

ORIGINAL

ATTACHMENT B

Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems, Inc.

FPSC Docket No. 980119-TP

Two Redacted Copies of Exhibits BH-11, BH-12, BH-13, AND BH-14

and Two Redacted Copies of Page 39 of

Olukayode A. Ramo's Amended Prefiled Direct Testimony

April 9, 1998

ACK _____
AFA _____
APP _____
CAF _____
CMU _____
CTR _____
EAG _____
LEG _____
LIN _____
OPC _____
RCH _____
SEC + _____
WAS _____
OTH _____

04090-98
4-9-98

1 for an entire week. From January 23, 1998, to January 30,
2 1998, LENS was totally unavailable to us. BellSouth,
3 during this period, held onto a check that we sent them for
4 payment of our bills. BellSouth employees claimed that the
5 bank informed them that Supra did not have enough funds in
6 its account to cover the value of the check. We know this
7 to be completely false as our account representative at the
8 bank told us several times that BellSouth did not call the
9 bank. During this period, we lost several large accounts,
10 including a very large customer, [REDACTED]. We believe that
11 BellSouth wanted [REDACTED] back and that this was the reason
12 BellSouth withheld our check and did not deposit it in the
13 bank. It is not the common practice to call the bank to
14 verify that there are funds to cover a check received from
15 a customer or vendor unless there have been previous bad
16 checks received. Supra has never given BellSouth a bad
17 check. Supra believes this was an intentional anti-
18 competitive tactic by BellSouth to get [REDACTED] back which
19 BellSouth succeeded in doing.

20 Due to the catch-22 regulations regarding paper/fax-
21 based transactions, we were unable to provide service to
22 our customers during that 7-day period. During that same
23 period, BellSouth was able to provide service to its own
24 customers in the same geographical areas, once again
25 highlighting the discriminatory design and rules being
26 applied toward Supra's customer service order processing.