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In Re: Proceedings


Tuesday Morning Session, April 20, 2010.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: On the record. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has assigned for hearing at this time and place Case

No. 09-100-TP-CSS, In the Matter of Vondelise Jones versus AT\&T Ohio.

I'm Jim Lynn, an attorney-examiner
assigned to hear this case. At this time I will have the appearance of the parties and begin with Ms. Jones.

If you will state your full name and address, Ms. Jones.

MS. JONES: My name is Vondelise Jones. My address is the 765 Donald Avenue, Akron, Ohio. 44306.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.
Representing AT\&T Ohio.
MS. FENLON: Yes. My name is Mary Ryan Fenlon, $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{AT}$ ( Ohio, 150 East Gay Street, 4A, Columbus, Ohio, 43215.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And concerning the order of our proceedings today, as mentioned, we will hear from Ms. Jones first and then from AT\&T.

Off the record a minute.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, if you
would like to discuss the nature of your complaints and what brought you here today and so forth so we can get on the record please.

MS. FENLON: Excuse me.
(Discussion off record.)

VONDELISE JONES
being first duly affirmed, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Please go ahead with whatever statements you have about your complaint.

MS. JONES: Thank you. I have read the testimony of Kathy Gentile-Klein, an employee of AT\&T, and the one thing that impressed me is that Ms. Klein stated that I paid all of my combined billing in full or whatever responsibility they gave me to pay, paid in full, and so, therefore, $I$ do agree with Ms. Klein's testimony in that way.

On January 5, 2010 in mediation defendant AT\&T stated --

MS. FENLON: Excuse me, your Honor. Off the record, please.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the
record. If you want, you were mentioning about the purchasing of records or something of that type.

MS. JONES: Yes. On January 5, 2010 in mediation, Defendant AT\&T stated that AT\&T landline bought Plaintiff's AT\&T wireless account from the AT\&T department.

MS. FENLON: Make a motion to strike.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. What we want to focus on is what the nature of your complaint is.

MS. JONES: This is.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: But don't include what was said on January 5, which apparently that is the date of the settlement conference.

Is that correct?
MS. FENLON: Correct.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If you leave out of the discussion what was said at the settlement conference. Here at the hearing we are starting with a clean record. We want to hear why you filed the complaint, what the details of it are. Anything that
was brought up at the settlement conference we don't get into that here at the hearing itself.

So I agree to that motion to strike any references to what was said at the conference.

But please continue.
MS. JONES: Okay. AT\&T landline said that they inherited the responsibility to collect \$481 from Plaintiff Vondelise Jones $\$ 481$ that was supposedly attached to Plaintiff's wireless account. Plaintiff states she is here to prove that the \$481 --

MS. FENLON: Do you need a moment? MS. JONES: Yes. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record. (Discussion off record.) THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

MS. JONES: Plaintiff states that she is here to prove that the $\$ 481$ is her credits and not her debits and that AT\&T landline is using AT\&T wireless as a decoy to keep the Public Utilities from properly looking into her case.

Let's examine the January-February 2008 landline account. Her credits are \$76.25, $\$ 57.03$ credit, $\$ 5$ credit. So we want to go into the

January-February 2008 bill. Now, if you take -let's look at the current charges. Okay. The current charges is $\$ 122.88$. All right. And look at -- AT\&T took the least of Plaintiff's credits, which is $\$ 5$, a $\$ 5$ credit, and subtracted the $\$ 5$ credit and got a lesser amount due, which is the \$117.88.

MS. FENLON: Can we mark that as Jones
Exhibit 1?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, let's do that. When your testimony is completed, we will make sure that the reporter has copy of the bills you are referring to and that can be entered into the record. That will be Jones Exhibit 1.

MS. JONES: Okay. And her debit became -- excuse me -- of her debit because of the -she got a lesser amount due, which is the $\$ 117.88$ of her debit because of her $\$ 5$ credit. And she paid the balance in full, which is $\$ 118$, leaving a 12-cent credit to her use and to her advantage.

So what I'm saying is this. If that was a credit to AT\&T landline, it would surely not take away and lessen my debits if it was a credit to. I'm talking about if it was my credit. It wasn't a credit for AT\&T landline or AT\&T wireless. A credit
is a credit to the customer and not to the company. The waywards of mathematics just don't change like that. And I did the math. It was $\$ 122$ current charges minus the Plaintiff's \$5 credit, and that brought a balance to $\$ 117.88$, and, as I said, I paid that in full.

MS. FENLON: That's Exhibit 2? Are we on Exhibit 2?

MS. JONES: We are still on Exhibit 1. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are still on Exhibit 1.

MS. JONES: Then I got a 12-cent credit because I overpaid, in other words, by 12 cents.

Now, let's look at another, at the landline billing October-November 2008.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call this Jones Exhibit 2 then.

MS. JONES: Okay. Exhibit 2.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What months does
Exhibit 2 cover, ma'am?
MS. JONES: Exhibit 2 covers October 26
to November 25, 2008. Again, we are talking at Plaintiff's credits.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.
MS. JONES: Now, there are several
credits -- can I back up a little bit?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes.

MS. JONES: I want to go back to
Exhibit 1 because $I$ want to really make it plain here. Plaintiff has several credits on the January-February, January 26 to February 25, billing, and those credits are $\$ 76.25 . \quad$ I believe $I$ repeated that before.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can mention it again.

MS. JONES: Okay. And a \$57.03 credit, and there's a $\$ 5$ credit, that's what $I$ wanted to cover.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's all for
Exhibit 1 . Now you want to move on to another exhibit; am I correct?

MS. JONES: Yes. I have a question. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. MS. JONES: Where is the judge? THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's myself, ma'am.

MS. JONES: You are the judge?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes.

MS. JONES: I thought there would be another.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off record.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the
record.

Ms. Jones, do you want to move on to a new exhibit?

MS. JONES: Exhibit 2.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Could you tell me again, that covers the months October 26 through November 25 of 2008 , correct?

MS. JONES: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: Okay. Now, again, there are several credits on this particular bill, and the credits are a $\$ 50$ credit, a $\$ 481.10$ credit, a $\$ 30.98$ credit, and of course, there's current charges.

Now, again, AT\&T landline took the least of Plaintiff Vondelise Jones' credits, the least, which is the $\$ 30.98$. They took the current charges and subtracted the current charges from the $\$ 30.98$. And then that brought a \$11.04 credit because it didn't take up all of that particular credit.

So how can -- just a moment. I got an $\$ 11.04$ credit from that, and at the bottom of the
bill, not the exact bottom of the bill but below the balance, there's a statement here that says, "Payment not required." I have $\$ 11.04$ credit. "Payment is not required."

Okay. And I would like to move on to the third -- wait. I would like to move on to Exhibit 3.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And what is that, ma'am? Is that another AT\&T monthly statement?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Can you tell me what months that statement covers, please?

MS. JONES: That statement covers the same, October-November 2008.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call this Jones Exhibit 3. Could you tell me, since it covers the same period of time, what are the differences between the two exhibits, ma'am?

MS. JONES: The difference between the two exhibits here are, one, AT\&T gave me all my credits and they marked them as credits.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to on Jones Exhibit 2 you have some of these credits that you mentioned, the $\$ 50$, the $\$ 481.10$, the $\$ 30.98$ ?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Please
continue then comparing that to Jones Exhibit 3. MS. JONES: Exhibit 3 is where AT\&T landline took all of my credits, converted them into debits, put them over into collections to collect the same amount of money, which is $\$ 481.10$--

MS. FENLON: Excuse me, your Honor. For the record, so that there is no confusion as to Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3, Exhibit 3 has a different account number, different customer code number, 474 for Exhibit 3 versus 473 for Exhibit 2. I want to make sure the record was clear on that.

MS. JONES: Well, we're still talking about the same money, though. We are talking about the money. Forget the account number because, you know, you can give me any kind of account number but we are talking about the same money on my credits. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will take notice of your comment, Ms. Fenlon. Thank you. Ms. Jones. MS. JONES: And I didn't think that was right either, to hide my credits behind another account number. I don't think that's right. And that's exactly what you did, and I don't appreciate that.

This Exhibit 3, as I was saying, is the
same money, $\$ 481.10$ hidden behind account number 330-773-3890-434-7. It's the same date, October-November, October 26 through November 25, 2008. Plans and Services was zero. Total current charges was zero, but, yet, still this is the same money. As I said, that is kind of confusing to somebody who don't know any better.

Let's go to Exhibit 4.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Can you describe Exhibit 4, Ms. Jones?

MS. JONES: Okay. Now, Exhibit 4 displays my credit of $\$ 11.04$.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, this must be then another AT\&T monthly statement; am I correct?

MS. JONES: Yes. Did I say
November 26-December?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I was going to ask what period of time does it cover. This is November 26 to December 25?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 2008 again?
MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call that Jones Exhibit 4.

MS. JONES: All right. So now Exhibit 4, my previous bill, is an $\$ 11.04$ credit. And it states in this particular -- as I said before, there was no payments required. But the payment in this particular exhibit was my $\$ 11.04$ credit for the November-December. Okay, that was my payment, but my current charges, again, my current charges is \$32.39. Plaintiff Vondelise Jones did the math and you take that $\$ 11.04$ credit against the current charges, it brought the total amount due to \$21.35.

All right. Now, I paid that in full. I paid the $\$ 21.35$ in full, and $I$ believe that $I$ paid $\$ 22$, okay, which brought me again a credit of 65 cents. So my credit are credits. This shows my credits are credits and not debits.

AT\&T didn't believe that themselves, that these credits were debits. But they believe that these credits are truly my credits, the customer credits, because they subtracted my credits from my debits.

Now, the rest of the Plaintiff's credits, which is $\$ 481.10$, AT\&T landline converted credits into debits again and turned them over to the collection agency to again turn over or generate another $\$ 481$ from the customer and Plaintiff

Vondelise Jones.
MS. FENLON: Excuse me, your Honor, are we on another exhibit? Where did the $\$ 481$ come from?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you referring to the 481 on your Exhibit 2 or Exhibit 3? You seem to be referring to a number that is on the October to November statements, correct?

MS. JONES: Yes, the October-November.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Is that your statement that you are referring to, the one that shows your $\$ 481.10$ as a credit; am I correct?

MS. JONES: That's a credit to the customer.

MS. FENLON: Is that Exhibit 3?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That would be Jones Exhibit 2, actually shows the $\$ 481$ as a credit.

MS. JONES: We are talking about more than the \$481; we are talking about all that are credits. You know what $I$ am saying?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Right. But you mentioned that number, and Ms. Fenlon was trying to make sure what exhibit that number was on.

MS. JONES: Okay. I am here to prove those are my credits, and AT\&T agrees with me because of their actions is in agreement.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. When you say "their actions," you mean the fact it is indicated on the bill as a credit.

MS. JONES: Yes, indicated as a credit, and also it eliminated some of my debits.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. Ms. Jones, do you have any additional exhibits you want to move on to?

MS. JONES: I'm glad you asked that question, yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: Okay. Well, I wanted to say Plaintiff Vondelise Jones paid AT\&T landline more than enough money to cover her wireless account in 2008, also 2007, and that AT\&T breached their contract through AT\&T landline causing Plaintiff hardship.

Now, let's stop and look at the billing cycle. Let's take the bill May-June, June-July.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What dates and what years are you referring to, ma'am? Is this 2008 again?

MS. JONES: This is still 2008.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Can you give me the precise dates, May when to June when?

MS. JONES: Okay. May 26, 2008 to June 25, 2008.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call that Jones Exhibit 5 then.

MS. JONES: Okay. As I said, I gave AT\&T landline, which is the collector of all monies to the wireless. Now, I have a payment for June 17, 2008. And I wanted to say the way that AT\&T landline set my account up for collections, it was very bad. It's malpractice. And I'll tell you why. June I paid a credit -- I paid AT\&T landline $\$ 50$ in June.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring paid on the bill that is Exhibit 5, correct?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: It right here says payment received 6/17/2008.

MS. FENLON: How much?
MS. JONES: \$50.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 6/17 is
apparently the date that the payment was received and has a $\$ 50$ credit.

MS. JONES: \$50 credit, right, okay, and then that's in June, okay. I want to say this now. Then July there was a payment in July.

MS. FENLON: Moving on to another
exhibit?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you moving on to another exhibit?

MS. JONES: No; same bill. Let me say it like this. Let me say it was like three payments to one bill.

MS. FENLON: We are on Exhibit 5.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Still on
Exhibit 5.
MS. FENLON: Can you show me where the other two payments are on this bill, if this is where we are?

MS. JONES: Yes. Let me explain first. There were three payments to one bill. All right, first July and then the August bill was hidden. Okay. And then -- I'm sorry, the June bill, paid. July was hidden, and then the August bill, that was paid.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring again to the fact that on Jones Exhibit 5 it indicates that the payment was received June 17, and it was $\$ 50$, correct?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Then you seem to
be stating that you made on this particular bill you made some additional payments as well?

MS. JONES: Yes, July; July, which was hidden.

MS. FENLON: Where is the payment?
MS. JONES: Just a moment. July which
was hidden and then the bill was due in August.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: When you say it's
hidden, how do you mean? You made a payment in July but it doesn't show up on that bill?

MS. JONES: Right. Or the next month's
bill. That's like three payments to that one bill.
So I gave AT\&T landline more than enough money.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What you are
saying for this bill, that represents May 26-June 25, 2008.

MS. JONES: June, yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That you made several payments on that bill.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Although the bill
itself, the exhibit itself shows just the $\$ 50$ payment.

MS. JONES: Right.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are saying
you made some others as well.
MS. JONES: Right. Right. Enough to cover my wireless.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Enough to cover your wireless?

MS. JONES: Yes. It was like $\$ 150$ when it is all said and done because most of my bills were paid early in the month so it would have to catch it up to $\$ 150$.

All right. Now, then, sir --
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you moving on to another bill?

MS. JONES: Another bill.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This next bill is June 26 to July 25 of 2008 .

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call this Jones Exhibit 6.

MS. JONES: Okay.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That is Jones Exhibit 6.

```
    Off the record.
```

    (Discussion off record.)
    THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the
    record.

MS. JONES: Now, as I said, the June bill shows a credit -- excuse me, my June bill shows a credit of --

MS. FENLON: Back on Exhibit 5?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, Exhibit 5.
MS. JONES: And then July is hidden, okay?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: When you say July is hidden, in other words, you're saying --

MS. JONES: In other words, they didn't show my credit.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, as you mentioned earlier before, that bill you had made a payment in July, but you're saying it doesn't -isn't reflected on that bill.

MS. JONES: I made that payment in June -- wait a minute. Were --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: June 17.
MS. JONES: June 17.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's on the bill.

MS. JONES: That's on the bill, \$50.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And then?
MS. JONES: Then July -- that's late, June 25, 2008, that's the May-June and then July --
then June-July.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to Exhibit 6 now, June 26 to July 25, 2008.

MS. JONES: Yes. Which is exhibit?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 6.
MS. JONES: 6, okay. Exhibit 6 displays that a previous bill of $\$ 250$, Okay. But then the payment displays nothing there.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What Ms. Jones is referring to is that on Exhibit 6, you are indicating the previous bill \$250.79.

MS. JONES: And it displays no payment.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's correct, the payment line is two zeroes, zero dollars, zero cents.

MS. JONES: No payments, no adjustments, that's June 26 to July 25, 2008. But now I have a money order here to AT\&T that is dated 6/12/2008, and I paid $\$ 50$, which should have been reflected. It was early enough to reflect.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Why don't we call the money order Jones Exhibit No. 7.

MS. FENLON: Okay.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is a money order. What is the date on that money order?

MS. JONES: The money order is 6/12/2008 in the amount of $\$ 50$.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: \$50 even, \$50 and no cents.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's Jones Exhibit 7.

MS. JONES: Okay. Now, let me say this.
All of my bills are like that, where there's three payments to one bill. So I know that I have paid AT\&T more than enough because that second payment was always hidden. See, June-July and then August is hidden and here's September. I don't miss no payments. The devil is a lie. I don't miss no payments, as long as you keep me in the range of righteousness, I don't miss no payments. I pay my bills.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record. (Discussion off record.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

MS. JONES: Is there anything else you want?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Not so far.
MS. JONES: All right. I wanted to say
instead of my bills or my debits going down, they go up as though I don't make no payments.

All right. Now, and then again $I$ wanted to ask -- let me see here. By this AT\&T has breached their contract with me concerning my wireless.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: When you say "by this," what do you mean?

MS. JONES: By not displaying all of my -- by taking my monies that $I$ have paid to AT\&T and putting it towards the bills of the wireless. Okay. And my wireless, I lost my wireless as a result of it. My car insurance went up as a result of it because it went into collections.

And I have the collections, I'll leave it with you. I have all of the collections here.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones is referring to some statements from the Bay Area Credit Service.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are there particular statements you want to bring to our attention out of that stack?

MS. JONES: Yes. The statements here was Bad Debit Alert.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. Are there
any particular periods of time, months that you wanted to have as exhibits?

MS. JONES: Okay. The exhibits are -- I don't know if $I$ put them in order. The exhibits are balance due, \$481.10.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is from the Bay Area Credit Service. This is dated January 8, 2009. Why don't we call this then Jones Exhibit 8. Off the record. (Discussion off the record.) THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record. The Bay Area Credit Service letter is dated January 8, 2009.

MS. JONES: I failed to put these in chronological order, but $I$ haves one for December 2, 2008, and that particular report is an account notification.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: For the record, this is from the Bay Area Credit Service. This is dated December 2, 2008, and we will call this Jones Exhibit 9.

MS. JONES: I thought I was going to give people packages of it today. Then I have another that's dated April 20, 2009.

Bay Area Credit Service letter or statement. MS. JONES: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The date on this one is April 20, 2009.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call this Jones Exhibit 10.

MS. JONES: I have another that is from Bay Area, and it's dated December 19, 2008.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This a letter, not really a statement, but a letter from Bay Area Credit Service, and the date on it is December 19, 2008. We will call this Jones Exhibit 11.

MS. FENLON: Who is this letter from? THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is also from the Bay Area Credit Service.

MS. FENLON: It's dated when again? I'm sorry.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: December 19, 2008.

MS. JONES: And then I have another from Enhanced Recovery Corporation.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This on the top of the page, says Collection Notice. This will be Jones Exhibit 12. This is Enhanced Recovery

Corporation, and I'll call this a statement more than a letter, and the date is September 4, 2009.

MS. JONES: I'd like to make a note of it for it to be made known that how my billing is set up and how I have paid into AT\&T where AT\&T failed to transfer monies to my wireless.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: So I would like to leave that exhibit also. I don't know if $I$ have it. I don't think I left it here. I just left the money order, but I got to have that exhibit in this pile, an exhibit --

MS. FENLON: There's another exhibit you want to introduce?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Can you explain that again? You are talking about an exhibit that indicates, if I understand you correctly, that you paid your monthly statements that come from AT\&T landline, and you said I think it was something like that money was not then also used to pay your wireless account or not transferred as you said. MS. JONES: Right, it was not used to pay my wireless account. It was a hidden factor. We will call it a factor. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are searching
for it. You don't actually have it.
MS. JONES: I have it.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You do have the statement.

MS. JONES: Sure I have it. I wouldn't come here without it. No. No. I showed you already. I pointed it out but didn't tell me to put it over there.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's okay. You already separated those out in your binder. I just want to see what page you're turning to.

MS. JONES: We're going to June. All of my statements are like that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So you are referring to Exhibit 6, June 26 to July 25, 2008. MS. JONES: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So you seem to be indicating that statement as well as some of your other monthly statements --

MS. JONES: All of my monthly statements are like that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So you are contending that payments that you made to the landline were not also, as you say, transferred over to help pay for the wireless bill as well.

MS. JONES: Right.
MS. FENLON: Are we referring back to Exhibit 6?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, June 26 to July 25, 2008.

MS. FENLON: Which is marked as June Exhibit 6.

MS. JONES: But it was just the money order that was marked.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That was that Exhibit 7.

MS. JONES: Let's put the bill over
there. You said later, right?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go off the record.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

MS. JONES: Okay, let's look at April-May 2008 billing.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you happen to have that bill with you, ma'am?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: April to May,

MS. JONES: For 2008.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If you could find that, please, we will mark that as an exhibit as well.

MS. JONES: Okay.
MS. FENLON: We will mark this as 13?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You found the exhibit you were referring to?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This will be Jones Exhibit 13.

MS. JONES: Okay. With my -- concerning my wireless and my Plans and Services, okay, I got like a 60-cent credit here.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones is referring to the part of the bill under Billing Summary where it says Plans and Services, 60-cent credit.

MS. FENLON: On the 2008 bill?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is on
April 26 to May 25, 2008, that's Exhibit 13, under the Billing Summary on the first page, there is next to the words Plans and Services, there's a 60-cent credit.

MS. JONES: This particular bill I paid
like $\$ 50$ on it. I paid like -- okay. On the April 3 -- let me pull that out.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones is referring to a money order. This will be Jones Exhibit 14, a money order. This date on it is April 3, April 3, 2008, and that is in the amount of $\$ 96.46$.

MS. JONES: Yes. Okay. Now, and then the money did not go towards -- should have showed up over in -- okay. Wait a minute. That was an early enough payment to go into April.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Well, Ms. Jones, you are pointing to -- which bill are you saying Exhibit 14 should be reflected on?

MS. JONES: Hold on.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Your money order is dated April 3, 2008.

MS. JONES: Yes. And the end of that bill was April 26, so it should have been reflected in there.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So you are referring to the bill that is April 26 to May 25 of 2008. That's Exhibit 13. So, Ms. Jones, you seem to be saying that the payment from Exhibit 14 should be reflected in the bill on Exhibit 13.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's a payment of $\$ 96.46$.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: It should be reflected right there.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones is pointing to part of Exhibit 13 that says Bill At A Glance and lines for Payment Received and so forth. MS. JONES: But it wasn't reflected at all.

I wanted to go back into, well, 2007, in the year 2007, and then I'll continue on to 2008 because I think this is how the agenda ran.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ma'am, you are referring to 2007. Are there exhibits you wanted to introduce connected to that year?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you need some minutes to find those?

MS. JONES: In 2007 -- all right. In 2007 here, AT\&T, I added up my year's statement.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So Ms. Jones is holding here a summary apparently, a page that she
prepared for -- that runs from December -- I assume this is December '06 to January '07?

MS. JONES: Yes, '06, December '06 to January '07.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Then it runs all the way through November of '07 and December of '07.

MS. FENLON: Summary of her bills.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, a summary of
her bills. We will get a copy of this for you, but it indicates column of payments, landline charge, and long distance charges.

Off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Jones Exhibit 15, this is a summary page that Ms. Jones prepared of her payments, landline charges and long distance charges, and this is -- starts with a billing cycle December 2006 to January 2007 .

MS. JONES: Did you say wireless?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: She also includes her wireless as an attached page. At any rate, this is December to January 2007 and runs all the way through November of '07 through December of ' 07.

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So this is a
summary sheet, Jones Exhibit 15.
MS. JONES: And the reason why I had brought that out, because $I$ was overcharged in that year by $\$ 69.67$. And $I$ take it that these are some charges that were hidden just like the others, but I say that to say this, okay? Then the long distance charges are bogus because of the fact I had a cell phone. I would never put these on my home phone. For what?

Now, again, I say I brought this out because of the fact that these monies could have easily been put toward my wireless on the onset that it wouldn't be where it is delinquent no-how. It still could have been toward my wireless phone, but it wasn't put toward my wireless phone or my landine phone. It was hidden charges, again, hidden money, and that could have covered whatever I needed.

Okay. I want to know, though, concerning this, does it matter that it wasn't -- I mean, that's what I'm here for, hidden money, monies that wasn't applied to my bills. But I gave the money. You can see the money orders, and then I have so much time to claim that money anyway.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What do you mean, so much time?

MS. JONES: I'm sure.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I don't quite understand what you are saying. You have so much time to claim the money?

MS. JONES: No, I say it hasn't been ten years.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Since some of your billing issues came up, is that what you're saying?

MS. JONES: Yes. Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I see.
MS. JONES: Okay. I would like to take a moment, sir, for you to examine my documents, my AT\&T wireless and my AT\&T landline, for the purpose four eyes is better than two.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, are there some AT\&T wireless documents you want to mark as evidence?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Then what we need for the record, not only for myself and counsel for AT\&T, and so the Commissioners can examine them, so which of the wireless statements do you want to introduce as evidence here?

MS. JONES: All of them.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All of them?
MS. JONES: Yes, sir. And the reason being -- just before $I$ would go into that, I would like to present another exhibit.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. What does this consist of?

MS. JONES: All right.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, what we will call Jones Exhibit 16, Ms. Jones, has an image, apparently of a check, money order from a credit union for $\$ 15$. It's dated March 4, 2009.

MS. FENLON: I'm sorry?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: A photocopy of a money order from a credit union, and it is dated March 4, 2009. It is in the amount of $\$ 15$, made payable to AT\&T.

MS. JONES: And it was never posted as a payment.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will call that Jones Exhibit 16.

MS. JONES: Now, back to my AT\&T wireless statements from January 1, 2008 -- I want to say these statements are from January 2008 through --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Looks likes that is through September 10, 2008. These are the AT\&T
wireless statements. Ms. Jones, is it your preference then to introduce all these statements as evidence?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Why don't we make the AT\&T wireless statements, and these are statements that begin with the time period January 11, 2008 through February 10, 2008, and apparently they end August 11, 2008 through September 10, 2008, we will make that all one exhibit. That will be Jones Exhibit No. 17.

MS. JONES: Do you have everything through mid-September?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I have everything through mid-September.

MS. JONES: Let's see that -- excuse me.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go off the record a minute.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: After the discussion, it has been determined we will take a lunch break until 12:45 and we will resume at that time.

MS. JONES: Okay. Thank you.
(At 11:43 p.m. a lunch recess was taken.)
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Ms. Jones that are wireless statements. What we will do is --

MS. JONES: Excuse me. Can you first state the fact that $I$ have a wireless contract?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can state that yourself, actually. I'll finish with the exhibits. Then you can state what you need to about the wireless contract.

MS. JONES: All right. Thank you.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We have some wireless monthly statements here as well. I will mention quickly what months these cover.

MS. FENLON: Are we going back to Exhibit 17? We were going to lump January through September '08 together.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record. (Discussion off record.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

Jones Exhibit 17, the wireless statements, we will make a correction to what was said earlier. That exhibit begins with a statement for wireless, December 11, 2007, and runs through September 10, 2008. The wireless exhibit will be all those statements as one exhibit.

MS. FENLON: Is there an Exhibit 24, or did we stop at that?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Right now we are through 23. We will move on to some additional pages Ms. Jones has submitted. This would be then Jones Exhibit 24, a summary page that she has provided of her AT\&T payments, landline charges and wireless charges, starts in November to December of 2007 and ends in February to March in 2009 .

Ms. Jones, did you have a comment to make before we move on to the other exhibits?

MS. JONES: Yes. There were some long distances charges to this one but I didn't put the long distance charges on because I didn't really have the time before everything just shut down, you know.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: When you say shut down, you mean when your wireless service was discontinued?

MS. JONES: No. I was out doing my paperwork, and the area in which $I$ was working is closed and I had to leave. But just to let you know, there was long distance.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So there's -- you're indicating there are some long distance charges that aren't represented on Exhibit

24?
MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We also have Jones Exhibit 25. This is a statement from AT\&T. It says your account is seriously past due. This is dated October 20, 2008.

Finally we have Jones Exhibit 26 . This is a wireless service agreement that Ms. Jones has with Cingular Wireless.

MS. JONES: Did you put out the date for this one?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It is dated September 14, 2005, Jones Exhibit 26.

MS. FENLON: What is it?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Cingular Wireless contract between Cingular and Ms. Jones, again dated September 14, 2005.

Ms. Jones, having submitted these exhibits, are there any additional statements beyond what you had said this morning that you would want to make?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Please go ahead.
MS. JONES: Okay. The reason why I submitted the Cingular statements as well as the AT\&T
landline statements is because I failed to see any accumulation of debt that $I$ could have possibly incurred to constitute the $\$ 481$ accumulation. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, you are referring to a $\$ 481$ credit that's on your landline statement or combined statement, I guess it is, October to November 2008, Jones Exhibit 2 .

MS. JONES: Now I was referring to the debit because AT\&T landline said that I owed this much money.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I will correct what I said. Ms. Jones is referring to what is on Jones Exhibit 3, and that is indicated as a debit.

MS. JONES: Yes. It's an accumulated debit, but $I$ fail to see on any of my statements there was ever an accumulation.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: When you say "an accumulation," you mean bills that had not been fully paid?

MS. JONES: Right. And then causes an accumulation of debt. They're pretty much single statements and never accumulations that suddenly constitute $\$ 481$ of debt that AT\&T landine is trying to put on me and said that AT\&T wireless is demanding these charges be paid when AT\&T wireless is not
demanding anything and never have.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.
Ms. Jones, was there anything else you would want to add as far as statements go? And if not, we will allow AT\&T to ask any questions if they wish to. MS. JONES: I would like to add more. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. MS. JONES: Okay. Would you look at July-August.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What year is this, a 2008 exhibit?

MS. JONES: Yes.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are saying it
is for July to August of 2008?
MS. JONES: Yes.
MS. FENLON: Wireless or landline?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Landline.
MS. JONES: This the landline.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Just a minute, please. This is July 26 to August 25, 2008. I have that as Jones Exhibit No. 21.

MS. JONES: Okay.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are looking at that statement apparently. What did you want to point out on that statement?

MS. JONES: Well, what $I$ wanted to point out on this statement here is this, some charges that has been very burdensome to me, and these are plans that I did not ask for.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: They are what that you did not ask for?

MS. JONES: Plans, plans of the AT\&T. I guess it's their plans, $I$ don't know.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You mean service plans?

MS. JONES: Yes, service plans that I did not sign for, call for.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to that column on Exhibit 21 that says Plans and Services on the right-hand side?

MS. JONES: Well, it's the flexible call plan, the three-way calling, the automatic callback, the flexible call plan. Did you say that?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I did not mention that, no.

MS. JONES: Let me finish now. The flexible call plan service, which is under local calls, and this is a monthly service, August -- well, this is a monthly service, okay, and I'm not pointing out just this particular dated document but I'm
pointing out the majority of my monthly statements. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So you seem to be indicating that this statement then lists -Exhibit 21, which is from July 25 - August 26, 2008, you seem to be indicating that some of the local calling services that you have on this statement are representative of other billing statements, too? MS. JONES: Yes. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. And you're saying that some of those services that are listed there under local calls are services that -- you are saying they are not services you requested or were interested in. Explain please.

MS. JONES: Yes. These were services that were just put on me.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I see. MS. JONES: I'm a woman that has a limited income right now, and I would never call AT\&T and ask them to charge me if I call across the street, and with this is what that information is all about. It is the total usage or calling area A, Okay?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.
MS. JONES: And this is calling area A, and there is also a calling area B. It's like they
charge me if I call across the street. It would cost me so many -- so much money a minute.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. All right.
What you're indicating, this bill had some services you never really were seeking to have.

MS. JONES: AT\&T put that on me. I never requested that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: They never even asked me about this. This is -- I told them, you know, a lot of these charges they just showed up on my bill.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, your complaint that you filed concerned --

MS. JONES: Yes, I understand that, wireless, AT\&T wireless and landline.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And given what you just said, what is your connection between that and your complaint? Why are you bringing this up here?

MS. JONES: Well, the thing of it is that the charges here is monies that AT\&T landline is just taking -- has taken from me.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I see, all right. MS. JONES: Just like the other monies, the hidden monies they have taken it from me, okay.

And like I seen, like three-way calling, I see my dad's number on there. We don't play that. My dad don't play that three-way calling stuff. That was just something they picked out of the fact that $I$ do call my dad and his number just appears on the three-way calling.

And if you don't believe me, sir, I will bring my dad up here, sir. He will tell you he doesn't do that three-way calling stuff, un-uh. I saw his number on three-way call three times, and what really messed me up is three times that day on the 25th, three, four times three-way calling, three, four and five. We don't do that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.

MS. JONES: If you need him here as a witness, I would bring him here as a witness.

And then I would not tell AT\&T landline to bill me, it is like 1,236 minutes billed at 88 cents each.
Q. Where are you?

MS. JONES: On the flexible call plan service. I would never ask for something like that. You would have to be a sure enough fool. I mean, you got to be bent.
still referring to Exhibit 21, and there is some detail under the section that says local calls, has minutes additional, 1,236 minutes billed at . 0088 each, and that's cents.

MS. JONES: And there's lots. The whole thing, the whole section of local calls, un-uh, I would never tell them to put that on me. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. MS. JONES: I would never call them and tell them to put that on. As a matter of fact, I don't know what their business is, but that ain't none of my business right there.

MS. FENLON: Your Honor, I am trying to find out what the purpose of the testimony is. If it is that she didn't want the plan, to make this move a little bit quicker, we are willing to do the math, the difference, we will take that flexible call plan off and recalculate it as if it was just a one-line residential flat rate. That's easy enough to do. So let's just move on that way. We don't have to go through every piece of it. We are willing to do that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, when you are stating, making these comments, again, I was asking earlier, your original comment concerned the
link between the wireline and the wireless billing and that you felt that you --

MS. JONES: The landline you mean?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Landline and wireless, you're correct.

MS. JONES: That's inconsistent with the landline.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What you are indicating here, what was your main purpose in brining up this point about these various kinds of services? If you could summarize it quickly. We need time to allow AT\&T to testify also.

MS. JONES: Okay. My main reason for bringing that up is because of the fact that, number one, I didn't order that service.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: That was put on me. I asked them to take it off. They said I can't.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: That's what they told me, so therefore it remained. But the thing of it is, this here, it's like them taking money from me like they have done concerning -- like AT\&T has done concerning their malpractice of billings.

MS. FENLON: Your Honor, I move to strike
that last statement.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll agree with that.

Again, Ms. Jones, basically what you are saying is --

MS. JONES: That is bad practice.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are not going to get into that issue. Your issue is you seem to be saying that some of these service plans were things you did not ask for or seek, that you were not interested in.

MS. JONES: None of this.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If that's the main point, then that's the bottom line.

MS. JONES: Excuse me. None of this, none of this, I didn't ask for none of this here. Flexible calling, you name them all, three-way calling.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, we will go on the assumption many of the things you indicated on Exhibit 21 are services you were not seeking and that's the main point you are interested in making.

MS. JONES: Now, these are services that I didn't order.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's what I'm saying.

MS. FENLON: The record is very clear. Let's move on.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, could we move on? Is there anything else you might have to say on your complaint? If not, we will allow AT\&T some time to ask questions and have testimony.

MS. JONES: Let me say this, my whole entire phone service with AT\&T is disturbed, just like that. Okay?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
MS. JONES: Let's see here.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are there any other comments you would like to make as far as a closing statement or two? And then we will allow some questions to be asked by AT\&T if they have any.

MS. JONES: Okay. Hold on one moment. Now, let me say this, though, because it's on my mind to say it, that $I$ had a plan with AT\&T and AT\&T messed up the plan. Okay? Like three-way calling, call waiting --

MS. FENLON: This is already on the record. If there is a question of flexible calling and you didn't order it, AT\&T accepts that and we
will deal with that and make the appropriate reductions from the amount owed. We will accept that, although I will allow my witness to put on evidence that it was ordered.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones, I think you made your point very well and very clearly as far as some of these services that appeared on your bill that you never really were interested in. In the interest of fairness to everyone, we need to allow time for AT\&T to ask you questions and for them to present their witnesses as well and allow you to get home at a reasonable hour. So is there anything additional you want to state very briefly and then we must move on to other parts of the proceedings here?

MS. JONES: I believe I'm done.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. Thank you Ms. Jones.

Before you close, Ms. Fenlon, is there anything you want to ask of Ms. Jones --

MS. FENLON: No.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: -- based on her testimony. You have no questions?

MS. FENLON: No. I will be putting my witness on.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Fine.

Ms. Jones, in that case we can allow
AT\&T's witness to make her statements, and then you will have a chance to ask her questions.

MS. JONES: Well, I have one more statement to make.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.
MS. JONES: I am here for litigation. You know that, right?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes.
MS. JONES: I'm here for punitive damages. You know that, right?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Right.
MS. JONES: Because my contract was broken by AT\&T and it caused my life to be miserable and, like I said, it caused my insurances to go up, my premiums to go up, and also the monies that was taken from me, I'm here for punitive damages. I'm not interested in you taking off stuff. I'm not interested. I'm not there. I'm here for punitive damages. That's how I want it judged, and I'm not accepting anything else so don't bring it to me. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. Ms. Jones, thank you for all your statements and your exhibits. If you would like to do so, you can move that all the exhibits be admitted into evidence.

MS. JONES: Yes. And I move that all of
my exhibits be moved into evidence --
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
Ms. Fenlon, any objection?

MS. JONES: -- against AT\&T.
MS. FENLON: No objection.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No objection,
Okay. Thank you.
(Recess taken.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

KATHLEEN M. GENTILE-KLEIN
being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Ms. Fenlon:
Q. Please state your name.
A. My name is Kathleen M. Gentile-Klein.
Q. Your address.
A. 45 Erieview Plaza, Room 1500, Cleveland, Ohio, 44114.
Q. What is your title?
A. I'm an area manager in regulatory
relations.
Q. I hand you what has been marked as AT\&T Exhibit 1. Does this look familiar to you?
A. Yes. That's my prefiled testimony.
Q. Your prefiled testimony, which was marked as confidential; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MS. FENLON: And AT\&T has been advised
that the Plaintiff does not need to keep anything confidential, so AT\&T is willing to resubmit the prefiled testimony with the confidential designations removed at a later point in time after this hearing. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I have no disagreement with that unless we consider AT\&T Exhibit 1, I take it it's your only exhibit.

MS. FENLON: Correct, right now.
Attached to that Exhibit 1 are a number of
attachments and letter attachments and some are
marked confidential, and we move those and will
resubmit those and as well remove the confidential designation I'm sorry.
Q. Ms. Gentile-Klein, I understand that there are a couple changes you want to make to your testimony; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Where is the first one?
A. It's on page 5, the second block of data numbers, previous April bill, \$93.79, payment of $\$ 30$, the current charges was incorrect. The current charges should be \$63.48.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What page was that again?

THE WITNESS: Page 5 in my testimony.
Q. Question No. 12?
A. Yes, question No. 12.
Q. Are there any other corrections?
A. Yes. Question No. 13, again the data below the previous bill, 127.27, a payment of $\$ 50$, the current charges should reflect \$173.52.
Q. Are there any other corrections?
A. No. Those are the only corrections.

MS. FENLON: At this time I move for the admission of AT\&T Exhibit 1, the confidential version which will be changed to a public version notwithstanding any questions or objections that Ms. Jones may have.

However, in the meantime, your Honor, you have agreed to allow us to address some of Ms. Jones' questions through Ms. Gentile-Klein by having Ms. Gentile-Klein review some of Ms. Jones' exhibits and address some of her concerns, correct?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, please go ahead.
Q. Ms. Gentile-Klein, the first issue I would like you to address is Ms. Jones' testimony early on regarding her Exhibit 21, and she had indicated that she had not ordered the flexible call plan, and walk his Honor through the billing, August 8 billing, and pointed out some of the services that she had not ordered. As you recall, AT\&T had offered to credit the difference between the flexible call plan and a 1FR, however, the Plaintiff has rejected that offer.

I am handing you what is temporarily marked now as AT\&T Exhibit R, and can you tell me what that is?
A. This is a notes page from a permanent note page from the customer service records we have for Ms. Jones. On any conversations that she has with the phone company, each and every representative will put a note on the customer's account. On 5/6 I have a note Ms. Jones called in, verified her customer information, and discussed changing her package to the flexible rate package. Then she was passed to Lifeline for additional assistance. And that verification matches the bill copy for that
month that shows her services were changed on 5/7/08 to reflect that new package.
Q. That's marked right now as AT\&T Exhibit R?
A. Right. R is our attachment if you want to go along with attachments.
Q. Thank you. Now I want to go back to a few other attachments that AT\&T has that have not been entered yet as part of your prefiled testimony or that Ms. Jones was not able to enter today. I hand you what has been marked as AT\&T Attachment $N$.
A. Yes. Attachment $N$ is the final bill copy for just the landline phone service, the January 25, statement. That represents the final bill.
Q. How much is that?
A. At the time it was \$35.80.
Q. Thank you. Now I hand you what has been marked as AT\&T Attachment 0 .
A. Attachment $O$ is the January 25, 2008 billing statement that we will be discussing in my testimony.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What was the date on that one?

THE WITNESS: This one is the December 25 through January 26, 2008 time frame. We are marking
it as Attachment 0 .
Q. Okay. I hand to you what is marked AT\&T Attachment $P$ and also Ms. Jones' Exhibit 1. Want to make sure the complete and entire exhibit is entered into evidence.
A. This is the January 26 through February 25, 2008 billing statement, and we will be discussing that as well.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What period of time does that cover again?

THE WITNESS: January 26 through
February 25, 2008.
Q. Now I hand you what has been marked as AT\&T Attachment Q. Can you identify that, please?
A. This is the February 26 through March 25, 2008 billing statement.
Q. We will be talking about that later.

MS. FENLON: What I think would be most helpful for the Bench, if Ms. Gentile-Klein went through the billing history of Ms. Jones, and that would take us to AT\&T Attachment A.
Q. Would you identify that, please?
A. Attachment $A$ is the September 26 through October 25, 2005 billing statement. This billing statement shows the incorporation of Ms. Jones'
wireless account on her landline phone service. It was the first month that the wireless charges came on her landine service.
Q. I hand to you what has been marked as AT\&T Attachment B.
A. On the AT\&T Attachment $B$ is the October 26 through November 25, 2005 billing statement. I produced this record to show that the customer's total charges of $\$ 247.99$ from attachment A's billing statement were paid in full on the Attachment B. Those were her wireless charges as well as her landline phone service charges.

MS. FENLON: Again, these are all part of Ms. Gentile-Klein's prefiled testimony.
Q. I hand you what has been marked as AT\&T Attachment 1.
A. The Attachment 1 correlates that the billing from the wireless account, which the wireless account statement is October 11, 2005 through November 10, 2005 for $\$ 43.07$, was brought over and put on the landline phone bill on Attachment B, $\$ 43.07 . \quad$ There's as asterisk by both totals to show that the wireless bill charges were incorporated on the AT\&T landline phone service bill.
Q. Attachment $C, A T \& T$ attachment $C$ ?
A. Attachment $C$ is AT\&T's phone bill

September 26 through October 25, 2006 . Again, this attachment is just to show that the customer still had combined billing with her landline and her wireless service, and that her wireless totals were still showing up on her main landline bill.

And the Attachment 2 is reflective of that, that the $\$ 41.45$ from her wireless statement of September 11 through October 10 were incorporated on Attachment $C$ under her wireless statement, 41.45.
Q. Attachment D.
A. Attachment D, again, is the October 26 through November 25, 2007 statement. The previous billing was $\$ 157.73$. She made a payment of 157.75 showing both her landline service bills and her wireless bills in full on this statement, and Attachment $C$ again is just reflective of the fact that her wireless charges of 42.16 were brought over on her landline bill, 42.16, and that the customer continued to make her payments in full.
Q. AT\&T Attachment E.
A. Attachment $E$ is the April 25 bill during the time frame of March 26 through April 25, 2008. Again, this statement shows that the customer was paying her bills in full. Her previous balance was
96.34. She made a payment of 96.46. And she had a credit of 12 cents on this account. Her wireless statement reflects 64.09, and those charges are represented on the landline phone service bill.
Q. Attachment 4.
A. Attachment 4 is the wireless bill that has the 64.08 charges -- I apologize. I said it was 64.09. It looks like a nine. It is $\$ 64.08$ on the landline phone bill.
Q. Attachment F , which is also Jones Exhibit 13.
A. Okay.
Q. We will get back to Attachment F . Let's look at what has been marked as Attachment 0 , January 2008.
A. I thought for the purpose of this hearing it would be easier to just go through the breakdown of the charges and the billing on the account. Since we have a whole year of '08 in the record, it's probably the easiest way of going through this. The bill, Attachment 0, is December 26 through January 25, 2008. Her previous bill was 82.32. She made a payment of $\$ 83$. She didn't have any adjustments on the account. She had a credit balance of 68 cents.

If you go down to the Billing Summary section of the bill, her Plans and Services were \$29.82. That consists of her basic value package, which was $\$ 32$, and in that package she had three-way calling, call forwarding, call waiting, line backer, line charge, automatic callback, repeat dialing, and unlimited residential services. All of those custom calling features were included in that package for \$32.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If we could go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.
A. Back to the basic value package of $\$ 32$ with the custom calling features, she also had nonpub service for $\$ 2.20$, federal access charges for $\$ 5.39$ for a total monthly service of 39.59. However, the customer is a Lifeline customer and she does get a telephone assistance credit on her account, which is \$12.39, which reduced her monthly service charges to $\$ 29.82$, which is reflective of the Billing Summary section of bill.

And then she had AT\&T long distance on the account, but it was zero rated. She didn't have
any charges, and she has wireless service of $\$ 99.14$ for total current charges of $\$ 128.96$, which is reflective in the Bill at a Glance section, 128.96, minus the 68-cent credit that she had on her account, her total bill due was 128.28, and that bill was due by March 1st of 2008.
Q. Attachment 8 .
A. Attachment 8 was not in my prefiled testimony, but this is just reflective that the billing for the wireless account, 1/11/08 to 2/10/08 with a balance of $\$ 99.14$ was incorporated into that Attachment $O$ and part of the customer's total balance due.
Q. Now Attachment P.
A. Attachment $P$, bringing the balance from the month before, this is the January 26 through February 25, 2008 billing statement, previous balance was $\$ 128.28$. Customer received -- the customer made a payment in the amount of $\$ 76.25$ on $2 / 11$. An adjustment came from the wireless group in the amount of $\$ 57.03$, which is marked under adjustment, and that information can be found under the detail of payments and adjustments on this billing statement.

She had a $\$ 5$ credit balance. Her current charges again included her basic value package,
nonpub, federal access charges, her Lifeline credit discount. On this billing statement there was \$3.99 in AT\&T long distance charges for calls made to Cleveland, Ohio, and \$89.07 in wireless charges, leaving the total current charges on this bill less the $\$ 5$ credit she had above to \$117.88.

MS. FENLON: Attachment $P$ was your Exhibit 1.
Q. Attachment 9.
A. Attachment 9 is the wireless statement, 2/11/08 to 3/10/08, which reflects the balance of $\$ 89.07$ being incorporated on the previous statement we just discussed.
Q. Attachment Q.
A. Attachment $Q$ is another statement we will be adding to my testimony. Again, the bill is reflective of the previous balance of $\$ 117.88$. Customer made a payment on $3 / 17$ for $\$ 118$, leaving her a credit balance of 12 cents. Again, going to her Plans and Services, her basic value package, her nonpub service, federal access charges, and her Lifeline discount, her Plans and Services were \$29.88. There's no long distance on this account this month, and her wireless service charges were 66.58, making her current total charges \$96.46.
Q. Attachment 10 .
A. Attachment 10 is the wireless charges from 3/11/08 to 4/10/08 in the amount of \$64.09.
Q. Now, let's go back to --

MS. FENLON: Here's attachment 10 if you want to look at that, Ms. Jones.
Q. Let's go back to AT\&T prefiled testimony Attachment $E$, and $I$ want you to address the payment that was made on that account.
A. Right. Ms. Jones previously made a comment that she had money order dated $4 / 2$ or $4 / 3$ in the amount of 96.46 that she did not get credit for. If you look at the March 26 through April 25 billing statement the previous balance was 96.34. The payment was received on $4 / 9$ and applied to her account in the amount of 96.46 , leaving her with a credit balance of 12 cents. So we did receive the payment that she claimed that she didn't get credit for.
Q. Let's pick up again in May. This is AT\&T prefiled testimony Attachment $F$, which is now also marked as Jones Exhibit 13.
A. This statement is from April 26 through May 25. We are going to start with a previous balance of $\$ 93.79$. A payment of $\$ 30$ was received on

5/19. No adjustments on the account, leaving a past due balance of $\$ 63.79$. Again, if you go to the plan summary, this is in line with the notes we had discussed before.

It identifies under Plans and Services that the package was removed from her account. She had the line charge billed at 6.70, 2.27 for the nonpub service, the flexible call plan was zero rated. Her federal access charges were $\$ 5.41$ for a total monthly service of 14.31. She was given a credit for the basic value package that was removed from her account. She's billed one month in advance so any charges she would be credited for that were unused. So we credited it in the amount of \$14.34. The flexible call plan is based on time of day, duration of calls, and the distance of the calls, and these identify the local calling A calling areas and minutes of usage during the different time frames giving the total amount of 5.79. And then there were pay per use charges on the account, auto callback, which is dialing star 69, and also -- this one just has the auto callback charges, which is dialing star 69.

Now, then there were the wireless charges are $\$ 64.08$. So if you subtract the 60 cents in
credits that she incurred from her basic plan because of her Lifeline discount and then the credits from removing this package off of her account, we gave her 60 cents credit balance, and then you add the wireless charges to that, but then you also have to add in the past due charges that were not paid from the month before because of only receiving a \$30 payment from the customer, her new balance for this month is 127.27.

The Attachment 5 is the wireless
statement reflecting the $\$ 64.08$-- I should have Attachment 4, I think for this one. I'm sorry, Attachment 4 is the correct attachment because it just reflects the $\$ 64.08$ from the wireless statement being brought over to her landline bill, 64.08.
Q. Attachment G.
A. Attachment $G$ is the May 26 through June 25, 2008 billing statement, her previous balance 127.27. We received a payment from the customer on 6/17 for $\$ 50$. I think the previous testimony she had a money order which she made a payment on 6/12, and it is reflective on this bill on 6/17 for $\$ 50$, leaving a past due balance of 77.27. And on this billing statement she had $\$ 23.61$ in plans and service, that would be her local service. She didn't
have any long distance, but she had \$149.91 in wireless charges, bringing her total current charges to 173.52, including the past due balance of 77.27 , making her new total amount due $\$ 250.79$.
Q. And Attachment 5.
A. Attachment 5 is just reflective, this is the cellular service May 11 through 6/10 in the amount \$149.91.
Q. Attachment H, which was also Jones Exhibit 6?
A. This previous balance $\$ 250.79$, no payment was received on this billing statement. There were no adjustments, and the Plans and Services for this month were $\$ 59.76$. There were a lot of automatic callback charges and three-way calling charges on this bill totaling \$37.81. That's why the Plans and Services were so expensive.

There's 26 cents in long distance charges and \$64.59 in wireless charges, bringing the total amount due 124.61, plus the past due balance of $\$ 250.79$ bringing the new total balance due of $\$ 375.40$.
Q. Attachment 6 .
A. Attachment 6 is the wireless statement 6/11/08 to 7/10/08 in the amount of $\$ 64.59$.
Q. Attachment I.
A. Attachment $I$ is the July 26 through August 25, 2008 statement. Her previous balance was $\$ 375.40$. We received a payment of $\$ 50$ on $8 / 4$, and there were no adjustments on this account. Her past due balance was $\$ 325.40$. So then we get to our Plans and Services of $\$ 34.12$. This month had $\$ 8.77$ in long distance charges on it, and the wireless service charges of $\$ 186.38$. Of that 186.38, $\$ 175$ is a cancellation fee for the wireless services being terminated.
Q. Attachment 7.
A. Attachment 7 is the wireless statement from July 11 to $8 / 10$ showing the $\$ 186.38$ charge, and the charges of $\$ 175$ are represented on that billing statement to her as a fee -- as an early termination fee of her contract.
Q. Attachment J.
A. I didn't go over the balance due.
Q. Going back to I.
A. Going back to Attachment I, at this point she had $\$ 325.40$ past due, and her current charges are $\$ 229.27$, bringing her total amount due to $\$ 554.67$.
Q. Now, Attachment J.
A. Attachment $J$ represents the billing
statement August 26 through September 25, previous bill $\$ 554.67$. We received a payment of $\$ 50$ on $9 / 8$. There were no adjustments on this bill. Her past due balance at that time would be $\$ 504.67$. Her Plans and Services were $\$ 25.03$. She had a $\$ 1.40$ in long distances charges. The wireless charges are no longer represented on this billing statement. Total current charges are $\$ 26.43$, bringing her new balance of a $\$ 531.10$.
Q. Attachment K.
A. Attachment $K$ is the September 26 through October 25, 2008 billing statement, previous balance of $\$ 531.10$. We received a $\$ 50$ payment on $10 / 8$. There were no adjustments made to the account. The past due balance, $\$ 481.10$, with her current charges of $\$ 19.02$, her total amount due was $\$ 500.12$.
Q. The next one, Attachment L, which is also Jones Exhibit No. 2.
A. This is the October 26 to November 25, 2008 billing statement. The previous bill was $\$ 500.12$. We received a payment of $\$ 50$ on 11/5. We removed $\$ 481.10$ of past due charges and transferred them to a final account. That final account number is 330-773-3890-474-7. That is reflected in the detail of payments and adjustments. There's an
asterisk -- it's a pound sign next to the description. On $10 / 25$ we transferred unpaid charges of AT\&T of 8 cents to the final account. We also transferred unpaid wireless charges of $\$ 478.07$ to the final account, and transferred unpaid charges, AT\&T LD of $\$ 2.95$ to the final account, making that credit on that bill $\$ 481.10$. Those adjustments were not payments. We removed the charges because they went unpaid for several months and put them on a final bill.

Her local services charges on this bill were $\$ 17.41$. Her long distance was $\$ 2.53$, making her current charges $\$ 19.94$. When you deduct starting with the previous bill of $\$ 512.12$, and you remove the payment of $\$ 50$, you take the $\$ 481.10$ transfer to the final account and add the current charges, it leaves a balance of $\$ 11.04$ credit on her account.
Q. And finally AT\&T Attachment $M$, which is also Jones Exhibit 3.
A. Final account 330-773-3890-474-7, the transfer of charges is reflected under the detail of payment and adjustments. 10/25, transfer of unpaid charges, AT\&T of 8 cents. Transfer of unpaid charges wireless, $\$ 478$ 07. Transfer unpaid charges AT\&T LD, $\$ 2.95$ for the total amount $\$ 481.10$. And that final
bill time frame was the October 26 through November 25, 2008.
Q. Can you briefly explain what you mean by final bill and then what happens after the final bill is issued?
A. In this case the customer's past due charges went unpaid several months, and she became involved in what we call a bill separation where we keep her local service intact and remove the unpaid charges off of her live account and put them on a final bill.

We will send the customer a notice that she has two weeks to care for the final account, and if the charges aren't paid in full in two weeks, then the account is referred to outside collections.
Q. Is that all your testimony Ms. Gentile-Klein?
A. Yes. That concludes my testimony.

MS. JONES: Again AT\&T moves for the admission of AT\&T Exhibit 1, which is the prefiled testimony of Ms. Gentile-Klein, along with additional attachments.

THE WITNESS: $N, O, P, Q$, and $R$, and then Attachments 8, 9 and 10.

MS. FENLON: I am going to leave the
remainder of the new attachments right here. We are giving you a few to look at. If you want to look at any more, take a break.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. Let's do that. Off the record please, then.
(Recess taken.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are back on
the record now, and we will have any remaining questions that Ms. Jones has of AT\&T's witness. If you would like to ask her questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION By Ms. Jones:
Q. In the basic value package, that package was already incorporated in the plan that I had with AT\&T. Now AT\&T took upon themselves to separate that plan, to want me to pay $\$ 34$ all by itself. Now, listen, now I ain't stupid. I have never told anybody to pour it on. I can't even afford what you all put on me.

MS. FENLON: What is the question?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: State it as a question.
Q. The question is, was that basic value package incorporated -- I know it was in the
statement, but was it in incorporated as a bill that I was paying?

MS. FENLON: Was there a separate fee for that package assigned to your bill, is that your question?

MS. JONES: No. My question is this. Okay. This is the basic value package. Do you see it?

MS. FENLON: I know what you are taking about.
Q. Now, this particular package here, I have never agreed to pay $\$ 39.59$ all by itself.

MS. FENLON: You had already testified that you had not agreed to the value added package.

MS. JONES: The basic value package.
THE WITNESS: Can I interject? The basic value package was on your bill October 25, 2005.

MS. JONES: I don't care when it showed up. I didn't order it.

MS. FENLON: Your Honor, there needs to be a question on the record. That's what I am trying to figure out, what is the question, not testimony.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: A question, not a statement but a question for her as far as the value package.

MS. FENLON: This is cross-examination.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have a question for her concerning that package?
Q. Yes. This particular package, were you actually billing me? I mean, were you actually asking for money for this particular package? And then was it really in effect -- I mean -- I'm talking about, it was money -- were you charging me every month?
A. Yes.
Q. No, you wasn't.
A. Yes, I was.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I need you to
limit it to a question.
MS. FENLON: Strike after my witness
answered the question. I move to strike the Plaintiff's comments.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I agree to that.
What we want you to do is ask your
question. You asked a question about whether you were paying and the witness responded. So do you have any additional questions beyond that, just questions for the witness?

MS. JONES: No, I don't have no
questions. I got a problem.

MS. FENLON: Can we go off the record, your Honor, and explain to the Plaintiff the purpose of the cross-examination?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. (Discussion off record.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

Ms. Jones has some additional questions hopefully for the witness.
Q. My question is this, if $I$ have been paying for this all the time and this was under my billing statement, AT\&T has been paid in full.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Your question is what?

MS. JONES: Wait, wait, wait, I'm going to get there.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
Q. Why was this particular part turned over to --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones is looking when she said that particular part. You are referring to where in particular on this bill?
Q. Why was it -- why was this turned over to the credit bureau to collect it again, because when the credit bureau called me --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, your question, ma'am?

MS. JONES: Yes. I asked why.
Q. Why are you bothering me about call waiting, call forwarding, three-way calling -- no, no, no I'm sorry. Let me rephrase that, rephrase that, because I'm still coming into the question, though. I asked him, what do I owe you? What do I owe to AT\&T? He said, Did you have call waiting, three-way calling? And then, You had call forwarding, three-way calling, didn't you?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It sounds like a conversation you had with an AT\&T service representative on the telephone.

MS. JONES: Yeah, I know I'm not supposed to, but what I'm saying is this.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If you phrase it as a question for Ms. Gentile-Klein.
Q. So why would AT\&T turn this over to the credit bureau for collections if $I$ was already paying it?
A. As I've already testified in this case, you were making partial payments starting in May of 2008 and were not paying your bill in full. You were making 30 and 50 dollar payments, and your balance
kept accumulating. The payments of 30 and 50 covered the local service charges but they weren't enough to make any payments towards your wireless charges on any long distance charges on your bill and that's why $\$ 481.10$ was turned over to outside collections, because you did not pay those charges in full.
Q. Ma'am, did I -- did I receive a check from AT\&T stating that $I$ paid AT\&T in full? Didn't I receive a 15-cent reimbursement check?
A. That was after we had separated off your long distance --
Q. No.
A. -- wireless charges that were unpaid and put them on a final bill. You had regular local service for an additional two months and you paid those charges and you overpaid them, like you've done in the past by a few cents, and that's why you had a 15-cent credit refund sent to you.
Q. Un-uh.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have other questions?
Q. Okay. This is under Plans and Services, ma'am. This is not under wireless. This is under Plans and Services, monthly service. The basic value plan is under Plans and Services. That has nothing
to do with wireless. That's another part of the archives of the bill. Okay.

There's a title, ma'am -- wait a minute. Isn't there title under wireless and everything that come under wireless is wireless?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Well, it doesn't fall under wireless.
A. Is there a question?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you
trying to say, Ms. Jones? I don't quite follow you.
MS. JONES: I asked a question.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, but I'm not real clear what your question is.

MS. JONES: Okay. She said, she stated this is under wireless.

THE WITNESS: No.
MS. FENLON: What is under wireless?
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are pointing to a landline bill and it says Plans and Services.

MS. JONES: Okay. The thing, she said something about me partially paying.
Q. Say that again.
A. Our billing system is such that when you make a payment to the account, it gets applied to
your local service charges first, and then it gets applied to your other charges after that, which would be your long distance and then your wireless. So if you made a $\$ 30$ payment, it would be applied to the local charges, which would be either your basic value package or your flex call package or whatever package you had on your account.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. Your local service charges were paid in full month after month after month, even after the May time frame when you were making limited payments on your account. Your limited payments made enough to keep your local phone service, landline service on but not enough to keep your long distance or your wireless service connected. Does that help answer the question?
Q. I just need to know what happened to my payments if they didn't affect these charges.
A. Ms. Jones, you had a perfect payment history up until May of 2008. At that time you started making partial payments or smaller payments to your account. If we haven't applied any payments, as we just discussed prior, we would be happy to look at any money orders you have outstanding that weren't applied to your account, but with all the payments
we've received, they have been applied appropriately to this account.
Q. Well, I don't think so.

MS. FENLON: Motion to strike.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, we will
strike that statement. We want to focus on questions here.

MS. JONES: Okay, strike the question.
MS. FENLON: Your Honor, can we go off the record for a second.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record. (Discussion off record.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record. I have a question for the witness.

## EXAMINATION

By The Attorney Examiner:
Q. Apparently Ms. Jones was getting combined bills for quite some time, but some of the exhibits that she introduced today were a separate bill for the wireless account. When she had the combined bill; that is, her local, long distance and wireless all appeared $I$ guess on the landline statement, did she receive a separate bill in the mail for the wireless, too?
A. Yes.
Q. She did. So really when that came in, from my own knowledge, she could choose to pay everything on the landline or maybe -- how is she supposed to pay, everything on the landline I guess?
A. Because those bills were reflected on the landline, the wireless charges were moved. The wireless charges look paid. It says "payment posted."
Q. Yes.
A. But in actuality it's just the fact that it was paid because they were incorporated into the landline services.
Q. Incorporated before Ms. Jones even sent in a check or something?
A. Right. That's why I tried to do the attachment with the number associated, so you can see that the charges were moved over. And Ms. Jones paid those charges in full for three years combined billing. She paid those charges in full, so that was the basic value package and the wireless charges.
Q. For a time she paying enough to cover all services, right? She even overpaid. She did overpay. It's easier to write a check for 118 than 117.95. Those credits showed up on the bill
accordingly.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Did you have a question?

MS. JONES: Yes. Did I understand -what was your question about billing?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I wanted to be sure, you had a combined bill that showed wireless as well, not just local and long distance. I wanted to be know if during that period of time were you still getting a separate bill in the mail that reflected just your wireless usage, and the answer was yes.

MS. JONES: Was I getting a separate bill?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That was just addressed, the wireless service, and the witness answered yes. I just want to get clear in my mind how the process worked.

MS. JONES: You mean on one of these? You're not talking -- see, I'm going to tell you, it may have been, it may not have been -- I don't know -- lawful. It may be unlawful.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ma'am, are you leading to a question again? You should be asking the witness a question.

MS. JONES: Yes.

By Ms. Jones:
Q. Okay. So I don't owe you nothing now, right?
A. No, you owe us \$481.10, final bill.
Q. You know what --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Could you explain again what that amount represents.

THE WITNESS: The amount represents on your October billing statement in 2008, it showed that we transferred unpaid charges off of your account. It may be reflected as a credit to you, but in actuality we took the charges off of your bill because you didn't pay them for three or four months in a row, and then you made payments to the account but nothing went on the past due balance, and so after several months we will separate any unpaid charges off of the bill and put it on a final account, and that's what happened. That's why your bill went from $\$ 500$ down to $\$ 19.04$. There was no payments received. Those were transferred amounts onto a final bill because those payments were not paid in full.
understood your testimony earlier, the final bill had a separate account number, too.

THE WITNESS: Yes it did. It had the same telephone number but a different customer code. Her main customer code is 473-9. Her final bill had a 474-7. It's very close but it's in conjunction with the fact that charges were separated off the bill. It's even reflected on the bill it was transferred to a final account, and then you got an exact duplicate bill with the new customer code which showed is $\$ 481.10$ on the statement.

MS. JONES: Un-uh. No.
THE WITNESS: That would be Attachment N .
MS. JONES: I would like for this to be an exhibit here because I don't want them to come back tomorrow and say, well, okay, we made a mistake on your wireless. It was on your landline.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Jones is also asking that a copy of a several checks be introduced into evidence as well.

MS. FENLON: Copies of checks? One is the 15 cents.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: From AT\&T.
MS. FENLON: From AT\&T.
MS. JONES: Stating I don't owe you
nothing else forever.
THE WITNESS: On the landline account. MS. FENLON: On the landline, not wireless.

And what is the $\$ 15$ check for? MS. JONES: That's AT\&T. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record. (Discussion off record.) THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record. We have what $I$ believe is the final exhibit for Ms. Jones, this is Jones Exhibit 27. This a photocopy of a check from a credit union written out to AT\&T and then a check with a 15-cent refund check that AT\&T issued to Ms. Jones after that 15-dollar payment was made, and this is all on the same page as Jones Exhibit 27.

Ms. Jones, having asked the witness numerous questions and you have introduced a final exhibit here, is there anything else you wanted to mention or ask? If not, we will admit all the exhibits that were submitted today into evidence and make copies for the reporter and so forth. MS. FENLON: Both of those together are Exhibit 27, correct?

Off the record.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record. Jones Exhibit 27 is this page indicating the \$15 check written to AT\&T and the 15 -cent refund from AT\&T.

Ms. Jones, anything else today? If not, there have already been motions to put the exhibits into evidence, and $I$ will admit those into evidence. MS. JONES: All right.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Then we will admit all the exhibits both AT\&T and Ms. Jones' exhibits into evidence.
(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

MS. FENLON: We renew the motion for the admission of all our exhibits, included the prefiled testimony and additional ones.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I will also grant that motion all the exhibits that have been offered into evidence today will be admitted into evidence as well for the record.
(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: On that note, I believe we can close the hearing for today.

MS. FENLON: Off the record.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What Ms. Fenlon proposed here if there are any -- all the exhibits that were admitted into evidence, that will be the extent of the exhibits, except if Ms. Jones finds some money orders or checks for payments that were made that she doesn't believe were reflected on the AT\&T statements, those would be admitted as late-filed exhibits. On that note then, we will -MS. JONES: I want to submit these money orders. I have these money orders today. I'm not submitting nothing that $I$ can't submit right now. Why submit tomorrow what you can submit today. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record for a minute please.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the
record.
Ms. Jones has submitted a number of exhibits that are all checks that she said were sent to AT\&T. I have numbered them separately and I have them as Jones Exhibits 28 through 37, and on that note, Ms. Jones says she has nothing more to submit, so we will end the hearing for today. Thank you. MS. JONES: Wait a minute. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record.
(Discussion off record.)
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

AT\&T's motion is that any evidence of checks, payments from January of 2008 on, will be on the record. Anything other than that will not be.

MS. JONES: I object.
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll agree with AT\&T's statement because the bills clearly are not in dispute up through May of 2008.

Ma'am, that's my decision. We have ruled --

MS. JONES: But there's money in between there. I have to go in and get that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will stick with the decision I made because there are no bills that are in dispute prior to that time.

MS. JONES: But there's money that I paid that wasn't recorded.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: My decision will stand on that.
(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
Then we will close the hearing for the day.
(The hearing adjourned at 4:31 p.m.)

> Rosemary Foster Anderson, Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires April 5, 2014.
(RFA-8432)
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