
April 27, 2018

██████████
████████████████████
██████████████████
██████████

██████████
Office of the President, Rogers Communications
855 York Mills Road
North York, Ontario
M3B 1Z1

RE: CCTS file number #796574

On March 12, 2018, we issued a Recommendation regarding the above complaint. As Mr. ██████ rejected our Recommendation, I am required to issue a Decision under Section 13 of our Procedural Code (“the Code”).

Our Recommendation

Mr. ██████ alleged that he accepted the following offer from Rogers on March 4, 2017: internet, television and home phone services with 15.5 hours (930 minutes) of international calls to Ghana (and 9 other countries of his choice) for the monthly cost of \$158.00 (taxes included) for a 24-month period¹.

Three months after having activated his services with Rogers, Mr. ██████ noticed that he had been overcharged by Rogers. Specifically, he was billed incorrectly for:

- long distance calls made to Ghana that ought to have been included in his plan; and
- the cost of his recurring monthly service fees, as he was billed about \$180.71 (taxes included) when the charges ought to have been \$158.00 (taxes included).

Following our investigation, we concluded that Rogers had agreed to provide Mr. ██████ with a residential bundle, including television, internet, and phone services with 15.5 hours of international long distance minutes to Ghana, for a guaranteed rate of \$158.10 (taxes included) per month for 12 months.

Rogers had agreed that its agent had mistakenly presented this offer to Mr. ██████. It agreed to credit the long distance charges for the period of March to December 2017 and to adjust the monthly service charges retroactively to reflect the agreement from March 2017 to March 2018.

However, Rogers offered to estimate the international long distance usage for the months of January to March 2018 and provide the estimated number of minutes to Mr. ██████ for that period. We did not

¹ A typo was found in the Recommendation: Mr. ██████ indicated that he agreed to a 24-month term, not 12 as stated in the Recommendation.

agree that this was appropriate and instead recommended that Rogers honor the original agreement by crediting up to 930 minutes monthly of long distance charges to Ghana.

Objection to the Recommendation

Under Section 13 of the Procedural Code, a party may reject a Recommendation. That party is required to explain why he or she considers it to be unacceptable or inappropriate.

On March 16, 2018, Rogers accepted CCTS' Recommendation.

However, Mr. [REDACTED] rejected the Recommendation on March 21, 2018². In his objection, Mr. [REDACTED] indicated that our Recommendation did not take into account the entirety of his complaint.

Specifically, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that CCTS did not consider the following:

- Rogers had offered to charge him \$122.00 per month for the first year of the term and \$138.00 a month thereafter as a "student promotions package".
- The television and telephone services haven't functioned properly in months.

Analysis of the Objection

As part of our original investigation, we asked Rogers to provide us with the recorded telephone call between its agent and Mr. [REDACTED] that took place on March 4, 2017.

We were able to confirm that Rogers agreed to provide a residential bundle, including television, internet, and phone services with 15.5 hours of international long distance minutes to Ghana, for a guaranteed rate of \$158.10 (taxes included) per month for 12 months, as described in our Recommendation.

In reviewing the call, we confirm that there was no mention of a "student promotions package" or an offer of \$122.00 a month for the first year and \$138.00 for the second year³. Mr. [REDACTED] did not provide us with any documentation to support these claims.

As for the second issue, we did not investigate the allegations relating to the television and telephone service problems as they were not mentioned in the initial complaint; they were only brought up in the objection to the Recommendation⁴. In the event that Mr. [REDACTED] is still experiencing service problems, he should attempt to resolve them with Rogers. If these problems persist, Mr. [REDACTED] would be free to file a new complaint with CCTS.

Decision

Section 13.2 of our Procedural Code provides that in formulating a Decision the Commissioner shall consider whether there is substantial doubt as to the correctness of the original Recommendation.

² Through an agent that he appointed to discuss the matter with CCTS.

³ These claims contradict Mr. [REDACTED] original complaint.

⁴ We note that television service issues were out-of-scope when Mr. [REDACTED] filed his complaint.

Based on our analysis of his objections, Mr. [REDACTED] has not raised a substantial doubt as to the correctness of the Recommendation.

Accordingly, I confirm the Recommendation in this Decision.

Further to Sections 13.4, 13.5 and 13.6 of our Procedural Code, Mr. [REDACTED] may accept or reject this Decision within 20 days of receipt, and we ask that he inform us of his decision as soon as possible.

Should Mr. [REDACTED] decide to reject this Decision, he may pursue this complaint through any other forum and Rogers shall be fully released from the Decision.

A copy of our Procedural Code is attached for reference.

Sincerely,

Howard Maker
Commissioner