

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Richard Valentino	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2023-3041051
	:	
Verizon Pennsylvania LLC	:	

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
Katrina L. Dunderdale  
Administrative Law Judge

**INTRODUCTION**

This decision sustains Complainant’s Formal Complaint alleging Respondent failed to provide reasonable and adequate customer service by providing available and reliable Digital Subscriber Line internet and telephone service as required by the Public Utility Code. Respondent is ordered to investigate the cause of failed telephone service and report to the Bureau of Technical Utility Services.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On June 1, 2023, Richard Valentino (Mr. Valentino or Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against Verizon Pennsylvania LLC (Verizon). Mr. Valentino alleged ongoing issues with reliability, safety or quality problems, and he averred communications (both telephonic and DSL) are unreliable with dropped communications due to heavy static. For relief, Complainant seeks an order from the Commission directing Verizon to repair or replace his telephone and internet lines to his residence and improve reliability.

On June 21, 2023, Verizon filed the Answer and admitted it provides telephone service and retail Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) internet service at the service address, in the name of Kathleen Valentino. Verizon denied the allegations in the Formal Complaint, asserting it investigated the allegations, offered a direct dial number to Complainant to contact a representative, applied Out of Service credits to Complainant's account and installed a signal booster operating over the DSL service. Verizon further averred it replaced the multiplexer in the remote terminal on June 7, 2023.<sup>1</sup>

On August 3, 2023, the Office of Administrative Law Judge issued an Initial Telephone Hearing Notice, which scheduled the Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing for September 27, 2023. On August 3, 2023, the presiding officer issued a Prehearing Order which outlined procedural matters to the parties, including the procedure to request a continuance or reschedule a hearing.

On August 21, 2023, Verizon filed and served a Motion for Continuance, in which Verizon requested the initial hearing be rescheduled due to the presence of a pre-planned vacation for Verizon's counsel. Verizon indicated Complainant had no objection to the continuance. After email discussions between the parties, the Office of Administrative Law Judge issued a Rescheduled Initial Telephone Hearing Notice on August 22, 2023, which rescheduled the Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing for September 20, 2023.

On September 20, 2023, the presiding officer convened the parties by telephone and conducted an initial hearing. Mr. Valentino appeared *pro se* and testified on his own behalf. Mr. Valentino offered one exhibit, which was admitted into evidence as Complainant Exhibit A. Respondent was represented by Suzan Paiva, Esquire. Attorney Paiva presented the testimony of two witnesses and offered three exhibits, which exhibits were admitted into evidence as Verizon Exhibits 1, 2 and 3.

---

<sup>1</sup> A remote terminal is defined in 66 Pa.C.S. § 3012 as a structure located outside of a central office which houses electronic equipment, and which provides transport for telecommunications services to and from a central office.

On October 19, 2023, the presiding officer closed the hearing record by Interim Order Closing the Hearing Record.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Complainant, Richard Valentino, resides at 187 Crownover Road, Homer City, Pennsylvania 15748 (service address) with his wife, Kathleen, in a single-family home built in 2016. (Tr. 8, 9).

2. Respondent, Verizon Pennsylvania LLC, is an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC)<sup>2</sup> that currently provides telephone and internet service, in the form of a dial tone and Digital Subscriber Line (DSL, a/k/a dial-up service), to Complainant at the service address. (Tr. 10, 38).

3. Complainant receives and generates telephone calls on a dial tone through a copper line that starts at the central office<sup>3</sup> and goes out through a remote terminal. (Tr. 11, 14, 26, 27, 40; Verizon Exhibit 1).

4. Complainant receives access to the internet through a DSL dial-up service that uses a fiber line connected at the remote terminal. (Tr. 40, 41; Verizon Exhibit 1).

5. Respondent designed the system so a loss of electric power will not cause a loss of a dial tone because the power for the dial tone is designed to come from Respondent's central office. (Tr. 42).

6. Respondent uses batteries in the remote terminal designed to keep Respondent's remote terminal operational even during a long power outage. (Tr. 41, 42).

---

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 3012, an incumbent local exchange carrier is defined as the incumbent carrier authorized by the Commission to provide local exchange telecommunications services. The term includes a rural telecommunications carrier and a nonrural telecommunications carrier.

<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 3012, a central office is defined as the local exchange telecommunications company switch used to provide local exchange telecommunications service.

7. The booster associated with Complainant's Verizon service is intended to help with cell telephone service. (Tr. 42).

8. Respondent contracted with Complainant to provide a three megabit bandwidth DSL internet service at the service address. (Tr. 43).

9. Since moving into the service address in 2016, Complainant experienced trouble with the telephone service – including dropped calls, poor service, unreliable service and heavy static – and with the internet service, including periods with no service. (Tr. 10–27; Complainant Exhibit A).

10. At times, the landline telephone at the service address does not have a dial tone. (Tr. 11–13; Complainant Exhibit A).

11. Verizon suggested Complainant attach a booster to the modem to improve service and reliability, but the booster stops working when the internet and telephone service is down. (Tr. 12).

12. Complainant and his wife have severe health issues and have lost service, including dropped calls during medical appointments. (Tr. 12, 13).

13. When an electric service outage occurs, Complainant loses telephone and internet service. (Tr. 11–14; Complainant Exhibit A).

14. When the internet service is unavailable, Complainant is sometimes unable to make or continue a telephone call on his cellphone. (Tr. 11–13).

15. At the service address, the following electronics require telephone and internet services to operate: two smart cellphones, one computer, one tablet and one printer. (Tr. 10–20).

16. Complainant uses a television through Direct TV (or satellite) service. (Tr. 26).
17. Verizon has visited the service address on many occasions, in response to Complainant's calls. (Tr. 10–15; Complainant Exhibit A).
18. Respondent performed multiple tests on the remote terminal and on Complainant's terminal at the service address. (Tr. 43, 44).
19. Starting in March 2023, Respondent's personnel visited the service address, or checked the equipment associated with the service address, 12 times. (Tr. 47–60; Complainant Exhibit A; Verizon Exhibit 2).
20. After most service calls or equipment checks, Respondent's personnel concluded, "the service tested okay," and did not report experiencing the problems noted by Complainant. (Tr. 47–60; Complainant Exhibit A; Verizon Exhibit 2).
21. In March 2023, Complainant's service was affected after rodents chewed through copper wires. (Tr. 47–49; Verizon Exhibit 2).
22. On April 6, 2023, Respondent replaced a missing DSL filter after Complainant reported static on the telephone line and no internet service. (Tr. 49, 50; Verizon Exhibit 2).
23. On three occasions in May 2023, Respondent changed the central office equipment back at the main switching center even though Respondent's tech found the service at the service address tested okay at times when Complainant had reported static on the line. (Tr. 50, 51; Verizon Exhibit 2).

24. In May 2023, Respondent determined Complainant would lose DSL internet service after power outages because Respondent's DSLAM did not reset itself automatically, as it is designed to do. (Tr. 51, 52; Verizon Exhibit 2).

25. On June 3, 2023, Complainant reported static and no internet service, but Respondent visited and reported not finding any static while service tested okay. (Tr. 51; Verizon Exhibit 2).

26. On June 6, 2023, Respondent replaced the DSLAM remote because it was not resetting itself after a power outage. (Tr. 52, 53; Verizon Exhibit 2).

27. On July 20, 2023, Respondent worked on the copper cable from the remote terminal to the service address, which is a distance of 1,200 feet, and installed a new terminal that was located 900 feet from the service address. (Tr. 53, 54; Verizon Exhibit 2).

30. The copper line from the remote terminal to the house carries both the DSL and the dial tone voice services. (Tr. 69).

31. The distance of 1,200 feet, from the remote terminal to the service address, is a very close distance relative to other locations where the distance is typically 18,000 feet. (Tr. 69).

32. The DSL signal from the central office to the remote terminal is carried over a fiber optic cable for a distance of 42,768 feet running along poles and in underground conduits. (Tr. 69, 70).

33. Verizon does not provide Fiber Optic Service (FIOS) service within Indiana County but does provide Complainant with DSL and telephone services over a copper line. (Tr. 71).

34. Respondent tried replacing equipment as a precautionary attempt to eliminate potential trouble areas, including ordering new batteries and TA3000 extension shelf equipment. (Tr. 55, 56, 74–76; Verizon Exhibit 2).

35. On August 2, 2023, Complainant lost internet service and Respondent determined the DSLAM worked. (Tr. 58).

36. On August 22, 2023, Complainant lost internet service after a technician accidentally terminated service while performing work on other equipment in the remote terminal. (Tr. 58, 59; Verizon Exhibit 2).

37. Complainant experiences times when there is no dial tone on his telephone, but Respondent's technicians found a dial tone each time a technician visited the service address in response to a complaint from Mr. Valentino. (Tr. 10–27, 64).

38. When there is no service disruption at the service address, the service address receives 3 megabits of DSL service. (Tr. 78).

39. From June 1, 2023 through September 11, 2023, Complainant experienced 22 days when the internet was down for a significant part of a day or for an entire day. (Complainant Exhibit A).

40. From June 1, 2023 through September 11, 2023, Complainant experienced 14 days with one or multiple instances of dropped calls and/or heavy static on the landline which rendered the landline unusable. (Tr. 10-26; Complainant Exhibit A).

## DISCUSSION

Complainant challenges the reasonableness and adequacy of the voice and DSL services Respondent provides to the service address. Complainant asks the Commission to require Respondent to provide him with reliable telephone service, which is free of static and without dropped calls, and for reliable DSL service through the telephone line.

### A. Legal Standard

Any person, having an interest in the subject matter, may file a complaint with the Commission setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation of any law, which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer.<sup>4</sup> Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code (“Code”) imposes upon every public utility a duty to furnish and maintain adequate, efficient and reasonable service and facilities.<sup>5</sup> This provision of the Code specifies that every public utility:

shall furnish and maintain adequate, efficient and reasonable service and facilities, and shall make all such repairs, changes, alterations, substitutions, extensions and improvements in or to such service or facilities as shall be necessary or proper for the accommodation, convenience, and safety of its patrons, employees, and the public. Such service also shall be reasonably continuous and without unreasonable interruptions or delay. Such service and facilities shall be in conformity with the regulations and orders of the commission.<sup>[6]</sup>

The term “service” is “used in its broadest and most inclusive sense, includ[ing] any and all acts done, rendered, or performed, and any and all things furnished or supplied ... by public utilities ... in the performance of their duties under [the Public Utility Code.]”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

<sup>5</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

<sup>6</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

<sup>7</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. § 102.

Whenever the Commission, after reasonable notice and hearing upon complaint, finds the service or facilities of a public utility are unreasonable, unsafe, inadequate, insufficient, or otherwise in violation of the Code, the Commission shall determine and prescribe, by regulation or order, the reasonable, safe, adequate, sufficient service or facilities to be observed, furnished, enforced, or employed, including all such repairs, changes, alterations, extensions, substitutions, or improvements in facilities as shall be reasonably necessary and proper for the safety, accommodation, and convenience of the public.<sup>8</sup>

B. Burden of Proof

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has defined the term “burden of proof” to mean a duty to establish a fact by a preponderance of the evidence.<sup>9</sup> The term “preponderance of the evidence” means one party must present evidence which is more convincing by even the smallest amount than the evidence presented by the other party.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, one must review the record in this case to determine whether Complainant has satisfied his burden of proof. If the review indicates the burden has been satisfied, one must then determine whether Respondent has submitted evidence of “co-equal” value or weight to refute Complainant’s evidence. If this has occurred, the burden of proof has not been satisfied, unless the party bearing the burden of proof presents additional evidence.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, one must exercise care to ensure the decision of the Commission is supported by substantial evidence in the record.<sup>12</sup> The Pennsylvania appellate courts have

---

<sup>8</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. § 1505(a).

<sup>9</sup> *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Marquies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1954) (*Se-Ling Hosiery*); *Feinstein v. Phila. Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (1976) (*Feinstein*).

<sup>10</sup> *Se-Ling Hosiery*; *Feinstein*.

<sup>11</sup> *Morrissey v. Pa. Dept. of Highways*, 225 A.2d 895 (Pa. 1967); *Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982).

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., 2 Pa.C.S. § 704; *Yellow Cab Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 524 A.2d 1069 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1987).

defined the term “substantial evidence” to mean such relevant evidence that a reasonable mind may accept as adequate to support a conclusion. More is required than a mere trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact sought to be established.<sup>13</sup> The Commission has held that a complainant must show the utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the complaint, to establish a sufficient case against a utility and satisfy the burden of proof.<sup>14</sup>

### C. Responsibility of Public Utilities Offering Telephone Service

Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. §3019(b), the Commission has the following powers and duties relative to its regulation of telecommunications carriers and interexchange telecommunications carriers, including the power to; address the safety, adequacy, reliability and privacy of telecommunications services and the ordering, installation, suspension, termination and restoration of any telecommunications service; and establish requirements necessary to ensure the protection of customers.

To the extent that issues of installation, quality, adequacy, reliability, safety and privacy of jurisdictional public utility telecommunications services are implicated – whether those are price regulated or not – and whether the associated facilities of a regulated public utility may be involved for the adequate, safe and reliable provision of such services, the Commission is statutorily obliged to maintain the appropriate degree of interest and regulatory oversight. *See generally* 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 102 and 3019(b)(2).<sup>15</sup>

Section 63.56(a) of the Commission’s regulations, 52 Pa. Code §63.56(a), states a public telephone utility must “utilize measuring devices, methods and practices generally recognized and accepted by the communications industry to obtain or to allow the calculation of

---

<sup>13</sup> *Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 413 A.2d 1037 (Pa. 1980); *Erie Resistor Corp. v. Unemployment Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 166 A.2d 96 (Pa. Super. 1961); *Murphy v. Pa. Dept. of Pub. Welfare, White Haven Ctr.*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

<sup>14</sup> *Feinstein*.

<sup>15</sup> *Daskalakis v. Verizon Pa., Inc.*, Docket No. C-2010-2172222, Motion of Commissioner James H. Cawley, March 17, 2011 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 4, 2011).

the service objectives” detailed in the Commission’s telephone service regulations. On the subject of transmission requirements and standards, 52 Pa. Code §63.63 provides:

(a) A public utility shall furnish, operate and maintain facilities adequate to provide acceptable transmission of communications. Transmission shall be at adequate volume levels and free of excessive distortion, noise and cross-talk.

(b) The transmission standards shall be based upon the use of telephone sets connected to a 48-Volt dial central office, measured at a frequency of 1000 Hertz (Hz).

(c) A telephone line terminating at a customer’s premises shall have a loop resistance not exceeding the operating design of the associated central office equipment.

(d) Overall transmission loss on a customer loop shall not exceed 15 decibels.

(Emphasis added).

Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 3014(b) of Chapter 30,<sup>16</sup> local exchange telecommunications companies shall have the following options for amendment of a network modernization plan:

(1) (i) A rural telecommunications carrier that elects to amend its network modernization plan pursuant to this subsection shall remain subject to the carrier's network modernization plan in effect as of December 31, 2003, as amended pursuant to this subsection, through December 31, 2008. Prior to implementation of such election, the rural telecommunications carrier shall comply with the notification requirements of subsection (e).

(ii) The rural telecommunications carrier shall commit to accelerate 100% broadband availability by December 31, 2008, in its amended network modernization plan. Any rural telecommunications carrier electing this option shall not be

---

<sup>16</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 3011–3019.

required to offer a bona fide retail request program or a business attraction or retention program.

(2) (i) A rural telecommunications carrier that elects to amend its network modernization plan pursuant to this subsection shall remain subject to the carrier's network modernization plan in effect as of December 31, 2003, as amended pursuant to this subsection, through December 31, 2013, or December 31, 2015, as applicable. Prior to implementation of such election, the rural telecommunications carrier shall comply with the notification requirements of subsection (e).<sup>[17]</sup>

#### D. Complainant's Position

Complainant alleged Verizon fails to comply with its obligation to provide reliable telephone and internet services through his telephone and DSL service. Mr. Valentino argued he has not had reliable telephone or internet service for the last few years. He contended he experiences dropped calls, unreliable internet and static on his telephone line. Complainant argues he wants a continuity of service, but he has not received it from Verizon. Complainant asserts he experiences times when there is no dial tone on his landline telephone, despite Verizon's contrary assertions. Mr. Valentino contends he does not have functional internet service and often must reboot the modem repeatedly during a 24-hour period. Complainant insists there are times when the telephone will ring but he cannot speak with the caller until he terminates the landline call and calls on his cell phone. In short, Complainant argues Verizon has failed to provide adequate internet and voice service to his residence over a period of many months.

Complainant asserts Verizon's customer service – in failing to provide him with available and reliable telephone and internet service – is unreasonable and inadequate to meet his needs. Complainant blames Verizon for the problems he experienced with his telephone service (and, as a consequence, his DSL internet service). He contends the facilities Verizon uses to provide telephone service should be repaired or replaced, and Verizon should be ordered to provide reliable service. By asserting Verizon failed to provide reliable residential telephone

---

<sup>17</sup> Further details about time-specific commitments to be made by rural and nonrural telecommunications carriers appear at 66 Pa.C.S. § 3014(b)(2)(ii) and 3014(b)(3)(1)–(2).

service that is free of the problems he describes, Mr. Valentino alleges Verizon provides inadequate or unreasonable service in violation of the Code, specifically 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1501 and 3011–3019. As the proponent of this allegation seeking affirmative relief from the Commission, Complainant bears the burden of proof.<sup>18</sup>

E. Respondent's Position

Verizon denies there are problems with the landline telephone service and argues it provides appropriate DSL service. Further, Verizon denies that any problems Complainant experiences are caused by Verizon's equipment or facilities, or by a failure to provide reasonable and adequate customer service. Respondent avers it replaced all the parts it can on Complainant's line and intends to install all new equipment in December 2023. Verizon asserts the Commission's jurisdiction concerning the DSL service is limited to ensuring Verizon provides at least 1.5 megabit service, pursuant to Chapter 30. Verizon argues it proved that it does provide the requisite 1.5 megabit of DSL service to Complainant. Verizon also asserts it has worked and continues to work to make sure Complainant gets the benefit of the DSL service by testing everything and replacing the equipment.

Further, concerning the telephone voice service, Verizon asserts there are many objects using the one copper line coming into the service address, including the booster, the cell phone booster, the DSL and the voice service. Verizon acknowledges it does not know the cause of the static reported by Complainant but asserts it continues to work with Complainant to test and troubleshoot the cause of the problems Complainant reports. Verizon argues the cause of the problems must originate from inside the service address.

Lastly, Verizon argues it has not violated any order, rule or regulation of the Commission and requests the Commission dismiss the Complaint for failure to meet the burden of proof. Meanwhile, Verizon contends it plans to continue to provide Complainant with reasonable and adequate customer service every time Complainant reports problems. Verizon notes the Chapter 30 speed services it is required to provide are not fast enough for modern

---

<sup>18</sup> 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

technology but hopefully the area in which the service address is located will soon receive faster service, which might eliminate the problems Complainant has reported.

F. Disposition

Complainant has experienced consistent but periodic trouble being able to make/receive telephone calls, maintain a telephone call without heavy static and/or access the internet through the telephone line. In response, Verizon indicates it has done everything it can think to do. It does not argue Mr. Valentino is lying but it asserts it can find no flaw in its service or facilities, or in the equipment within the service address when it investigates the complaints or visits the service address. Complainant's testimony was accepted as credible and proved these intermittent interruptions have been occurring.

Complainant testified credibly about the problems he experiences when attempting to use his telephone or connect to the internet through his telephone line. Respondent did not contend Complainant was lying but denied Complainant experienced dropped calls, experienced static or any other type of unreliable service. Respondent acknowledged it replaced its equipment associated with Complainant's line and intends to install new equipment in December 2023, out of an abundance of caution. Mr. Valentino proved he experiences unreliable service over his telephone line, in the form of static, dropped calls and a concomitant loss of internet service when the telephone service goes down. Complainant's uncontroverted testimony about the existence of service issues was not rebutted sufficiently by Verizon. Accordingly, it is the decision of the undersigned presiding officer that Complainant provided more evidence than Respondent and that evidence rises to the level sufficient to rebut the contrary evidence from Respondent.

Unfortunately, Verizon offered no solutions, no suggested solutions or even recommendations of actions Complainant can take that might improve his access to reliable telephone and DSL internet service. Verizon did prove that it provided Mr. Valentino with reasonable and adequate customer service in its handling of the calls and complaints from Mr.

Valentino. The evidence presented proved Verizon took the calls it received from Complainant seriously and responded reasonably quickly.

The problem with the telephone service remains the most troubling situation, however, and must be rectified. There were too many instances between June and September of 2023 when Complainant lost telephone service. While the presiding officer considered the possibility of issuing a civil penalty, a civil penalty will not provide Complainant with what is critical in a modern residence – reliable and consistent telephone service.<sup>19</sup> Further, any failure to provide reliable and consistent telephone service will result in the loss of reliable and consistent DSL. The hope would be that correcting the problem with the telephone service will improve the DSL service.

Respondent needs to return to the service address and locate the source and/or cause of the static and dropped calls. For that reason, it will be recommended in the Ordering Paragraphs below that a copy of this decision should be provided to the Commission Bureau of Technical Utility Services, which may be able to provide insight and/or guidance into what Respondent can do moving forward to improve reliability for Complainant. Further, Respondent will be ordered to provide a technical report to the Bureau of Technical Utility Services within 60 days from the date of this Initial Decision, which report should outline the actions taken to ascertain the cause of the difficulties and the result of attempts to solve the problem.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Any person with an interest in the subject matter may complain in writing to the Commission about any act or thing done by a public utility which the person claims violates any Commission statute, regulation or order. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

---

<sup>19</sup> The actions taken by Verizon Pennsylvania LLC to attempt to resolve the telephone service issues do not require the imposition of a civil penalty. 52 Pa. Code §69.1201(c); 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

2. The public utility must provide and maintain adequate, efficient, safe, and reasonable service and facilities, making all such repairs, changes, alterations, as needed or proper for the accommodation, convenience, and safety of its patrons. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

3. The proponent of a rule or order has the burden of proof and, to satisfy his burden of proof, Complainant must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence Respondent violated the Public Utility Code or a regulation or order of the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 332(a), 701; *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (1990).

4. The evidence standard requires proof by a greater weight of the evidence which standard is satisfied by presenting evidence that makes the existence of a contested fact more likely than its nonexistence. *Brown v. Commonwealth*, 940 A.2d 610 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2008); *Commonwealth v. Williams*, 732 A.2d 1167 (Pa. 1999).

5. Complainant met the burden of proving Respondent did not provide reasonable and adequate customer service in the provision of reliable telephone and DSL services to the service address. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 332, 3011 *et seq.*

### ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Formal Complaint of Richard Valentino in *Richard Valentino v. Verizon Pennsylvania LLC*, docketed at No. C-2023-3041051, is hereby sustained in that Richard Valentino did prove Verizon Pennsylvania LLC failed to provide reasonable and adequate service when it did not provide reliable telephone service to the service address.

2. That Verizon Pennsylvania LLC shall return to the service address and attempt to resolve the telephone service issues within 30 days from the date of the Initial Decision and create a report outlining what actions were taken, what solutions were suggested and what solutions succeeded, if any.

3. That Verizon Pennsylvania LLC shall provide to the Bureau of Technical Utility Services a copy of the report outlined in Ordering Paragraph 2, within 60 days from the date of the Initial Decision.

4. That the Secretary shall provide a copy of this decision to the Bureau of Technical Utility Services.

5. That the Secretary mark this proceeding as closed.

Date: January 17, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Katrina L. Dunderdale  
Administrative Law Judge