

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

		THE PUBLIC UT	2037 APR 20 PH 3:01		
Jeff Pontius,		Complainant,))		PUCO
AT&T Ohio,	v.	Companian,)))	Case No. 07-367-TP-CSS	
		Respondent.))		

ANSWER OF AT&T OHIO

AT&T Ohio, for its Answer to the Complaint filed against it, states as follows:

1. AT&T Ohio admits that it was a provider of residential telephone service to Complainant, Jeff Pontius.

2. AT&T Ohio avers that the billing dispute that arose with the Complainant has been resolved.

3. AT&T Ohio denies any other allegations raised by the Complainant not otherwise admitted.

> 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 An~ Date Processed 4/20/07

4. 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.

5. AT&T Ohio states that the Commission has no authority to award damages as apparently requested by the Complainant.

6. AT&T Ohio says that the Complaint fails to state reasonable grounds for proceeding to hearing as required by the provisions of Ohio Revised Code Section 4905.26.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, Respondent AT&T Ohio respectfully prays that this Complaint be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T OHIO

m Ferlon By:

Mary Ryan/Fenlon/ AT&T 150 E. Gay St., Room 4-A Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 223-3302

Its Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Answer of AT&T Ohio has been

served on the following party by depositing it in the U. S. Mail, postage prepaid, this 20th day of April, 2007.

Jeff Pontius 384 E. Cooke Rd Columbus, Ohio 43214

Mary Ryan Fenlon