

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of American	)	
Broadband and Telecommunications	)	
Company,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 10-533-TP-CSS
	)	
Frontier North Inc.,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) On April 19, 2010, American Broadband and Telecommunications Company (American Broadband or complainant) filed a complaint alleging, among other things, that Frontier North Inc. (Frontier North or respondent) has failed to provide adequate service as required by Section 4905.22, Revised Code. Specifically, American Broadband asserts that since 2007, Frontier North has failed to fix software problems that have negatively impacted the respondent's ability to timely and properly process the complainant's loop and port orders and corresponding local number portability requests. The complainant alleges that, as a direct and proximate result of Frontier North's deficiencies, its business has been interfered with and negatively impacted due to the cancellation of service orders by prospective customers. The complainant also asserts that the respondent's charges are in excess of those established in the applicable interconnection agreement and tariffs.
- (2) A settlement conference was held on May 19, 2010. Although no resolution was reached, the parties indicated that they would continue to discuss a settlement prior to the scheduling of a hearing. The parties have periodically reported back to the attorney examiner regarding their continued efforts to negotiate an informal resolution to the complaint.

- (3) In light of the amount of time that has passed since the filing of this complaint, the attorney examiner now believes that the complainant must notify the Commission on or before August 31, 2012, as to whether it intends to proceed to hearing in the near future. If American Broadband is not prepared to go forward or fails to respond to this entry, the attorney examiner will recommend to the Commission that the complaint be dismissed.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That the complainant respond in accordance with Finding (3). It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/ Jay S. Agranoff

---

By: Jay S. Agranoff  
Attorney Examiner

jrj/vrm

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**8/21/2012 4:00:16 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 10-0533-TP-CSS**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry requiring complainant to notify the Commission regarding its intention to proceed to hearing electronically filed by Vesta R Miller on behalf of Jay S. Agranoff, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio