

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

cc 94-129

From: Paul Southern, M.D. <southern.paul@pathology.swmed.edu>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/6/97 7:19pm
Subject: getting "unslammed"

Having been a recent victim of slamming, I attempted to get the situation remedied, and to find out how it happened in the first place. I have found that both are difficult. If someone can slam you without your knowledge or approval, how is it that it is not similarly easy to get "unslammed"? Let's get this practice stopped. Thanks! P. Southern

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Wed, 6 Aug 97 18:18:29 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id SAA16379; Wed, 6 Aug 1997 18:19:29 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from pathology.swmed.edu(129.112.20.7) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma016376; Wed, 6 Aug 97 18:19:21 -0400
Received: from [129.112.26.52] by pathology.swmed.edu
with SMTP (Eudora Internet Mail Server 1.2); Wed, 6 Aug 1997 17:20:15 -0500
Message-Id: <v01540b01b00eb5c53fff@[129.112.26.52]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 1997 17:19:36 -0600
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
From: southern.paul@pathology.swmed.edu (Paul Southern, M.D.)
Subject: getting "unslammed"

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

From: Paul Merideth <paulmojo@interaccess.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/6/97 1:28pm
Subject: ?

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I was slammed by AT&T about two months ago. This has caused me an incredible amount of grief to get things back the way they were. I have asked AT&T to supply me with the name of the person who authorized the switching of my service. (I am the only person on the account, and therefore the only one able to switch services and I did not give authorization for this.) Now, more than two months later, I still have no answers from AT&T. I have called several times. This whole process has not only cost me time and hassle, but also money. If you want to hear the whole story please contact me for further information.

Sincerely,
Paul Merideth

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Wed, 6 Aug 97 13:21:31 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id NAA09575; Wed, 6 Aug 1997 13:22:31 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mcfely.interaccess.com(207.70.126.131) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma009569; Wed, 6 Aug 97 13:22:05 -0400
Received: from [207.208.15.54] (d54.ch.interaccess.com [207.208.15.54]) by mcfely.interaccess.com (8.8.5/8.7.5)
with ESMTP id MAA25063 for <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>; Wed, 6 Aug 1997 12:20:05 -0500 (CDT)
X-Sender: paulmojo@pop.interaccess.com
Message-Id: <103010d00b00e62e9171e@[207.208.15.240]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 1997 12:26:43 -0500
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
From: Paul Merideth <paulmojo@interaccess.com>

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

From: Linda Aono <LAONO@cmht.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/6/97 11:32am
Subject: Tougher Rules

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I was slammed by MCI about five years ago or more (before the term slamming was used) and I did not know who to report it to. MCI's attitude at the time was we'll just change you back. I told them I wouldn't pay their part of the bill, and they said why not, since it was going to go through the local phone company anyway. They told me they would remove the charges but they did not -- until I called them several more times about removing the charges. This cost me a lot of time and I can easily see why people would just as soon pay the charges since they made the calls anyway. Unless there are some penalties for slamming, there seems to be no reason why MCI won't continue to do it. I have heard of others being slammed, all by MCI.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Wed, 6 Aug 97 10:34:23 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id KAA04719; Wed, 6 Aug 1997 10:35:23 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mail.cmht.com(207.244.227.10) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma004701; Wed, 6 Aug 97 10:34:59 -0400
Received: from CMHT-Message_Server by cmht.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 06 Aug 1997 10:32:38 -0500
Message-Id: <s3e852c6.072@cmht.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 06 Aug 1997 10:32:10 -0500
From: Linda Aono <LAONO@cmht.com>
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
Subject: Tougher Rules
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: "Robert J. Lenz" <boblo@dnet.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/6/97 1:16am
Subject: Slamming

Dear Sirs,

Slamming is basically stealing. I would hope the FCC could call for stricter penalties for salesmen who slam and the companies for whom they work. If what I read in the August 4, 1997 issue of USA TODAY is true, that there is marketing practice in which companies send people a letter saying there service will be switched if they don't reply within 14 days, I sure hope the FCC will help stop a practice that I can't understand how any company would allow.

Sincerely, Robert J. Lenz
112 Blackberry Bend
Murphy, NC 28906-9018
e-mail boblo@dnet.net

No. of Copies rec'd 3
List ABCDE

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 21:17:50 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id VAA18268; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 21:18:50 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from drake.dnet.net(205.218.214.160) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma018266; Tue, 5 Aug 97 21:18:44 -0400
Received: from oemcomputer ([206.102.46.75]) by sco.dnet.net (8.6.8.1/SCA-6.6) with ESMTP
id BAA07629 for <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>; Wed, 6 Aug 1997 01:17:41 GMT
Message-Id: <199708060117.BAA07629@sco.dnet.net>
From: "Robert J, Lenz" <boblo@dnet.net>
To: <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>
Subject: Slamming
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 1997 01:16:17 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1155
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

From: <JSHARP4USV@aol.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/5/97 11:28pm
Subject: Comments

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I read the article of "...phone-service slamming" in the Friday (August 1st) edition of USA Today.

This spring I received a telephone solicitation from MCI, and was talked into trying MCI. The offer sounded good, until I discovered what they did not tell me. The figures they quoted me for comparison with ATT were inaccurate (therefore untrue); they did not advise me their access fee was three times what ATT charged and other parts of the offer sounded "too good to be true" and were not. After one week I called to cancel and return to ATT.

For three months following this directive I continued to receive a billing from MCI through Bell Atlantic, charging me a minimum of \$5.00 fee because I failed to make long distance calls (charged to MCI) for at least \$5.00. I wasn't informed of this either; but nevertheless, because I called to cancel the service, should not have been charged anyway.

I called again upon receiving my most recent billing and they assured me my account would be credited in the appropriate amount. I will have to await next month to see if they remain true to this information.

Whatever credence MCI had with me prior to this is all but lost, and I think the marketing antics they utilized were fraudulent and irresponsible. Once I have received my credit for this "error", I consider my complaint satisfied..but in response to this article and the invite to file complaint, I wanted to file this for record.

My name is Joe Sharpless at the e-mail address listed. My home telephone number is 301-725-4087 in Laurel, MD should you choose to verify this communication.

While this incident is somewhat irrelevant to the circumstances in the article; I feel there is relevance because of the tactics used and misinformation distributed, and in this case, not shared.

Thank you for listening.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 23:29:31 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id XAA19730; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 23:30:32 -0400 (EDT)
From: <JSHARP4USV@aol.com>
Received: from emout15.mx.aol.com(198.81.11.41) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma019724; Tue, 5 Aug 97 23:30:08 -0400
Received: (from root@localhost)
by emout15.mail.aol.com (8.7.6/8.7.3/AOL-2.0.0)
id XAA03662 for slamming@comments.fcc.gov;
Tue, 5 Aug 1997 23:28:41 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 1997 23:28:41 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <970805232716_-221123562@emout15.mail.aol.com>
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
Subject: Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC

94-129

From: Arlene Rodriguez <Arlene_Rodriguez@ama-assn.org>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/5/97 11:15pm
Subject: Slamming

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I was slammed twice. These carriers were charging at least 50% more than the long distance carrier I selected. It took several phone calls, letters, faxes, not to mention all the frustration before I was able to straighten out my bill.

Refund the difference is not going to cut it. Thougher penalty is definatly mandatory.

Please Help!!!!

No. of Copies rec'd 3
List ABCDE

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 15:16:31 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id PAA11319; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 15:17:30 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from gateway.ama-assn.org(199.186.22.252) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma011154; Tue, 5 Aug 97 15:10:06 -0400
Received: by gateway.ama-assn.org id AA13735
(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for slamming@comments.fcc.gov);
Tue, 5 Aug 1997 14:08:35 -0500
Received: by gateway.ama-assn.org (Internal Mail Agent-1);
Tue, 5 Aug 1997 14:08:35 -0500
Message-Id: <s3e7348a.059@gwise.ama-assn.org>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Tue, 05 Aug 1997 22:15:50 -0500
From: Arlene Rodriguez <Arlene_Rodriguez@ama-assn.org>
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
Subject: Slamming
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

44-129

From: "John W. R. Gray" <JwrGray@worldnet.att.net>
To: "Slamming FCC" <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>
Date: 8/5/97 9:19pm
Subject: Standard Form

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FCC,

Why not require a standard FCC form to initiate and/or change phone service providers? The form would prevent slamming and cause far less inconvenience than slamming currently does.

I requested a form from GTE (my local provider) that I filled out and returned to GTE that requires a signed form before I can change long distance providers (currently, ATT).

John Gray

Today's problems cannot be solved by the fools that caused them yesterday.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 21:20:50 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id VAA18320; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 21:21:51 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mtigwc03.worldnet.att.net(204.127.131.34) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma018317; Tue, 5 Aug 97 21:21:40 -0400
Received: from default ([207.147.86.116]) by mtigwc03.worldnet.att.net
(post.office MTA v2.0 0613) with ESMTP id AAA11546
for <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>; Wed, 6 Aug 1997 01:20:12 +0000
From: "John W. R. Gray" <JwrGray@worldnet.att.net>
To: "Slamming FCC" <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>
Subject: Standard Form
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 1997 21:19:08 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1161
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Message-ID: <19970806012011.AAA11546@default>

CC 94-129

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <LENGUSS@aol.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/5/97 6:15pm
Subject: slamming

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I have been slammed at least 9 times over the past few years. It is outrageous that you allow these changes to be made solely on the sayso of the re-seller, putting the burden on the slammees to rectify the situation. This has been a total abdication of your responsibilities to the public.

My solutions, besides complaining to you and our state consumer protection agency, which has been pointless, have been:

I have filed letters with my carrier forbidding change without written consent - this only works sometimes.

I do not pay any long distance bill from an unknown carrier, but insist that my local carrier, GTE, send this bill back to the source so they can bill me direct - which i do not pay.

I have complained vigorously to GTE when such changes occur.

I tell my long distance carrier, AT&T.

I don't know what the hell else I can do to keep these vultures away!

No. of Copies rec'd 3
List ABCDE

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 18:16:34 EDT

Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id SAA15860; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 18:17:31 -0400 (EDT)
From: <LENGUSS@aol.com>

Received: from emout11.mx.aol.com(198.81.11.26) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma015856; Tue, 5 Aug 97 18:17:23 -0400

Received: (from root@localhost)
by emout11.mail.aol.com (8.7.6/8.7.3/AOL-2.0.0)
id SAA01413 for slamming@comments.fcc.gov;
Tue, 5 Aug 1997 18:15:55 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Tue, 5 Aug 1997 18:15:55 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <970805181522_870134382@emout11.mail.aol.com>

To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov

Subject: slamming

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

RECEIVED

From: <PAUL.MINER@emc.walgreens.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("SLAMMING@COMMENTS.FCC.GOV")
Date: 8/5/97 3:02pm
Subject: UNAUTHORIZED CARRIER SWITCH

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I AM WRITING SUBSEQUENT TO AN ARTICLE IN THE USA TODAY NEWSPAPER WHICH HIGHLIGHTED AN INCREASING ACTIVITY PRACTICED BY MANY LONG DISTANCE PHONE SERVICE PROVIDERS REFERRED TO AS SLAMMING.

I MYSELF HAVE BEEN RECENTLY SLAMMED BY SPRINT. MY NAME IS PAUL MINER AND MY PHONE NUMBER ACCOUNT WHICH WAS SLAMMED IS 773-871-3303. PRIOR TO READING THE USA TODAY ARTICLE I HAD CONTACTED MY LONG DISTANCE CARRIER (AT&T) TO SWITCH BACK, CONTACTED MY LOCAL SERVICE CARRIER (AMERITECH) TO PLACE A BLOCK ON MY ACCOUNT FOR FUTURE UNAUTHORIZED SWITCHES, AND AM NOW REGISTERING A COMPLAINT.

ON JULY 4, 1997 MY ACCOUNT WAS SWITCHED FROM AT&T TO A CARRIER CALLED AMER-I-NET WITH BILLING QUESTIONS REFERRED TO USBI (U.S. BILLING SERVICE). I WAS INFORMED THAT THIS AMER-I-NET SERVICE IS IN SOME WAY AFFILIATED WITH SPRINT. BE THAT AS IT MAY I FEEL THAT THIS IS A GROSS VIOLATION OF PUBLIC TRUST BY ANY COMPANY AND AM SICK TO HEAR THAT "EVERYBODY" IN THE INDUSTRY APPEARS TO LOOK THE OTHER WAY AND CONTINUE THIS PRACTICE UNDER PRESSURE OF MARKET FORCES.

I HAVE NOT YET CONTACTED SPRINT. HOWEVER, I FEEL THAT SINCE THEY ENCOUNTERED THE RISK OF SWITCHING MY ACCOUNT WITHOUT ANY AUTHORIZATION(VERBAL, WRITTEN, HIDDEN IN ANY RECENT SWEEPSTAKE OR SUBSCRIPTION OFFERING) THAT THEY SHOULD INCUR THE FULL BURDEN OF PROVIDING SAID UNAUTHORIZED SERVICE. IF SO, THEN MAYBE SUCH PRACTICES WOULD PROVE TO AS UNPROFITABLE AS IT IS UNETHICAL.

PAUL MINER, PHARM.D.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 15:02:27 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id PAA11014; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 15:03:28 -0400 (EDT)
From: <PAUL.MINER@emc.walgreens.com>
Received: from unknown(207.70.75.98) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma011006; Tue, 5 Aug 97 15:03:22 -0400
Received: from mailhst2.walgreens.com (mailhost2.walgreens.com [207.70.76.2]) by mailrelay.walgreens.com
id OAA21568 for <SLAMMING@COMMENTS.FCC.GOV>; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 14:01:55 -0500 (CDT)
Received: by mailhst2.walgreens.com (Smail3.1.28.1 #3)
id mOwvoPf-00005aC; Tue, 5 Aug 97 13:32 CDT
Message-Id: <mOwvoPf-00005aC@mailhst2.walgreens.com>
Date: Tuesday, 5 August 1997 7:10am CT
To: SLAMMING@COMMENTS.FCC.GOV
Cc: PAUL.MINER@emc.walgreens.com
Subject: UNAUTHORIZED CARRIER SWITCH

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

From: "3riversfan" <jvovrk1@midwest.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/5/97 2:55pm
Subject: Slamming

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Slamming ranks right up there with rape. Anyway you look at it, you are being violated. This is something that is done without your consent, you didn't ask for it, but it is being forced on you.

When your long distance carrier is changed without your consent or sometimes, without your knowledge, it reminds me of Mafia tactics. The "You WILL do business with this company whether you want to or not" type of mentality is against the law and violates your personal freedom of choice.

Having been an employee of 31 years for a major telephone company, I'm shocked that this type of thing is allowed. When my telephone service was established, I was the one that told the telephone company what long distance carrier I wanted. If any changes are to be made in my telephone service, I am the one that should tell the telephone company what changes are to be made. It is not unreasonable to think you are connected to the carrier of your choice without having to dial the 1-700 number to find out IF you are still connected to them before you make a long distance call. Having your carrier changed without your knowledge or consent is a violation of your privacy and the secrecy of communications act. THIS MUST BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY!

Respectfully,

Judy Vogel
626 Maple
Carrollton, IL 62016

e-mail: jvovrk1@midwest.net

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 14:50:26 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id OAA10775; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 14:51:26 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from cdale3.midwest.net(204.248.40.16) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma010771; Tue, 5 Aug 97 14:51:18 -0400
Received: from jvovrk1.midwest.net (carollton5.midwest.net [206.158.81.134])
by cdale3.midwest.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id NAA01101
for <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 13:42:49 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <199708051842.NAA01101@cdale3.midwest.net>
Reply-To: <jvovrk1@midwest.net>
From: "3riversfan" <jvovrk1@midwest.net>
To: <slamming@comments.fcc.gov>
Subject: Slamming
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 1997 13:55:08 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1157
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

From: <GJGALLEN@aol.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/5/97 12:39pm
Subject: slamming

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

Re. Slamming by
International Telemedia Assoc. (800-866-8889)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

This company just inserted charges totaling \$48.83 on my monthly Bell Atlantic bill, as follows:

INOVATE TELECOM, INC.	4.95
Plan USA Pag	9.95
Plan USA Fol	9.95
Plan USA Vma	19.95
Fed Tax	1.34
NJ Sales Tax	2.69

I had never heard of these people. When I called they said, yes, someone had ordered their service and as proof, they would play me a tape recording of the purchase. What followed was a recording of my young son's friend calling his parents on their private 800 number saying, "Joe, plan USA."

That was it. They said since he made the call from our phone they thought that was an order for their "service." I cannot even believe it.

They will take the "charges" off my phone bill in 60 - 90 days.

George C. Allen II
644 Centre St
Oradell, NJ 07649

No. of Copies rec'd 3
List ABCDE

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 12:40:53 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id MAA07789; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 12:41:53 -0400 (EDT)
From: <GJKGALLEN@aol.com>
Received: from emout18.mx.aol.com(198.81.11.44) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma007786; Tue, 5 Aug 97 12:41:27 -0400
Received: (from root@localhost)
by emout18.mail.aol.com (8.7.6/8.7.3/AOL-2.0.0)
id MAA25117 for slamming@comments.fcc.gov.;
Tue, 5 Aug 1997 12:39:59 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 1997 12:39:59 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <970805123920_-1440266786@emout18.mail.aol.com>
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
Subject: slamming

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 94-129

From: <Mma980@aol.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("slamming@comments.fcc.gov")
Date: 8/5/97 12:31pm
Subject: slamming comment

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I applaud the efforts taken on behalf of consumers by the FCC. I agree that as it is right now, the FCC sanctions are hardly disincentives to "slammers". The FCC must hurt them in the pocketbooks. Besides having slammers refund all charges billed under the slammed bill, the FCC should institute a private cause of action, replete with punitive damages. The problem will only get worse now that local phone service is opening up to competition.

SETH GILLMAN

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

3

Received: From [165.135.0.253] gatekeeper2.fcc.gov
By mail.fcc.gov (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.11)
Tue, 5 Aug 97 12:31:52 EDT
Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id MAA07654; Tue, 5 Aug 1997 12:32:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: <Mma980@aol.com>
Received: from emout11.mx.aol.com(198.81.11.26) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (3.2)
id xma007646; Tue, 5 Aug 97 12:32:41 -0400
Received: (from root@localhost)
by emout11.mail.aol.com (8.7.6/8.7.3/AOL-2.0.0)
id MAA06377 for slamming@comments.fcc.gov;
Tue, 5 Aug 1997 12:31:15 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 1997 12:31:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <970805123007_179100997@emout11.mail.aol.com>
To: slamming@comments.fcc.gov
Subject: slamming comment