

**BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

<b>IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION</b>	)	
<b>INTO RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANY'S</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. RUR-T-07-01</b>
<b>COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION</b>	)	
<b>RULES REGARDING CLASSIFICATION OF</b>	)	
<b>LOCAL SERVICE AND NOTICE OF</b>	)	<b>ORDER NO. 30324</b>
<b>TERMINATION OF SERVICE</b>	)	

---

On April 20, 2007, the Commission issued final Order No. 30306 in this case dismissing a complaint filed by a customer of Rural Telephone Company. The complainants alleged that Rural discriminated against them with its decision to reclassify their service from residential to business. In response to the complaint, the Commission directed Rural to file an explanation of its procedures regarding classification of the complainants' service. Order No. 30140. The Company filed its written explanation on February 26, 2007, and the complainants filed a response on March 12, 2007.

After reviewing the record in the case, the Commission concluded that Rural "did not act unreasonably, unfairly, or inconsistently with its tariff in determining to reclassify the Shimoda account as business rather than personal." Order No. 30306 p. 4. However, the Commission did not allow Rural to bill and collect the difference between the residential and business rates for past service.

On May 9, 2007, the complainants filed a Petition for Reconsideration. The complainants disagree with the Commission's conclusion that Rural did not act improperly in reclassifying their telephone service. Complainants also argue that the Commission failed to follow its own rules and regulations and also allowed Rural to violate Commission rules and regulations. Finally, the complainants assert that they have not been given a chance to correct the error that occurred when Rural originally classified their service as residential rather than business.

The Commission has fully reviewed and considered the arguments made by complainants in their Petition for Reconsideration and finds that the Petition for Reconsideration should be denied. The arguments and allegations raised in the complainants' Petition are similar to those raised in their complaint and written response and were fully considered by the Commission in reaching its decision in Order No. 30306.

The complainants question why the Commission does not allow them an opportunity now to correct the classification of their telephone service. Nothing in Order No. 30306 prevents the complainants from changing their telephone service. As customers, complainants have the ability to apply to the utility for services offered, as appropriate.

### ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the complainants' Petition for Reconsideration is denied.

THIS IS A FINAL ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION. Any party aggrieved by this Order or other final or interlocutory Orders previously issued in this Case No. RUR-T-07-01 may appeal to the Supreme Court of Idaho pursuant to the Public Utilities Law and the Idaho Appellate Rules. See *Idaho Code* § 61-627.


DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2007.

  
PAUL KJELLANDER, PRESIDENT

  
MARSHA H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER

  
MACK A. REDFORD, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:

  
Jean D. Jewell  
Commission Secretary

bls/O:RUR-T-07-01\_ws3