

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

\* \* \* \* \*

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **ADVANTAGE TELECOM PLUS** to show cause )  
why it has not violated Section 505 of the Michigan ) Case No. U-11918  
Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MICHIGAN,** )  
**INC.**, to show cause why it has not violated ) Case No. U-11920  
Section 505 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **VISTA INTERNATIONAL** to show cause )  
why it has not violated Section 505 of the ) Case No. U-11921  
Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **ADVANTAGE TELECOM** to show cause )  
why it has not violated Section 505 of the ) Case No. U-11922  
Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS** to show )  
cause why it has not violated Section 505 of the ) Case No. U-11923  
Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **QWEST COMMUNICATIONS** to show )  
cause why it has not violated Section 505 ) Case No. U-11924  
of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **MCI WORLDCOM** to show cause why it has )  
not violated Section 505 of the Michigan )  
Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )  
)

Case No. U-11925

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **LOCAL LONG DISTANCE** to show )  
cause why it has not violated Section 505 of the )  
Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )  
)

Case No. U-11926

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **AMERITECH MICHIGAN** to show )  
cause why it has not violated Section 505 of the )  
Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )  
)

Case No. U-11927

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **CABLE AND WIRELESS USA** to show )  
cause why it has not violated Section 505 of the )  
Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )  
)

Case No. U-11928

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION** )  
to show cause why it has not violated Section 505 of )  
the Michigan Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )  
)

Case No. U-11929

At the June 10, 1999 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,  
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. John G. Strand, Chairman  
Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner  
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner

**ORDER**

On February 26, 1999, the Commission issued an order in these dockets requiring each  
company to show that certain telecommunication provider switches associated with each were

processed in a manner consistent with the Michigan Telecommunications Act and the anti-slamming procedures adopted in Case No. U-11757.<sup>1</sup> The Commission has reviewed the responses that were filed, and now takes the following actions to close these dockets.

For AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., Frontier Communications Services Inc., and Ameritech Michigan, Cases Nos. U-11920, U-11923, and U-11927, respectively, the documentation submitted appears to satisfy the requirements of the law to show that the switches listed in the attachments to the orders were authorized. These dockets may therefore be closed without further action.

For Vista Group International Inc. (referred to in the prior order as Vista International),<sup>2</sup> LCI International Telecom Corp., d/b/a Qwest Communications Services, (referred to in the prior order as Qwest Communications), and Cable and Wireless USA, Inc., Cases Nos. U-11921, U-11924, and U-11928, respectively, it still appears that there were unauthorized switches. Individual complainants are pursuing or will have the opportunity to pursue those unauthorized switches with formal complaints. Because further action will occur in other dockets, these dockets may be closed.

For Sprint Communications Company L.P. (referred to in the prior order as Sprint Communications Corporation), Case No. U-11929, it appears that there was an unauthorized switch due to what the company says was clerical error. The customer has decided not to pursue a formal complaint. This docket may therefore be closed.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Commission has since issued an order in Case No. U-11900 expanding the anti-slamming protections adopted in Case No. U-11757.

<sup>2</sup>Because of confusion about the name under which several of the providers are operating, the April 23, 1999 order in Case No. U-11900 now requires providers to register.

For Advantage Plus (referred to in the prior order as Advantage Telecom Plus) and Local Long Distance, Inc., Cases Nos. U-11918 and U-11926, the documentation submitted is of poor quality and may not meet the requirements of the law. Moreover, at this time there is no basis for a formal complaint. The Commission Staff (Staff) obtained signed letters of commitment from these providers to bring their documentation into compliance with the law and the Commission's order in Case No. U-11900. The Staff will also work with other companies whose documentation is of poor quality to obtain the same type of commitment. These dockets may be closed without further action.

For Advantage Telecommunications, Corp., (referred to in the prior order as Advantage Telecom), and MCI WorldCom, Cases Nos. U-11922 and U-11925, respectively, the Staff has provided information to the affected customers and is waiting for their responses. If the customers choose to file formal complaints, those will be handled in separate dockets. These dockets may therefore be closed.<sup>3</sup>

The Commission FINDS that:

- a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; MSA 3.560(101) et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1992 AACCS, R 460.17101 et seq.
- b. These dockets may be closed.

---

<sup>3</sup>The February 26, 1999 order required two additional providers to show cause as well. On April 30, 1999, the Commission imposed fines on ACI Communications, Inc., and Brittan Communications International Corp., Cases Nos. U-11917 and U-11919, respectively, and closed those dockets.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that these dockets are closed.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ John G. Strand

Chairman

( S E A L )

/s/ David A. Svanda

Commissioner

/s/ Robert B. Nelson

Commissioner

By its action of June 10, 1999.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman

Its Executive Secretary

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that these dockets are closed.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

---

Chairman

---

Commissioner

---

Commissioner

By its action of June 10, 1999.

---

Its Executive Secretary

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
for **ADVANTAGE TELECOM PLUS** to show cause )  
why it has not violated Section 505 of the Michigan )  
Telecommunications Act. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. U-11918 et al.

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated June 10, 1999 closing these eleven dockets in which telecommunication providers had been required to respond to allegations of unauthorized switching of customers, as set forth in the order.”