)	-	
3.	Back	teleph 330	~		be covere				urier ch <i>896</i>				numba	t8):				_	r
E	oiei	A.	Numl	eu:	330 - Z	45-	, 1729	. 330	' - 47S	-000	5.3	/ 130-	475-	· đu s	ræ.	3.X	644	- /1/4	2). G ^{9.}
4.	By:	submitt	ing this	LOA,)	<u>330 - 2</u> 330 330	- 64 . 643	4 - 72 F- 740	490 j 109	530-	644	- 929	873	30-4	44,	-929	72,	\$30-4	45-,	200
	auth	lorize C '') to ac	holee ()ne Car	nmunicat for the pu	ions Ir	ic. and/	or its s	ubaidiar	ics and	Vor aut	horiza	id ager	nts (co	liecti	vely	"Choice		
В.	wan	rant the		free of e this L	f any this OA:	d-parl	y oblig	ation p	reventii	ng me	from (ioing	80, ar	ud tha	t I hs	iva t	he legal		
Ċ.		· · ·			e my pref	erred (arrier:												

14

4

,

현

- D. understand that only one carrier may be designated as my interstate or interLATA preferred interexchange carrier for any one telephone number;
- E. understand that Choice One, my preferred carrier, will be the carrier directly setting my rates:
- F. authorize Choice One to notify all appropriate parties, including my current local and/or long distance telephone company(ies), of this decision and to make the necessary changes for my current and future services without further permission;
- G. direct my chosen intraLATA and/or intrastate/interstate/international long distance company(ies), if not Cholce One, to comply with Choice One's current applicable access tariff(s). Choice One may obtain any records from my local, data, Internet, intraLATA long distance, and/or intrastate/interstate/international long distance phone company(ios) necessary to provide these services;
- H. may be charged a tariffed fee for changing my long distance and/or local phone company(ies), and I understand that I may inquire of Choice One what fees, if any, will apply to these changes;
- I. authorize Choice One and/or its authorized agents to make any and all inquiries necessary for the purpose of obtaining credit information.

	Client Name; KEATH S. UNDAS
Ŷ	Client Authorized Signature:
v	Print Name & Title: 16-ETTAS. Chigane Fes