

Mailed

FEB 23 1996
FEB 23 1996
FEB 23 1996**Decision 96-02-062 February 23, 1996**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Robert R. Philipps, Plaintiff, vs. GTE California Incorporated, Defendant.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, is the **Complainant**, and defendant, GTE California Incorporated, is the **Defendant**.

On or about July 21, 1995, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Defendant, Case No. 95-07-047.

The complaint asserted that Plaintiff had been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has been a customer of Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, for approximately one year.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Plaintiff, Robert R. Philipps, has never been overcharged by Defendant, GTE California Incorporated, in the amount of \$10.00.

Under defendant's system payments received after the first three days of processing will not be credited until the following month.

Defendant recognizes that complainant pays her bill on the actual last payment date, which is 22 days after the billing date. Because complainant pays her bill on the last payment date, defendant's billing system often does not pick it up in time for the current billing cycle and defendant is unable to suppress a late charge from appearing on her current statement. However, the system does recognize the payment was timely and the late payment charge is credited on the following bill. Defendant's current billing system was installed in May of 1994. Prior to that there was no problem with payments made on the last day to pay without penalty.

Because of the case specific nature of our review in an Expedited Complaint Proceeding, we refrain from making a general pronouncement regarding defendant's billing system. But we do remind defendant of TURN v. Pacific Bell (1993) D.93-05-062, et al., 49 CPUC 2d 299, where Pacific Bell was fined \$15 million because of improper late charges. GTE California Incorporated's (GTEC) tariff Rule 10E addressing late payment charges states:

"A late payment charge will apply if payment is not received at the Utility or one of its payment agents by the late payment date printed on the bill."

A late payment charge is shown on the customer's bill and applied to the customer's account even though the customer's payment is made prior to the late payment date printed on the bill. It is clear that, although subsequently reversed, the late payment charge was imposed prior to date specified in GTEC's tariffs. This is inconsistent with Rule 10E. Moreover, GTEC's tariffs do not discuss billing situations where customer payments are received during the eight days preceding issuance of bills but prior to the end of the billing period.

late payment date. Therefore, the tariff is ambiguous in this respect. We expect GTEC to take the necessary steps to ensure that customers who pay their bill on time will not have late charges appear on their bill. And more specifically in this case, complainant's bill must not show a late charge when she pays on time.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that defendant GTE California, Incorporated shall not impose a late charge on complainant Philpy's telephone bill unless complainant's payment is late.

This order is effective today.

Dated February 23, 1996, at San Francisco, California.

DANIEL Wm. FESSLER
President
P. GREGORY CONLON
JESSIE J. KNIGHT, JR.
HENRY M. DUQUE
JOSIAH L. NEEPER
Commissioners