

---

**Ticket: # 1283163 - Data Spike**

**Date:** 10/23/2016 9:51:26 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Dallas, Georgia 30132

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

**Description**

Unexplained data hikes showing via my data usage meter.

---

**Ticket: # 1287671 - Culinary Workers Union 226**

**Date:** 10/26/2016 11:43:07 AM

**City/State/Zip:** York, Pennsylvania 17406

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

### **Description**

CWU#226 has been sending emails requesting that members of The Association of Water Technologists boycott our training event in Las Vegas in 2017. This is the third time they have interfered with our events and have been informed to stop sending emails. When blocked, they use fictitious names to continue to harass. They have been informed that this is an FCC violation by AWT legal staff but continue to disregard my rights and desires. I would like this to stop.

---

**Ticket: # 1287959 - Correct the record**

**Date:** 10/26/2016 1:28:45 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sebastopol, California 95472

**Company Complaining About:** Correct The Record

---

## **Description**

This PAC has been illegally coordinating with the Clinton Campaign and has spent millions on paid "trolls" who have been stifling online discussion regarding the election. They have effectively silenced opponents on sites such as Reddit, Twitter and other online forums by spamming these sites and voting down opposition viewpoints, effectively limiting free speech and fair political discourse. This activity is undemocratic in nature and contributes to the perception of a rigged election, both for the manipulation of social media and blatant disregard for campaign finance law.

---

**Ticket: # 1290191 - ilegal link from mexico to us with no license**

**Date:** 10/27/2016 3:29:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Ysidro, California 92173

**Company Complaining About:** Beta Voip Llc

---

## **Description**

hello,

there is a ISP providing internet to US from mexico giving it to customer with no regulatory permits.

call IM NETWORKS S DE RL DE CV

---

**Ticket: # 1294577 - Bait and switch**

**Date:** 10/31/2016 11:28:28 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Willoughby, Ohio 44094

**Company Complaining About:** Dell

---

## **Description**

Hello,

It is my sincere hope that you can rectify a problem that I am having with an online company, namely Dell Corp. They advertised a Dell Inspiron at \$579.00, marked down from \$949.00. We (my wife and I) tried for 5 days to order the device, but kept getting an error message. When we finally spoke to someone, they said the ad expired 3 days ago and there was a limited quantity, and guided us to links for other computers. There was no mention of expiration date or limited quantities in the ad. This is unfair. Can you hold them accountable?

---

**Ticket: # 1295357 - Internet Service in Apartment Complex is Completely Out - Has Been Out 10/28/2016**

**Date:** 10/31/2016 5:00:56 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Columbus, Georgia 31909

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that on 10/28/2016, while she was on line... using her internet service, provided by AT&T, the service went out completely. The consumer stated that she has called them at least 16-20 times, since Friday. However, no one at AT&T could tell her why their entire apartment complex has NO internet service. The consumer stated that she contacted the apartment management office to determine if they had service. However, they do not subscribe to internet service through AT&T. The leasing agent advised her that they would have AT&T's service on site....very soon. The leasing agent also stated that at that present time, AT&T was working on 7 buildings in the complex. The complex is comprised of 10 buildings. The consumer stated that there are huge rolls of cabling on the property right now. The consumer had subscribed to DSL services. However, AT&T never provided any notification about the pending work order or the fact that all AT&T services would be down at this point in time. The Leasing Agent had also mentioned something AT&T U-Verse. The consumer requests immediate restoration of her services. She also requested appropriate credits for the period of time that she has been without service (Please note: At the present time, service has been out for Four days). The last information, provided by employees at DSL support, (at AT&T), is that service is estimated to be out until Wednesday/November 2, 2016. Originally, she was told that service would be out until Sunday. However, this is the first time that any one has acknowledged that service would be out for an extended period of time. The consumer stated that this type of treatment is inexcusable and they provided no notification for the outage that has lasted several days. The consumer stated that this is most unfair to anyone that telecommutes for their employment and questions why AT&T would not have provided advance notification/been more transparent. The consumer also mentioned that AT&T is sending information, to her home, under her maiden name of (b) (6). This is a name that she has not used for over 20 years. She requests that AT&T cease mailing information to her home/any and all telemarketing activities to her phone and home.

---

**Ticket: # 1297051 - Misled into internet plan that had data cap (Comcast)**

**Date:** 11/1/2016 3:55:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Hudsonville, Michigan 49426

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

I signed up for Comcast's Blast! Internet package a couple of weeks ago over the telephone as my address could not be set up online. The spokesman on the phone said that the plan had speeds of 75 mbps down and 10 mbps up, he never mentioned anything about a data cap. I just logged onto my account online and saw that I apparently have a data cap...

---

**Ticket: # 1297868 - fraudulent web site**

**Date:** 11/2/2016 1:16:27 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Brooklyn, New York 11238

**Company Complaining About:** Sprint

---

## **Description**

The following web site was used to defraud my mother of \$600:

<https://promptechsupport.com>

A pop-up ad appeared on her PC stating there was a virus on her computer and listed a number to call. When she called the number, the person who answered told her she needed to pay \$600 to remove the virus, which she did, using her credit card. The name of the company was Promptech. I called the phone number listed on their web site and it was invalid: 800-949-0031



---

**Ticket: # 1299249 - ATT Time Warner Merger**

**Date:** 11/2/2016 5:32:14 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Atlanta, Georgia 30316

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

I am writing to object to the merger of ATT and Time Warner on the grounds that it violates the basic tenets of the Paramount Decree which explicitly forbids one company to control the distribution, production and exhibition of media content. The paramount decree was decided in the 1930's to prevent one company from controlling all aspects of media production and without it we wouldn't be able to see different film studios content in movie theatres together. We used to have to see fox movies only at fox theatres and the same for United and paramount. ATT and Time Warner will effectively control all three of the categories and will only hurt consumers by providing less choice and competition in the marketplace. I think we both agree that already ISPs are an oligarchy and this merger will only bring about unfair competition and ATT is already a bad company from a consumer perspective so please please please don't allow this to go through.

---

**Ticket: # 1299781 - Reduction of service and quality without warning. Misleading customers.**

**Date:** 11/3/2016 2:05:56 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Angola, Indiana 46703

**Company Complaining About:** Zipspider Inc. [Http://www.zipspider.com/](http://www.zipspider.com/)

---

## **Description**

### **SUMMARY:**

Dishonesty (as in lies through omission) about plans and pricing, and status of IP addresses. Quiet implementations of policies that degrade their customers services without warning, disclosure, or adjusting fees to compensate.

### **THE NAT PROBLEM:**

First there was the the email stating that the isp was switching to non-static IP addresses for customers. If we wished to continue having a static IP we could contact them and continue with it for no additional charge. Otherwise we simply had to ensure our routers were set to use DHCP. This seemed to be no problem as I do not care if my IP address is static or dynamically assigned. What they failed to mention was that their "Non-static IPs" were really local addresses, putting us behind their private NAT.

When I called about this after their change, at first, they happily honored their first statement and set me back up with a static, real, public IP address. Later it was removed at some random time without notifying me. I discovered that I was behind their NAT again while attempting to use various services, some even as trivial as the Playstation Network VOIP. When I called about this again, at first they demanded that I pay an extra fee for a static IP. I explained that I do not care if it is static or dynamic, I just need a real internet IP address that is not restricted by their NAT setup. I explained the original deal and how I feel it's unfair to just change it without even communicating, and after a lengthy conversation with a manager-level person, they agreed to reinstate my previous configuration without their additional fee.

My brother who is a customer of this same ISP, and has been for as long as I have, has asked for the same consideration, but they have denied him. He is unable to access his personally owned home surveillance system without paying this ISP an additional fee to remove the effects of their NAT configuration.

Nowhere on their website do they mention anything about their nonstandard NAT configuration. A customer is never lead to question that this should be anything other than a standard internet connection with a standard world-accessible IP address assigned to them, either static or dynamic. Their technicians are not fully trained and lie to customers accidentally due to ignorance. An installer who was at my house to troubleshoot a different problem, called the office and had them remove me from "bridged mode" without consulting me. And would have left it that way if I didn't overhear the conversation and demand that he reverse the change. He attempted to convince me that it didn't matter. He literally tried to claim that I could still run any and all services, even though the publicly visible IP address was one pointing to THEIR server, instead of my network. He didn't seem to understand what NAT was, or how routing works. Yet he seemed trained to sell me on the idea that I should be subjected to it.

After complaints about this and other things from various customers, they just deleted their facebook page instead of addressing the complaints.

There is still no mention of this NAT situation anywhere on their website, or in any information a customer would be presented with during the course of purchasing the service.

#### UNDISCLOSED BANDWIDTH THROTTLING:

Now we have discovered that they have implemented a new drastic measure for bandwidth management. I am currently paying for 10 Megabits download. This is their residential Advanced Pro plan. One day I discovered that my consistent download rate was capped at 7 Mb. When I called about this, at first the technician had no idea what the problem was. He called me back later that day to explain that it was a policy they implemented. He explained that I should see full speeds if I simply pause a download and wait a moment. He hinted at their intent to remove or reduce this policy in the near future, but made no official claim. He then continued on to repeat the intent of an upgrade to something they call AirFibre, which is something they have literally been saying for years.

I called once again when I noticed that this download restriction was very aggressive. I can start a download, and within five minutes, it will restrict my paid for 10Mb connection to 7Mb for the remainder of the download. And it reduces its trigger time the more the connection is used, rendering the pause suggestion useless. This technician was also unaware of the policy until I explained to him what was going on. He apologized and said he could do nothing about it.

This bandwidth throttling was implemented quietly.

This policy change was never communicated to their customers in any way (Except to me when I contacted them about it). As of typing this, there is no information whatsoever about it on their website, not even in their terms of service agreement. They are marketing specific bandwidth allotments for specific prices, with no mention of throttling.

---

**Ticket: # 1300020 - Verizon Wireless Data Spike**

**Date:** 11/3/2016 10:39:11 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Virginia Beach, Virginia 23451

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

## **Description**

My Verizon Wireless data has spike 14gb in one month with similar use compared to previous months.

---

**Ticket: # 1306805 - Complaint against Rise Broadband****Date:** 11/7/2016 11:19:24 PM**City/State/Zip:** Weatherford, Texas 76087**Company Complaining About:** Rise Broadband

---

**Description**

Rise Broadband claims they do not throttle but instead 'reduce speed based on network congestion'. The reduction 1. is not relative based on the subscribers plan and unfairly affects users who have knowingly chosen to pay more to ensure they have the needed speed. Subscribers on the lowest plan only have their overall speed reduced to 50% of the original advertised speeds while subscribers on the highest available plan are throttled to 13.3% of their original advertised speed. 2. 'Network congestion' is almost a daily event from my testing. I have found that approximately 5 out of every 7 days subscribers on my distribution cell experience reduced speeds because of 'network congestion'. I have asked Rise Broadband to provide exact details, to make sure I am not testing incorrect; they have refused to do so. Unfortunately, in the rural area I am in, I have not been able to find any other providers and do not have other options.

---

**Ticket: # 1308310 - Deceptive and Unethical practices, Discriminatory Practices.**

**Date:** 11/9/2016 4:41:43 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Boardman, Ohio 44512-2012

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

I have had numerous ongoing issues with AT&T as a company. In my dealings with them, that I am disabled, the nature of said disability, and requests for accommodation that I might access customer service or technical support without being subjected to abusive conduct is well documented. I have been forced to lodge numerous complaints, with AT&T directly, and other regulatory agencies. On October 21st I began experiencing short interruptions in my service, and given my disability and previous dealings had put off contacting AT&T for days because of the strain I already knew it would place on me. Upon Contacting customer service on the 26 of October I was refused service, then upon contacting the office of the president I was refused the right to lodge a complaint (which exacerbated my mental/emotional illness for which I am disabled and which AT&T is well aware of). I contacted liaisons in AT&T's legal office and was intent on terminating service - they stated they wanted to address the issues first. I renewed my desire for a functional accommodation to avoid these confrontations with Abusive customer service. For the following week I had limited contact with AT&T, despite numerous emails and attempts to call on my part, and what contact I did have was not conducive to a solution. After several emails where I stated my desire to resolve these issues in a more permanent form, and still making no progress I filed a new complaint with the Ohio AG regarding the service issues. Following this AT&T terminated my service, after business hours, on a Friday, guaranteeing I would be unable to reach anyone. They insist they did so at my request, and have refused any further contact with me or effort to discuss this, resolve it, or restore service. I was clear in a communication to AT&T on November 2nd termination of internet was not what I wanted, but I felt am functionally being forced to terminate services by being denied reasonable customer service or tech support to address issues when they arise. I have prove of continuing requests for accommodation and continuing deceptive, misleading, and outright abusive conduct by Costumer service as well as clear evidence of notification of disability and requests time and again for accommodations so as to insure I can receive adequate service. What I have is the mental guarantee if I call customer service it is going to be more of the same, and will escalate my anxiety and blood pressure, and pose risk to my health, while not accomplishing its purpose - and that this is by AT&T's intentional design. I feel AT&T is encouraging and condoning bad behavior on the part of it's customer service agents. I feel the actions of AT&T in handling customer service and complaints, and in the continued misrepresentations and inaccurate information provided by costumer service constitute a willful and malicious denial of service and that the termination of my services is based in discriminatory and unethical practices. AT&T has continued to provide me false, misleading, and deceptive answers and engage in abusive conduct through it's various customer service avenues. Including a stretch in August and September when AT&T was to increase the bandwidth caps on all Uverse account holders, and over a period of multiple weeks I had to repeatedly contact customer service for the information on my account being inaccurate and not getting fixed.

---

**Ticket: # 1308317 - Biased**

**Date:** 11/9/2016 6:06:23 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Bloomfield, Iowa 52537

**Company Complaining About:** Straight Talk

---

### **Description**

CNN, the news agency. Chose to be completely biased and one side during the Presidential Elections. After being caught, there where no consequence, not even a slap on the wrist.

---

**Ticket: # 1311464 - Comcast Sold a package and then refused to honor it.**

**Date:** 11/11/2016 1:43:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Jaffrey, New Hampshire 03452

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

My wife and I were on internet essentials. We decided to upgrade and called the call center. We were told by the sales rep. that there was a package with up to 200mbp internet speed and also 145+ cable channels for \$79. The sales rep's, supervisor overrode a code they saw about amnesty and told us they had no idea what it meant. My wife and I paid \$45 for the overnight shipping of the equipment. I came home after work to install everything and the TV screen told us to call Comcast. We called and were told that they were not going to allow us to have the package, that we could not upgrade, had to return the equipment and that they were not going to refund the \$45 shipping fee. We spoke to different people at comcast over two days for over three hours and no one was willing to do anything for us, even though the original sales manager did an override for the amnesty associated with Internet Essentials. At this point they are not allowing us to upgrade our service, even though we are more than capable of paying and it was approved by the sales manager!



---

**Ticket: # 1312140 - Data Usage****Date:** 11/11/2016 10:00:14 PM**City/State/Zip:** Joppa, Alabama 35087**Company Complaining About:** Viasat

---

**Description**

On the Internet Plan I have with Exede Internet Services by ViaSat I have a soft cap at 10GB and after the 10GB have been used my speed is slowed considerably for the remaining of the billing cycle. During the time after the data cap is reached is referred to by ViaSat as "Liberty Pass" and during the time of 5am -2pm is when the connection should be faster on Liberty Pass and slowed even more Significantly during "peak usage hours" of 3pm-4am. During my last billing cycle data was shown being used at all hours of the day when no one was home and even being used with nothing connected to the Internet Modem. The Issue I am having is I am paying for 10GBs of non throttled data every month but only get to use about 4GBs of it because they are saying I am using 6GBs of it during the time nothing is connected to the service. In a summery I am not getting the non throttled data I am paying for every month because of the amount they are saying I have used. I am canceling the service and they are applying a 150 cancellation fee and I feel this should be waved because I am paying for 10GBs of non throttled data and I am not receiving the full amount and this is a violation of the contract between myself and Exede by ViaSat.

---

**Ticket: # 1312225 - Comcast Blocking access to HBO Go on PS4**

**Date:** 11/12/2016 12:30:17 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Richfield, Minnesota 55423

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

The Playstation 4 game console (PS4) offers an application to stream HBO Go shows. This application works with what appears to be every Internet provider in the United States except Comcast.

Comcast has not disclosed the reasoning for their incompatibility. They have made claims that it is a "business decision" but they have not been nearly transparent enough about their reasoning.

Customer service reps evading the question can be seen at the following links:

<http://forums.xfinity.com/t5/Xfinity-TV-Website/HBO-Go-on-PS4/m-p/2733850#M47137>

<http://forums.xfinity.com/t5/Xfinity-TV-Website/PS4-HBO-GO/m-p/2742629#M60478>

<http://forums.xfinity.com/t5/On-Demand/HBO-Go-PS4/td-p/2537324/page/2>

It has been over a year since the HBO Go functionality was enabled for other Internet providers. Comcast does not have the customer's best interests in mind.

---

**Ticket: # 1313469 - Misuse of public information.**

**Date:** 11/13/2016 9:48:07 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Bakersfield, California 93304-6323

**Company Complaining About:** None

---

## **Description**

The popular social media platform Twitter is just one example. In a move that literally defies all common sense, they have decided to allow the hashtag #AssassinateTrump to be used and promoted. You need to do something about this. Since Twitter is part of Google, they need to have their license pulled. Threatening death to our future president is a serious crime. They have even allowed people to break Twitter's own rules by using vulgar language.

---

**Ticket: # 1318747 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 11/17/2016 12:31:17 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

After a rude call from a Comcast representative I've been informed that Comcast will not disclose how it measures my data cap. The information is unavailable to audit, see detail or check against my records. Comcast refuses to provide any information about it's 'third party' resource it claims is performing an audit. Leading to questions of if they are truly objective.

---

**Ticket: # 1321338 - ktla ch5 los angeles market false biased reporting**

**Date:** 11/18/2016 6:12:34 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Phelan, California 92329

**Company Complaining About:** Boost Mobile

---

### **Description**

I have Routinely documented obviously false and inflammatory news stories that with minimal vetting that are obviously wrong. ktla is violating the public trust. the Arctic is NOT 36f higher then normal. it is Currently 36f. period. this is obvious false news to forward the agenda of global warming. I have had enough and my group is going to force you to do your job and fine them. this will be coordinated with our own payed protesters. you will be hearing from us regarding this violation of the. Public trust that ktla continually breaches. Thank you. The public is now fighting back.

---

**Ticket: # 1322990 - Comcast Trade Practice Complaint****Date:** 11/21/2016 9:39:06 AM**City/State/Zip:** Bloomington, Minnesota 55425**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Since approximately 2004 I've subscribed to "Xfinity Internet" service for roughly 54 dollars per month. It provided download speeds of 50-60 mbps. I recently changed my, contractually independent, Xfinity cable services. I received a verbal assurance from the rep at the Comcast store that the change would have no impact on my wifi plan/service. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Without my knowledge or consent they changed my wifi plan to one that provided about half the speed at a higher price - all without my knowledge or consent. My calls to their customer service were not helpful. They basically say that their systems do not permit them to restore my previous wifi plan. They offered me a one year promotional deal on my wifi which I accepted because I don't think that either I or the FCC will be able to compel Comcast to honor its contractual commitments.

---

**Ticket: # 1328735 - Grossly Inaccurate Data Metering Biased In Comcast's Favor****Date:** 11/26/2016 1:46:29 PM**City/State/Zip:** Grand Rapids, Michigan 49507**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Since implementing their 1TB data cap, Comcast's data meter has consistently been grossly inaccurate and biased extremely in Comcast's favor. Currently, for Nov 1 - Nov 26, 2016, Comcast claims I have used 287GB of data. My router, on the other hand, has only transmitted a total of 153.93 GB (sent and received) from Oct 28 - Nov 26, 2016. As you can see, this includes several more days of traffic and is significantly lower than Comcast's claim of my data usage. I demand to be exempted from the data usage plan or have the 1TB cap cease to be enforced, as Comcast is unable or unwilling to provide accurate data monitoring as has been repeatedly pointed out by several customers, and they only bias the data in their favor to inflate actual data used and extract more fees from customers.

---

**Ticket: # 1329864 - 1TB of Capped Data is Not Generous, it's Criminal.**

**Date:** 11/28/2016 1:40:22 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97236

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I hope this reaches the person making the decisions to exploit customers through the implementation of a data cap for internet usage. I would like to extend my complete distaste for that person, as they are knowingly preying on unsuspecting customers.

With 4K video streaming becoming more commonplace as 4K TVs are now being adopted at much higher rates, Comcast is preventing their customers from using their brand new TVs. It's not just video streaming either, as video game downloads are averaging 50GB each, with some reaching closer to the 80 and 90GB mark, and that's excluding post-release-day patches.

Comcast's PR page on data caps state that a terabyte worth of data is equal to 600 hours of HD video streaming. This is incredibly deceptive to those who are purchasing 4K TVs, or utilizing streaming services available from one of Comcast's many cable-cutting competitors. UHD video streaming uses up nearly 4 times the bandwidth of HD, and thus, UHD streaming eats up a terabyte data cap much more quickly than Comcast will publicly admit.

The deceptive bullet points on the PR page do not stop there. "Play better. Play more." reads the game related headline on the PR page, but the tag "play more", is an outright lie. As mentioned before, video game download sizes are reaching an all time high. This will be especially noticeable during the holiday season, as customer's data caps will be decimated from a small number of new video game installs.

Comcast needs to increase the data cap usage dramatically, not just for the sake of fairness to its customers, but for innovation and growth within the home entertainment industry through increased viewing resolutions, and the explosion of video game digital distribution services.



---

**Ticket: # 1330528 - net neutrality**

**Date:** 11/28/2016 3:07:47 PM

**City/State/Zip:** New York, New York 10023

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

## **Description**

I do not think net neutrality should be dismantled. It is completely obvious to me that dismantling net neutrality would be an enormous disservice to the common person/consumer. It is clearly in the interest of ISPs and ISPs only. There is a whirlwind of ignorance and disinformation on this subject that is making this an unnecessarily partisan issue. Please do what is in your power to ensure that net neutrality remains in place. This is not an issue specifically with my internet service provider, but the issue of net neutrality in general.

---

**Ticket: # 1339115 - internet speed**

**Date:** 12/4/2016 9:35:53 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Brandon, Florida 33510

**Company Complaining About:** Bright House

---

### **Description**

Since August I have been paying for 200 mps/ Have been out since August 25 they have been out 6 times cable and 7 times about speed. my speed is still 12 mps. They charge me 180\$ a month and do not provide the service that I am promised. I work from home and this is a terrible inconvenience

---

**Ticket: # 1339241 - Cox "Enhanced Error Results Page" DNS hijacking w/ advertising/sponsored results persists despite Opt-out**

**Date:** 12/5/2016 2:23:05 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Phoenix, Arizona 85013-9998

**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

**Description**

Despite opting out of this service, which hijacks one's DNS requests and returns a page with advertising/"sponsored" results, Cox continues to employ it on my connection. I have verified on a number of occasions that I have indeed opted-out (see attached for PDF of page confirmation from today; cannot recall when I originally opted-out, but it would have likely been at some point in early-mid 2013) and taken the issue up with technical support (ticket CUI000003395135 - opened around 2PM MST on May 17, 2016). In other words, at some point between when I originally opted-out in 2013 and May 17, 2016, Cox's system stopped respecting my opt-out status (and perhaps others) for their DNS hijack-based advertising scheme.

Despite being told that I would received a follow-up within 24 hours and my following-up with them on May 23, 2016, the issue persisted. I advised them in my follow-up that if they failed to address the issue, I would consider filing a complaint such as this. Months later this issue remains unaddressed and I have, to date, still not received a response on my support ticket from May 17.

Attached is a PDF of results from a query today that triggered the error results page. Ironically one of the web results listed concerns DNS hijacking. In a captive market for high speed internet, this practice is abusive, regardless of the opt-out provision, but made even more so when the opt-out provision is illusory. Given the recent reclassification of broadband Internet service as a public utility, this practice should be reevaluated further beyond just this instance.

I look forward to engagement on this issue and, if appropriate, an investigation being initiated.

---

**Ticket: # 1342099 - Data improperly represented**

**Date:** 12/6/2016 7:40:24 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Tacoma, Washington 98445

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I have a data cap of 1TB and I've monitored my connection on my firewall and Comcast is claiming I used 200GB more than I really did. If I used that much to the point of where I'm risking going over, they need to prove it to me by having some type of meter at my house that both them and I can see. They should not be allowed to just say that "this is what you used although we have no proof to show you so deal with it."

---

**Ticket: # 1342602 - rude customer service / high bill**

**Date:** 12/7/2016 10:31:08 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Bonaire, Georgia 31005

**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

## **Description**

cox customer service is very rude. and changed my monthly plan to a higher rate that I have been paying and refuse to credit my account back

6:53, Dec 7

Info: Thank you for choosing to chat with us. An agent will be with you shortly.

6:53, Dec 7

Info: Welcome to Cox Live Chat Support. My name is Denice G., it's my pleasure to assist you today!

6:53, Dec 7

Denice G.: Hello! (b) (6)

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): hello

6:54, Dec 7

Denice G.: I'm happy to help. Let's take a look.

6:54, Dec 7

Denice G.: Are you receiving an error message?

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): no

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): I don't know my log in information

6:55, Dec 7

Denice G.: Oh okay.

6:55, Dec 7

Denice G.: I'm glad to assist to provide it.

6:55, Dec 7

Denice G.: To better assist you, I will need the following information: 1. The 10-Digit Phone Number as it is listed on the account. 2. Your full name as it is listed on the account. 3. Your complete home address where the service is located. 4. The four-digit PIN number listed on the account.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): (b) (6) pin # (b) (6) address (b) (6) Bonaire ga 31005

6:57, Dec 7

Denice G.: Thank you for all the information you have provided me. This will take me a moment while I look up your account information.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): thanks

6:58, Dec 7

Denice G.: We appreciate your business.

6:59, Dec 7

Denice G.: May I have the Cox pin number please?

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6) : (b) (6)

6:59, Dec 7

Denice G.: Thanks.

6:59, Dec 7

Denice G.: The Cox pin did not match.

7:00, Dec 7

Denice G.: The Cox PIN can be found on the first page of your current bill statement on the right side, directly under the "Account number."

7:00, Dec 7

Denice G.: May I have the Secret Q/A: City your parents met?

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6) : (b) (6)

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6) : (b) (6)

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6) : pin number (b) (6)

7:00, Dec 7

Denice G.: Thank you.

7:01, Dec 7

Denice G.: Thanks.

7:01, Dec 7

Denice G.: I was able to access.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): thanks

7:02, Dec 7

Denice G.: I can go ahead and inform you that your primary e-mail address in the service is "(b) (6)" (without quotation marks).

7:02, Dec 7

Denice G.: I'm going to reset the password so you can sign in.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): OKAY

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): I HAVE IT THANMNKS

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT PLAN IM ON

7:04, Dec 7

Denice G.: The password was successfully reset. The new password for (b) (6) is (b) (6)

7:04, Dec 7

Denice G.: Try accessing and let me know if it works.



7:05, Dec 7

Denice G.: Sure.

7:06, Dec 7

Denice G.: For internet service you have the Preferred for 50mbps.

7:08, Dec 7

Denice G.: For TV is the Advanced Contour 2 package.

7:09, Dec 7

Denice G.: It worked?

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): YES I WANT TO KNOW THE BEST PLACE FOR ME FOR 80.00 A MONTH

7:11, Dec 7

Denice G.: In this case I'm able to downgrade the services package to lower cost.

7:11, Dec 7

Denice G.: Let me check please.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): IM NOT ON A PLAN NOW

7:12, Dec 7

Denice G.: Yes, you under a plan.

7:12, Dec 7

Denice G.: All services active is under a plan.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): IM NOT IN A CONTRACT

7:13, Dec 7

Denice G.: No, you not under a contract.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): SO WHAT IS THE PRICE I CAN GET UNDER a contract

7:14, Dec 7

Denice G.: I'm sorry the contract with price lock is for new customers with 3 services.

7:14, Dec 7

Denice G.: Allow me a moment, please.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): I would like the silver bundle

7:15, Dec 7

Denice G.: I recommend changing your password immediately. To change your password, go to [www.cox.com](http://www.cox.com), click the My Account tab then under Manage Profile click Change Password. Sign in to your account and the option to change your password will display. Follow the prompts to change your password.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i have changed my password

7:16, Dec 7

Denice G.: Okay.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): about that silver bundle

7:18, Dec 7

Denice G.: Thank you for waiting.

7:19, Dec 7

Denice G.: I would like to inform that the Silver package is for new customers I can try verify lower package to save also can refer to the loyalty department with a representative for them to check a promotion to lower cost too.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): okay i was on the 89.00 package someone took me off

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i need it

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): \$99.49 Contour TV Includes: \$70.00 Cox TV Starter (Promo Rate) Price protected at \$24.99 Expanded Service (Promo Rate) Price protected at \$53.00 Contour Guide Faith & Values Pak Advanced TV Service (Promo Rate) Price protected at \$4.00 DVR Service (Promo Rate) \$5.00 Price protected at \$12.99 Mini Box \$2.99 Starz (Promo Rate) \$10.00 Price protected at \$15.99 Contour Receiver \$8.50 Other Fees and Surcharges Broadcast Surcharge \$3.00 Total TV \$99.49  
INTERNET\$19.99 Cox High Speed Internet Preferred Includes: Preferred Internet Service (Promo Rate) Price protected at \$72.99 Download speeds up to 50 Mbps. 1TB (1,024 GB) Monthly Data Plan. 50 GB free Cloud Drive storage. Cox Security Suite Plus. Total Internet \$19.99  
TELEPHONE\$16.99 Basic Monthly Service \$16.99 Directory Listing - Block Phone Book Total Telephone \$16.99 \

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i need this package back

7:23, Dec 7

Denice G.: I do apologize for this inconvenience.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): ok

7:24, Dec 7

Denice G.: It seems the promotion you are viewing is for new customers, my resources allow to downgrade service package to lower cost, but if this is not the case.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): no that was on my account

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): someone took it off i need it back on my account

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): account

7:25, Dec 7

Denice G.: Yes, but once disconnect the phone service the bundle discount lost and the others service go to the regular cost.

7:25, Dec 7

Denice G.: This was informed when make the change.

7:25, Dec 7

Denice G.: This is why the bill increase.

7:25, Dec 7

Denice G.: We appreciate your business and we have the Loyalty dedicated department to verify a new promotion discount or campaign to lower cost. You can contact them at: 888-438-6673 they will be more than happy to assist.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): no i was told that i would get the same deal bc i was on a bundle plan

7:26, Dec 7

Denice G.: You can lower the internet for the essential but speed will be less.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): no i would like my place back

7:26, Dec 7

Denice G.: Also for Tv can go to the basic package.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i wasn't on a bundle plan so i need it back

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i may need to speak to a sup

7:27, Dec 7

Denice G.: I can place the same package have but the promotion is not applicable.

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i need to speak with a sup

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): i was told that my bill would stay the same

7:29, Dec 7

Denice G.: Okay.

7:30, Dec 7

Denice G.: I understand and I apologize for this information if it was not inform.

7:30, Dec 7

Denice G.: Did you contact by chat to do this change?

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): okay i need to get my monthly bill back to where it was

9:27, Dec 7

(b) (6): no on the phone

7:33, Dec 7

Denice G.: I understand and I'm so sorry about this but in this case my resources does not allow to set up a promotion p

---

[Ticket: # 1347054 - asking for money](#)

**Date:** 12/9/2016 7:00:23 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winchester, Illinois 62694

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

asking for Money ..on trip in Philippines.

---

**Ticket: # 1348353 - Problems in the Coachella Valley,CA with land phone lines**

**Date:** 12/11/2016 5:53:13 PM

**City/State/Zip:** La Quinta, California 92253

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

## **Description**

Frontier Communications is our provider.

Prior to Frontier was Verizon who sold to Frontier. We had no complaint with Verizon. Yesterday I had no dial tone. Working with 3 different people yesterday I finally had a dial tone. Today I have a dial tone and no matter who I call including Frontier customer service I am told I cannot get thru and to call back later.

I am being told the same thing by my friends in the area that they are having the same problem.

Thank God we have cell phones. This is a monstrous problem out here and we need your help. This area is inhabited by seniors and not everyone has a cell phone.



---

**Ticket: # 1351463 - Verizon Data Usage Measurements are Incorrect****Date:** 12/13/2016 5:03:32 PM**City/State/Zip:** Oakland, California 94612**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that he has never had an issue with going over his data allowance on his wireless plan. He stated that he has actually decreased the usage of data over the last 7-8 months. However, since obtaining his iPhone 6S, he has noticed an increase in what Verizon Wireless is showing has been used. He stated that he has actually exceeded the amount on his original plan... (He subscribes to 10 GB). The consumer stated that he is always connected to Wi-Fi because he works from home and uses his home internet service and Wi-Fi connection. He also has the Wi-Fi Assist feature turned off. He stated that the information on line indicates "social media" usage. He stated that he does not use social media while on the road. Therefore, while he is at home, this usage should NOT be counted because he is using Wi-Fi services. The iCloud drive is also turned off so that cellular data is not used, randomly. The consumer believes that the readings are either inaccurate in order to encourage the purchase of a larger data package. .... OR there is a problem with the phone and this does not appear to be the case as the phone is relatively new. The consumer stated that there are multiple filings on line regarding this issue while using Verizon's services.

---

**Ticket: # 1353671 - Monopoly**

**Date:** 12/14/2016 8:23:56 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Antonio, Texas 78258

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

## **Description**

Two issues:

1. No competition. Spectrum is the ONLY option in my very established neighborhood
2. Forced me to pay a bill without being able to look at it. They offered to mail it but I can't go two weeks without internet.

I recently purchased a home. I contacted spectrum/time warner cable for service. Paid \$200.00 and then a couple of days later they claimed I owed them \$175.00 from 4 years ago for equipment not turned in. I cancelled installation until this was figured out. I spoke to someone in consumer relations and was told they would investigate and would contact me. Several days went by and I discovered that company was my only option. I have my fiance call spectrum back to initiate service and they said they no longer serviced that home. i have to call them back and dealt with multiple people before someone in the audit depart finally told me i had to pay it or i would not have service. I did not have time to wait for them to mail me a copy of a bill i knew was incorrect. I felt I had no choice to pay and i also did not like that I couldn't go with another company. I have used AT&T for several years with no issue.

---

**Ticket: # 1356152 - Open Internet Transparency Rule****Date:** 12/16/2016 12:51:10 PM**City/State/Zip:** Gruetli Laager, Tennessee 37339**Company Complaining About:** Ben Lommand Connect

---

**Description**

Company is violating Open Internet Transparency Rule. Ben Lommand Connect is the only provider at my address. When looking at their service prior to adding services, the online pricing shows Internet a la carte for my speeds 59.99 a month. However when we went in person to sign up for service they then sprung on us that they require a land line phone as well. Nowhere on the internet does it say that land line is required. So 59.99 for 15mbps down and 1mbps up. Adding in the phone line brings the price to 74.99 before taxes and regulatory costs. On top of that nothing on there website states there is a membership fee up front. We had to pay 10.00 membership fees. Now they offer Fiber as well but I cannot get it at my house which is .4 miles from where the fiber stops. Which is cheaper for faster speeds. I pay more for 15down and 1 up vs the fiber customer down the road who gets 50 down and 20 up for the same price. Also they failed to disclose that I would have to buy a modem. When the installer came to the house he asked for our modem. We told him we didn't have one. "well you have to buy a modem". No rental options we have to buy it. I truly don't believe that buying a modem for DSL is going to be beneficial to me in the future and I shouldn't be forced to buy the companies equipment. There is no alternative to ben lommand as the other provider stops .4 miles down the road as well.

---

**Ticket: # 1356501 - Data Overages by Verizon Wireless****Date:** 12/16/2016 3:03:04 PM**City/State/Zip:** Charlotte, Michigan 48813**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that in June, he began having problems reading the data reporting information for his jet pack. It showed "not available". Therefore, he called Verizon Wireless/his service provider. He was advised that they were having problems with the towers and it was not sending the requested readings. They also advised that they were working on the problem. In November, the consumer received a replacement Jet Pack. (Verizon sent a refurbished device). This Jet Pack constantly required hard re-booting. Therefore, Verizon replaced this device with another Jet Pack. Since Tuesday of this week, 12/13/2016, the consumer again experienced issues - the data usage readings were skyrocketing. Verizon Wireless increased the data plan by issuing a credit to the account for the difference between the present plan and the next highest plan. They advised the consumer to use the Jet Pack in the same manner and they would monitor the usage through the towers. The consumer stated that he received yet another replacement Jet Pack on 12/14/2016. However, he is still experiencing incorrect data usage readings. He stated that the amount of data being used is way out of line. The consumer stated that his daughter, in the past, has accessed the Jet Pack for about 6 hours, daily. However, her data usage changed in June - she only uses the Jet Pack about 2 1/2 hours per day...now usage is about half of the original amount of time and Verizon is recording double the usage. The consumer stated that his daughter, (b) was also able to "message" a friend in Africa. However, she can not do this anymore because the data instantaneously escalates to data usage that is NOT accurate/is being reported as a very high amount. Verizon has requested the consumer re-set the tablet to low data usage/manual settings for all apps. This required him to make, maybe a dozen trips, to Best Buy in order to have a technician re-set everything to manual settings. He stated that they do not have any programs running in the background, etc. Everything is has been re-set to factory settings as per Verizon's request. The consumer stated that it is very apparent that Verizon Wireless cannot accurately measure data. He stated that although they have tried to be helpful, these readings/data measurements are not accurate. He stated that he is paying for service and is now unable to use the tablet in the same manner since Verizon experienced the "tower issues". He stated that Verizon constantly blames his daughter or the device for these problems. He stated that these tactics are highly deceptive/egregious and it nets them more money/encourages consumers to purchase more data, thereby netting them more money. He stated that at one point two employees have tried to sell him a new plan which is \$100.00 per month. (He is presently on a 5GB plan that cost \$50.00 per month). He stated that the tablet has showed that there is a SIM card error. One staff member stated that this could indicate this may be a defective device or the SIM card is defective. (Therefore, he is wondering if this particular Jet Pack also has problems). One of the local Verizon stores advised the consumer that these particular Jet Packs are not the "best devices". However, Verizon Corporate stated that this is the newest device...which it is not the newest device. He stated that he has problems downloading anything from this Jet Pack - The tablet constantly shows that it is buffering. (He stated that when they use free Wi-Fi, which is now often required.... at the library, etc. - there is no buffering). Therefore, the consumer believes that he is being throttled. He stated that his bill resets on the 13th of each month. Therefore, since the 14th, he has used less than 1 GB...about 1/2. Therefore, his traffic should not be slowed. He stated that during the time that Verizon stated that they would monitor the overages and provided the

next tier of service (10 GB) - they did not even use the amount of data provided, as a courtesy. They used slightly over the normal 5GB in spite of the fact that Verizon told them to use what they needed. His daughter did use the tablet more than usual during this period as per Verizon's request. The consumer stated that this alone demonstrates that data usage is being manipulated. The consumer stated that prior to June they used about 4 GB or slightly more....per month. Now they use almost 1 GB in two days...not possible ? He stated that they are not even using the tablet that much, any longer....unless on public Wi-Fi. The consumer stated that he has had service for about 18 years and has been a loyal customer. He requests that this behavior be stopped.

---

**Ticket: # 1358307 - Frontier High Speed "Boardband" is false advertising due to the new FCC regulations about broadband classification**

**Date:** 12/18/2016 3:46:21 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Rochester, New York 14624

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

## **Description**

Frontier High Speed "Boardband" is false advertising due to the new FCC regulations about broadband classification. I live in Rochester, NY and we only have two competitors in our area, (municipal oligopoly much) Frontier and Time Warner. We have Frontier right now and frontier is lying based off of their advertisements for "broadband internet" which is advertised as "Simply Broadband Max Includes: Download speed: as fast as 6 Mbps, Upload speed: as fast as 1 Mbps"(1) which under the new FCC classification regulations is now a connection must have a 25 Mbps download speed and 3 Mbps up to be classified as broadband.(2) Clearly Frontier is false advertising.

Sources:(1)- <https://frontier.com/shop/internet/dsl/simply-max>

(2)- <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-finds-us-broadband-deployment-not-keeping-pace>

---

**Ticket: # 1359603 - Comcast Internet Service is Sporadic****Date:** 12/19/2016 4:12:40 PM**City/State/Zip:** Manahawkin, New Jersey 08050**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that there had been a lightening strike around October, 2016. This occurred across the street from her residence. Comcast did respond to repair the problems other neighbors had experienced. However, since that occurrence, her telephone, internet, and TV service has been sporadic. Services cut off and on. The consumer stated that at the present time, all three services are not workin at all . The cable set top box and modem have both been replaced. However, this has not been the source of the outages. A second service visit was performed for a corroded cable. This was not the issue. When services went out, this past Saturday, Comcast called and advised that they had turned the service off. The consumer can only assume that it is because they are working on the problem (?) Therefore, the consumer requested that Comcast immediately repair her triple bundled service and restore all three services to working order. She also requests that appropriate credits be provided to her account because her services have not worked properly since the lightening strike/Comcast first attempted to address the reported services issues.

---

**Ticket: # 1363513 - have not had a steady internet connection for 2 weeks**

**Date:** 12/21/2016 7:26:50 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Naples, Florida 34104

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

### **Description**

I have not had a steady internet connection for some 2 weeks, after calling Comcast at least five times and speaking with a supervisor, who promised service, after leaving many messages on his private phone line, I have never had a reply, Please all I want is service to solve my problem



---

**Ticket: # 1365584 - Charged for Unnecessary Services and Fees**

**Date:** 12/23/2016 1:06:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Howard, South Dakota 57349

**Company Complaining About:** Alliance Communications

---

**Description**

I am writing to you because my ISP states on their website "Due to federal guidelines, a phone line is required to receive Internet. Residential customers should consider subscribing to a bundle for the best overall pricing on Internet, cable TV and phone.", <https://www.alliancecom.net/internet/>

Is this lawful? They do not cite the guideline or regulation, and charge \$18 a month (plus tax and fess coming to \$34.83 every month)) for a landline that I use maybe once a month. It seems to me like they are fleecing me, and other customers into buying an unneeded service. I seriously pay almost as much for the landline as I do for the internet!

Are they requiring landline service illegally? Is this a case of false advertising?

---

**Ticket: # 1374190 - Fake News sites with "articles " promoting products**

**Date:** 12/30/2016 10:09:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Greensboro, North Carolina 27410

**Company Complaining About:** The Smart Shoppers. Com

---

## **Description**

I am writing re t arding the following URL:

<http://www.thesmartershoppers.com/ABA/3/fbg/iq.html?rt=bg&sxid=cec39olozdei>

The site masquerades as a Forbes news site. However the URL and lofty claims reveal otherwise. This is a fake news site with an "article" about a dietary supplement taken by billionaires to help boost memory and IQ.

My 75 year old father told me about this site and the memory boosting pill Bill Gates touted in Forbes. I explained it was a fake news site.

Why is this not regulated? With our expanding aging population, how can we take greater measures to safeguard them against the sneaky ploys of sites, such as these. It is most alarming that a reputable magazine and public figures are used as persuasion tactics.

Just something to consider.

---

**Ticket: # 1374923 - This isn't a complaint but a question...I guess about fake news?**

**Date:** 1/1/2017 7:19:36 AM

**City/State/Zip:** West Palm Beach, Florida 33409

**Company Complaining About:** Google

---

## **Description**

does google news..or yahoo news make revenue by selling space for news? Example. I didn't see it, but there was an article about mariah carey's disastrous NY performance. then on google news there was an article by US weekly about how Mariah Carey looked forward to making headlines in 2017. OK, by then her publicist had probably called US weekly. Was that article then given priority on google news bc they were allowed to pay for that article placement? Are these companies required to state how their algorithm works? are they paid for this? are there any checks and balances? I apologize for asking this, I just don't know where this is regulated. also, this is just an example.

---

**Ticket: # 1379545 - Internet**

**Date:** 1/4/2017 2:21:30 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Woodridge, Illinois 60517

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

### **Description**

I have been charged for someone stealing my internet services and the internet provider has not helped. When i call to resolve they have representatives that do not understand English to even resolve the issue.

---

**Ticket: # 1382296 - fraud**

**Date:** 1/5/2017 5:32:03 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Diamond Bar, California 91765-1815

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

## **Description**

I was some directed to Peler Tech LLC while I was on line with Geek Squad, I was told Geek squad could not fix my computer problems and I would need "white Hat" help. I was then connected to Peler and told I had massive problems and it would cost \$1000.00 to fix. I was scared and agreed to pay. After fixing the problems, everything seemed ok. That was about three weeks ago, Recently I was in Best Buy and talked to a Geek manager, he told me I was scammed and Geek Squad does not use third parties. The Peler Tech LLC, 1-844-811-8888, support@pelertech.com, 14000 Falcon Crest RD. Germantown MD 20874. I'm 72 and I know it is no excuse but I thought my bank account and credit cards were in danger, I guess that's how they are a success. Hopefully this information will help . I called their phone its not in the USA.

---

**Ticket: # 1383705 - Violating Open Internet Transparency Rule**

**Date:** 1/6/2017 2:09:57 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Richmond, Texas 77406

**Company Complaining About:** En-touch Systems, Inc.

---

**Description**

En-Touch Systems, Inc. has violated the the Open Internet Transparency Rule in the following manners:

- They do not disclose their throttling practices. Note: I signed up for 115 Mbps and have been throttled to under 3 Mbps
- They did not disclose their 1 TB per billing cycle data limit when I signed up for their services via email and phone call with a customer service representative.

---

**Ticket: # 1387668 - Complaint****Date:** 1/9/2017 5:45:05 PM**City/State/Zip:** Los Angeles, California 90045**Company Complaining About:** N/a

---

**Description**

My laptop computer keeps getting reconfigured over metered networks without my permission. —I check it periodically and everything on the internet is illegal. It is an intranet that allows people to hack and download illegal software. I do not want to be a part of this crime syndicate.

To make a long story short. I was framed in the city of Tucson, Arizona because someone' loaded software on my computer that emits voices over the metered network via the telephone wires through-out the city using cell phones and any type of electronic device.

I wrote a complaint letter to the FCC about this matter nevertheless, they probably thought it was the local police in the in the area doing surveillance. Moreover, I got blamed for being a prostitute and they forced me to live out of my car. Hence, I have been homeless for five years. They told people it was a game because they know they would lose their jobs therefore, I was drugged and left to fend for myself. I have a degree in Biology and presently I am working on my master's degree in Nutrition. I barely have the wherewithal to function because people are logged onto my computer to use me all day.

Meanwhile, when I lived in Tucson, Arizona in the year 2011, I could not understand was I vilified in the community. This happened again when I lived in Oceanside, California. People where verbally abusing me calling me a "whore" because they could hear someone fornicating on that device and either they assumed it was I since I am African-American or they were lied to, and told it was I. I was drugged the entire time (all total, over fifteen years) the reason I could not figure out how they were getting away with disabling and exploiting me because the device retards my mind giving me dyslexia. I do not want to be used nor do I need to use people. I was told they charge people for using the network and since I do not need nor want their services, I do not want to be charged for something I do not need or want. I am followed everywhere by "eduroam" a wireless network. — They track me all day every day.

Thank goodness today, I had a moment of clarity

---

**Ticket: # 1389050 - Verizon's go90 mobile app doesn't count towards data use**

**Date:** 1/10/2017 1:34:45 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Fort Collins, Colorado 80526

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

## **Description**

Verizon's go90 mobile app allows users to watch sports "data free". By allowing their app to stream sports without affecting the users data, Verizon is stifling competition and blatantly breaking net neutrality by playing favorites.

Message:

"Sports fans! Score the best of live football, soccer and NBA LEAGUE PASS data free on the go90 mobile app! All included with your current plan when you download go90 and register: <URL REDACTED>"



---

**Ticket: # 1389165 - Billing and Service Issues involving Bait and Switch - Frontier**

**Date:** 1/10/2017 2:17:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Everett, Washington 98203

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

## **Description**

The consumer was contacted by Frontier with information advising her that she could upgrade her service to a faster internet speed. (She had complained about her service prior to the call which took place in 2015). She was advised that she would receive a new modem. She never received the modem. However, Frontier was billing her for the upgraded service w/o the equipment being provided. The consumer placed countless calls regarding this matter, at which time she requested to cancel the service ...especially because it was not even being provided to her at that time. On that day, the Frontier rep advised her that she would be required to pay an ETF of \$200.00!! The consumer called again and a Frontier rep advised her that, "That service is not even provided in your area"!! (The consumer was totally conned into paying charges for what amounts to Cramming). In March, 2016 ...again, after multiple contacts and continued combative conversations, Frontier refunded her slightly over \$200.00. The consumer then noticed, this past summer that her bill continued to escalate and had now escalated to around \$30.00 (Her service was supposedly "grandfathered" at rate of \$14.99). After contacting the last supervisor, (Jason Hardy), that had remedied the first billing issue, she then made several attempts at contacting another Frontier staff member (Carah Galindo). However, no one ever contacted her back regarding the new billing issue involving the charges over and above the grandfathered plan. Later on, she was provided a \$100.00 credit by CSR, Ayesha. Ayesha also provided the consumer with more time so that she could visit Frontier's Offices in order to straighten out the billing matter. The consumer spoke to Amanda Brooks, at Frontier's Office. Amanda Brooks provided a credit of \$42.00 and stated that the rest of the bill would need to be paid and going forward, the consumer would need to pay what was charged by Frontier. The consumer disputed anything over the \$14.99/granfathered plan. Amanda Brooks also advised that once the upgrade had been accepted, it cancelled the \$14.99 grandfathered plan. The consumer tried to explain that the fraudulent offer had most likely been made to get her to relinquish the grandfathered plan which was supposedly restored. She advised that Frontier never even had the capability of providing the service that had been promised. The consumer now has an outstanding bill in the amount of \$250.00 and is being threatened with disconnection. She stated that Frontier just ignores her and continues to bill amounts that have not been agreed upon. The consumer is upset that Frontier used these deceptive tactics. She stated that Frontier is extremely egregious and predatory and requests that they restore her grandfathered plan, which is what was supposed to happen after she realized that they could NOT deliver a service that was promised and was not even available in her area.

---

**Ticket: # 1391294 - Internet theft data**

**Date:** 1/11/2017 2:24:33 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Lubbock, Texas 79407

**Company Complaining About:** Dish Network

---

## **Description**

For 3 yrs, now, somebody has been hacking all my fine (b) (6) and No Contract, Phones, TV, and sometimes, I think my Mind!

---

**Ticket: # 1392862 - NPR mistrust of public perception on some of their programs**

**Date:** 1/12/2017 10:44:27 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Carrollton, Georgia 30116

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

FCC,

I want to begin by saying I like very well most of the programing on NPR and want to hear opposition from my political position but it needs to be based on accurate facts as best it can be and not one sided always.

Please provide me some people that can help me petition the FCC about the NPC constant intended interviews to discredit President Trump.

They have repeatedly produced and broadcast interviews that are productive in bringing listeners to conclusions that are misleading.

This conduct due to its continuation and consistent misleading nature is not serving the publics best interest and could be considered propaganda against the American Freedom at ti's highest level.

I would like to petition the FCC with documented evidence that NPR is continuing on a regular basis broadcast with the intended purpose of presenting a derogatory perception of our highest offices and officials and is not based on facts due to the negligence of NPR to confirm the details of these reports .

The public being served by the NPR Radio Network are expecting the broadcasting from NPR to be accurate as best they can be or to be informed that the broadcast are not confirmed. This is the trust in Broadcast truth that the FCC requires for NPR to air in their broadcast and maintain their license .

I would like you to provide me public support groups that I can help me bring this to the attention of the appropriate regulatory agency's.

Regards,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1392931 - Comcast Copyright Infringement Emails****Date:** 1/12/2017 11:12:17 AM**City/State/Zip:** Suisun City, California 94585**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I am receiving copyright violation emails from Comcast for a movie that we do not have on any of our devices. Comcasts instructions to acknowledge the warning are unclear and incorrect, making it very difficult to clear the warning. The only way to dispute the warning is to pay a \$35 fee to some arbitration place, which I think is an abusive tactic that pretty much ensures no one will dispute the notices. It's bogus. There should be no fee to dispute incorrect information. Who does that? I want to see the following: 1. Comcast needs to make it easier to acknowledge these bogus messages; 2. Stop harrassing me with messages about the same freaking movie that IS NOT on ANY DEVICE within my household; 3. Remove the fee to dispute these bogus allegations.

This is an abusive and unpleasant tactic. I am already paying A LOT OF FREAKING MONEY for my cable and internet services, which is another issue I have - I think we are being extorted, but I know that makes me sound like a crazy person. I should not have to deal with being extorted even further to dispute such bogus allegations against me and my household. I am beyond angry about this.

---

**Ticket: # 1394118 - Service Issues with Dish Network/Exede Internet Service****Date:** 1/12/2017 5:21:59 PM**City/State/Zip:** Grants Pass, Oregon 97527**Company Complaining About:** Exede

---

**Description**

The contracted internet service, through Dish Network, (Exede). He stated that services began in May, 2016. Approximately 6 months ago, the consumer began experiencing extremely slow speeds. Service was basically non-existent. When he contacted customer service, they would remark, "Oh you do not have any internet"! The consumer would also confirm this fact. The consumer stated that Dish has responded a couple times to evaluate the service problems so that the issue could be fixed. During the last visit, the tech advised that he could not find any problems and stated that perhaps the modem was bad and that this is owned by Exede and leased by the consumer. (The tech visit occurred about 3-4 months ago). The consumer stated that he called today because this is the TWELFTH day without any service. (He stated that he has had about 6 hours of service for the twelve days)! Yet, Exede continues to charge him and now is demanding a \$95.00 fee for a tech to respond in order to make certain that it is in fact the modem. The consumer was advised that no modem would be sent to him to try to correct the problem. He spoke with representative (Riki), ID # SLV2258. She advised him that she is a floor supervisor. The consumer stated that even if it is the modem, this would be their fault and he should NOT have to pay for this visit. The consumer stated that he has only been provided a credit of \$25.00 after he was kept on the phone for over 90 minutes. (At that time, service had been out for a week). The consumer requested appropriate credits for the horrible service and the unacceptable customer service. He also requested to be let out of the contract. He specifically requested waiver of the early termination fee.

---

**Ticket: # 1395501 - Complaint Involving Cox Communications****Date:** 1/13/2017 1:51:13 PM**City/State/Zip:** Escondido, California 92027**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that she is being charged for an in home service plan, at a rate of \$7.00 per month. This charge was never authorized, disclosed, etc. to this consumer. She never used this service plan. She stated that when she called to go over her bill to determine why the bill escalated, there was never any disclosure or discussion that this service appeared on the bill. Nor, was it apparent that it even showed on her billing statement. Cox Communications refused to provide a refund going back to August of 2016 - which is when they first crammed this on to her billing statement. She stated that this is fraud and constitutes cramming. She had been told that IF she dropped her complaint, they would still give her two months credit that had already been promised. It appears that the carrier will take away the \$14.00 if she does not agree not drop the issue.

---

**Ticket: # 1398033 - Yelp will not take down known Slanderous Reviews that have been Posted**

**Date:** 1/15/2017 6:15:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Altadena, California 91001

**Company Complaining About:** Yelp

---

**Description**

Hello,

I run an extremely small business in which I get about 5-10 clients each month.

Since October a woman named (b) (6) posted a false review making many false slanderous claims that against myself and my business. This is a form retaliation as she is seeking money and free services. Basically she is using Yelp to Extort my business. I have contacted Yelp about the review and harassment I have received from this individual since and according to their Terms of Service they are to research the reviewer and the review and it violates the law they claim they would remove the review. They have not.

There is another review that is also slanderous also posted around the same time as the other, by and individual by the name of (b) (6), she tried to extort money from my business in exchange for her removing her false negative review.

We also let Yelp know about this individual who is also a competitor and they have a business listed on Yelp as well. According to Yelps policies an business competitor should not be allowed to post fictitious negative reviews.

---

**Ticket: # 1398034 - Yelp will not take down known Slanderous Reviews that have been Posted**

**Date:** 1/15/2017 6:16:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Altadena, California 91001

**Company Complaining About:** Yelp

---

**Description**

Hello,

I run an extremely small business in which I get about 5-10 clients each month.

Since October a woman named (b) (6) posted a false review making many false slanderous claims that against myself and my business. This is a form retaliation as she is seeking money and free services. Basically she is using Yelp to Extort my business. I have contacted Yelp about the review and harassment I have received from this individual since and according to their Terms of Service they are to research the reviewer and the review and it violates the law they claim they would remove the review. They have not.

There is another review that is also slanderous also posted around the same time as the other, by and individual by the name of (b) (6), she tried to extort money from my business in exchange for her removing her false negative review.

We also let Yelp know about this individual who is also a competitor and they have a business listed on Yelp as well. According to Yelps policies an business competitor should not be allowed to post fictitious negative reviews.

My business name on Yelp is Envious Extensions



---

**Ticket: # 1399283 - Comcast Internet**

**Date:** 1/16/2017 5:31:17 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Nashville, Tennessee 37211

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I have had intermittently functioning internet services from Comcast over the past 6 weeks. This has resulted in 4 technician visits without the problem being resolved. Comcast also made unauthorized changes to my account during this process by deactivating upgrade changes made via their online representative.

---

**Ticket: # 1401643 - 2 votes in support of Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 1/17/2017 6:56:30 PM

**City/State/Zip:** New York, New York 10014

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

## **Description**

thank you for all of the work your agency has already done on behalf of keeping our internet open and fair. Just want you to know for myself and my partner, net-neutrality is so important. Please continue the good fight.

Allowing a private entity to decide which content is blocked, throttled or given slow or fast lane is a fundamental violation of our rights. And we say this with no personal financial interest at stake but a true interest in allowing free expression in our country. This isn't about just legal rights but a decision we make about what civilization will be - open and fair and thus ready to evolve and improve -or- a society where private corporate interests decide who gets a voice, and when.

Finally, would be great for the FCC to disclose precisely who is lobbying the FCC hardest to end net-neutrality, and if they're a congressman.. we'd all like to know if they're receiving any contributions from private corporate interests - fair disclosure.

Thank you again for protecting a free society, and our future.

---

**Ticket: # 1403232 - Insitution of significantly lower usage CAP to eliminate aDSL line, push u-Verse**

**Date:** 1/18/2017 3:07:38 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Barrington, Illinois 60010-4901

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

After calling AT&T to complain about rapidly escalating cost for my DSL (aDSL) line which I have had for years, AT&T agreed to reduce price for 1 year and then proceeded to tell me I had 150GB monthly data cap. I was not aware of ever having a cap on usage before. AT&T then proceeded to try and get me to cancel my "old" aDSL line (6Mbs service) for their "fiber" based U-Verse service which would have a much higher data cap which I would unlikely go over. I asked about installing U-Verse to ensure it would provide me the reliability I need (I work from a home office) and was told I MUST cancel the old DSL line and get U-Verse installed. If I had problems, I would have no way of getting back my old DSL line according to AT&T and I would also be required to rent hardware (today I own my own DSL modem and router) and U-Verse would require a \$10 per month hardware charge. Even cable services allow you to purchase your own hardware and eliminate monthly rental charges.

I feel AT&T is trying to corner old DSL customers by implementing a 150GB monthly cap, pushing users to either incur overage charges every month OR forcing them to switch to U-Verse service which requires a monthly hardware rental cost -- and a cap 4 times the size of the cap on old DSL. A 6mb user of U-Verse would have a 600GB cap while a 6mb "old" aDSL user (which is what I have) only gets a 150GB monthly data allowance.

This is discriminatory pricing at the very least and should not be allowed by the FCC. I would be happy to move to U-Verse IF AT&T would install and allow me to make sure it provides the reliability I require from my home office.

---

**Ticket: # 1410284 - Internet-Mobile data**

**Date:** 1/22/2017 7:16:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Elizabeth, New Jersey 07201

**Company Complaining About:** Virgin Mobile

---

## **Description**

I am having issues with functions on my phone . I suspect my device is being accessed by a means beyond my control due to provider connection security. Applications open & close without my request , the keypad types by itself adding full words without touching a single letter, volume & music selection operates by itself periodically. The battery indicates incorrectly. This was an ongoing issue with metro pcs whom I had accounts with for several years. They assured me these issues had nothing to do with wifi access but now that I have experienced having an internet-wifi provider I can identify the difference in service .

---

**Ticket: # 1411615 - Internet provider**

**Date:** 1/23/2017 3:17:19 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Terre Haute, Indiana 47802

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

## **Description**

We have continually had subpar service and lack of provider diversity in our area for as long as I can remember. I called the cable company last week and wanted to find out about lowering my bill. The operator informed me that if I called back after the 20th, it would be Spectrum I was dealing with not Time Warner due to a merger. Upon my calling I was told Spectrum services were not available in my area, and they did not have any idea when they would be. I asked the operator how is that possible since Time Warner no longer exist, and Spectrum is the new provider. I was told I was on the Time Warner Legacy plan and until Spectrum became available in my area, I was stuck. We have a different provider in town, but when I called to see if they could service us, they said they were not allowed due to a contract with the city. I believe something less than legal is happening with this. Your assistance would be greatly appreciated.

---

**Ticket: # 1411767 - Billing Dispute involving Defective Modem with Charter****Date:** 1/23/2017 4:04:00 PM**City/State/Zip:** Fort Worth, Texas 76135**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that when he signed up for service, Charter provided him with a defective modem. However, he did not know that the modem was not working until he exceeded his data allowance on this cellular phone and was billed more than expected. He then realized that the modem was not working because his phone was not connected to Wi-Fi as he had originally assumed. During the first part of his second month of service, he discovered this problem. When he contacted Charter, the representative refused to provide him with any credit and told him that he would have to pay the outstanding bill first. He was billed approximately \$100.00 per month for the internet. He stated that under the merger agreement, for Charter, they were supposed to be providing low income consumers discounted rates for internet services, which they did not do. He stated that he has been billed an early termination fee, non-returned equipment fees, and his account has been sent to collections. The only thing the consumer requested was to be credited appropriately for the defective modem (he did not realized this because he usually uses his phone). He stated that Charter did replace the modem. However, they refuse to provide the credit and no one, at Charter, disclosed that they even have a low income division! The consumer believes that they have acted in a very deceptive manner. He stated that he is 75 years old and lives on \$700.00 per month. Therefore, he requests appropriate credit, restoration of service, and fair pricing based on his on the fact that he is low income.

---

**Ticket: # 1412534 - inquiry into EAS Company****Date:** 1/23/2017 9:36:40 PM**City/State/Zip:** Chicago, Illinois 60659**Company Complaining About:** Alertsense

---

**Description**

I am not sure who I should contact regarding my inquiry, but I have some concerns regarding AlertSense, Inc. and I would like some answers. Since this company's services are used the US Government as part of Emergency Alert Systems, and I believe it is regulated by the FCC, I thought it is appropriate to contact you. Feel free to clarify.

My concern is of the criminal background of a member of the executive team at AlertSense. It seems to me that due to the circumstances around the convicted crimes in question, along with her executive role at the company which is involved in Emergency Alerts used by the government, it is worth investigating if there is any suspicious behavior regarding her role as executive. She has been caught illegally transporting children, and now she is in a position of power. I, and many others just want to see her be held accountable and determine if there is any evidence of wrongdoing and if it is even allowed for her company to be in partnership with government emergency alerts.

(b) (6)

<http://fox11online.com/news/local/how-the-alertsense-program-works>

<http://harvardhrj.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/King.pdf>

---

**Ticket: # 1412919 - Illegal Money laundering Attempt**

**Date:** 1/24/2017 10:26:48 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Bayside Hills, New York 11364-1838

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

**Description**

Received an e-mail which used a Marine SGT (b) (6)'s name but came from an .edu mailing enterprise. This e-mail requested assistance in what appears to be an illicit money-laundering request or an attempt to steal my identity for illicit reasons:

Hello

Sgt (b) (6) <(b) (6)> Today at 3:57 AM

To

Recipients

Message body

I have a personal Project in which i need your assistance I would like to be sure of your willingness, trustworthiness and commitment to execute this transaction with me, I cannot afford to compromise these virtues considering the money involved, it is necessary for me to be sure of the person to whom I will be entrusting this transaction, and my trust is not given out lightly. I want this large sum of money transferred with your assistance. I want to know if you are willing to follow up this business seriously. I must use this medium to let you know that this transaction is LEGAL AND RISK FREE okay?, I will ensure that we do everything possible from our end here for you to have a safe delivery of the funds and gold. I have a very good, trusted and reliable courier contact used mostly by our forces in Jordan, that can send goods easily through a private military way, to anywhere in the world, without them being checked at any port of entry. They can deliver this money for you easily, to any address of your choice.

The baggage will be tagged as personal effects and covered with a diplomatic coverage consignment trunk box, and the courier company will not know the contents of the boxes. A few friends have used this means to convey goods, without being checked because of the diplomatic coverage system. Their charges are very high, but I will negotiate a way out from this end, till it gets to your door step anywhere and I will follow up immediately and meet with you for disbursement after you have received it. I am very sure you will know the best way to handle this money for us, when it gets to your base. I will start making arrangements as to sending the merchandise to you. I will send the total since I can not take any chances by keeping cash on me. Your percentage stands at 30%. Meanwhile' I will like to know what you do for a living? Are you married with kids? Can you handle these funds? I will also want to see your passport copy or id/, driver's License if you have one so I can know who I am dealing with.

We need to build trust okay? The only people that knew about this is just you and I. You know that the security is very important, you can not trust anybody therefore, remember to keep it secret. The total sum amount in the box is \$25,000,000 TWENTY FIVE MILLIONS US DOLLARS (\$100 Bills) and I hope that you can handle it? I hope you are okay with this? Everything must be done by email until the funds get's to your possession. I hope you understand me? I don't need any telephone communication in this regard because of my soundless voice and presence of communications here. and I don't want to be monitor or for any one to know about this development. IF YOU ARE READY TO DO THIS AND CARRY OUT MY WISH, THEN SEND THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:-



Your Name

Your Mailing address (Not P.O. Box Please)

Your Private Mobile Line

As soon as I receive your reply that you are ready to proceed under these terms, then I will furnish you with all details of the security company and also how to secure the release of my consignment. But if you have any questions up to this stage, please ask and I will be more than happy to respond to them. And I will also send you all the necessary documentations to conclude this transaction and the security company details as I will meet you once the consignment get to your home address.

Note: You are to contact me via my personal email id (b) (6) )Once again thanks for your response.

Your Partner,

Sgt. (b) (6)

U.S Marine

So fresh and so clean.

---

[Ticket: # 1414495 - Net neutrality](#)

**Date:** 1/24/2017 5:02:53 PM

**City/State/Zip:** St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55426

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

### **Description**

The FCC must maintain net neutrality to ensure freedom of speech. Chairman Pai must keep net neutrality in force.

---

**Ticket: # 1418104 - internet not adquete**

**Date:** 1/26/2017 10:27:45 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Lafayette, New York 13084

**Company Complaining About:** Dish Network

---

## Description

Dishnetwork is abusing the consumer,  
taking advantage of the consumer

over charging the consumer for their service do to not getting the service that was agreed upon  
see all the following that you the FCC did nothing about to get Dish to correct or legal action as  
required

This is a follow-up to your previous request #1417309 "Re: [FCC Complaints] Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds"

This is a follow-up to your previous request #1391601 "Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:..."

Then I guess I will file a complaint to the inspector General against you for wasting TAX PAYER  
MONEY , you were appointed to over see internet service provider and to make sure these provider  
do not harm the consumer in any way and you are not doing that in this case.

I will also be contacting my congress man and bring this up to him and will be giving him access to all  
of this in my FCC file so he can see how the FCC is not complying with what you are suppose to be  
doing ,,,

started out as informal ,,, and when I kept giving you proof of how dish is robbing/stealing/not provide  
the service that we are paying for ,,, you the FCC should of taken it to the next level and you did not  
and I have asked numerous of times to have the top manger call me about all of this ,, and once  
again , you did not comply , my taxes pay you , if it wasn't for me and people like me ,, you would not  
have a job , but yet all you do is shit on the tax payer

I still want the top manger to call me , and you will be hearing from the IG office and my congress  
mans office

Thank you

for nothing ,, a job not well done again,,, government employee stealing tax  
money\_\_\_\_\_

• (b) (6) Yesterday at 17:17

I will keep filing a complaint until you take this to the next level as you should of done months ago ,,,  
how would you like it if you only got part of your pay check every week ,,, no more then I like paying  
for a service and only getting a part of it ,, and a very small part at that

1417309 Re: [FCC Complaints] Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds 32 minutes ago

1391759 Status of Complaint involving Dish Network 1 day ago

1391601 Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds 1 day ago

1391695 Hung up on 13 days ago

1366371 Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds 16 days ago

1359743 Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds 1 month ago

1328813 Re: Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds 1 month ago

1325682 Re: Re: Re: Slow Speeds 2 months ago

1310270 Re: Re: Slow Speeds 2 months ago

1282108 Re: Slow Speeds 3 months ago

1037405 Slow Speeds

WE CAN DO THIS EVER DAY FOR ETERNITY IF YOU WANT TO , IF YOU CLOSE IT OUT I WILL DO A FOLLOW UP AND OPEN A NEW TICKET ,,, YOU WILL DO YOUR JOB AND YOU WILL START LEAGLE ACTION AGAINST DISH ,,, AGAIN YOU WERE APPOINTED TO OVER SEE INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS ,, AND YOU ARE NOT DOING THAT BECAUSE YOU ARE LETTING THEM DO AS THEY FEEL PLEASE TO DO ,, AND IN THIS CASE RIPPING OFF THE CONSUMOR ,, JUST LIKE YOU FCC ARE DOING BY NOT STOPPING ISP FROM DOING THAT, SO YOU ARE RIPPING OF CONSUMERS/TAX PAYERS BECAUSE MY TAX MONEY PAYS YOU WORTHLESS PEOPLE TO DO A JOB AND YOU ARE NOT DOING IT

I CAN UPLOAD 14 MONTHS WORTH OF THESE TEST PROVING ALL THE ABOVE

GET OFF YOUR BUTTS AND DO LEGAL ACTION TO DISH AS YOU SHOULD OF DONE MONTHS AGO

CLOSE THIS TICKET OUT I WILL DO A FOLLOW UP AND OPEN A NEW TICKET  
WE CAN PLAY THIS GAME FOR EVER UNTILL YOU DO WHAT YOU ARE SUPPOSE TO DO

AND I STILL WANT TO TALK TO THE HEAD MANGER AT THE FCC AND AT DISH , TO THIS DAY I HAVE NOT BEEN CALLED BY EITHER ONE

---

**Ticket: # 1423274 - Violation of Open Internet Transparency Rule****Date:** 1/29/2017 2:43:56 AM**City/State/Zip:** Canal Winchester, Ohio 43110**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

**Description**

Hello,

I have been in contact with my cable provider recently. I have come to realize they have disclosed inaccurate information to me on several accounts. I have been with Time Warner Cable since March 15th of 2016 and we had been behind on payments since around July of 2016, but we have always set up promise to pay with the company and we have never not paid them. Now on January 27th of 2017 my boyfriend received a phone call around 5:58 PM from a person named Stephen Looney, who stated he was with Spectrum previously known as Time Warner Cable. Mr. Looney, stated he was coming to take a payment or something along the line of that. Now my boyfriend texted me saying that this man was on his way for collections, which I was concerned because I had not heard of someone coming to the home to take a payment and you do have to be careful these days. So I called my boyfriend and I explained I was not sure of this man because I had not heard of such doings. I immediately started a chat on time warner cable's website to confirm this matter. I started the chat at 6:42 PM on January 27th of 2017, I was finally connected with a representative named Daljit B around 6:51 PM. I have attached our full chat discussion to see what was said. Again I was contacting customer service to confirm that if this is something they now provide. I asked the representative eight times if they now have people that come out to your home and take payments and I was told no from the representative 4 times and once that I may get a call to pay. At this point I was very concerned and my boyfriend made a \$50.00 payment with Stephen Looney at around 6:55 PM. At this time while I was logged onto my Time Warner Cable/Spectrum account I show the \$50.00 payment was pending, so I was relieved that it was not a scammer or someone who would endanger my boyfriend. But I explained that a man came out to the home and took the payment of \$50.00 that I was thanked for and the representative still stated that "they won't come." I believe full heartedly that this is a violation of the Open Internet Transparency Rule and I would like to move forward with this. I asked the representative to have a supervisor give me a call on January 28th of 2017 at 11:00 AM EST, I asked this around 7:04 PM the representative then replied saying the call back request was confirmed and that they would try to connect with my 3 times, if they were unsuccessful after those 3 times then the request will have been cancelled. I do understand however I was only contacted once and unfortunately missed the call. I have provided two screen shots of the time the number had called me and as you can see it was only once, not three. The next issue I have is that when I called in this morning on January 28th of 2017 at around 2:02 PM and I waited for approximately 12 minutes. I have also included a screen shot of this outgoing call. During this call I was not able to speak with a representative however the recording stated that I have to pay this certain amount on or before February 8th of 2017. Which is incorrect once again, as stated in the conversation I had with Daljit B he said I had until February 10th of 2017, as well as my boyfriend's conversation with Stephen Looney. I would like the recording for January 28th's call pulled and listened to. I also just spoke with two representatives on January 29th of 2017 around 1:00 AM because my internet was acting up. I asked both of the representatives that I talked to if people come out to the home to take payments and they both stated no they would call you to let you know that its overdue and such. I would also

like the call from January 29th of 2017 pulled and listened to as well for proof. As stated I have attached all proof of these accounts that I have and I would like this issue resolved immediately.  
Kind Regards,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1423387 - Denied life line broadband by Century Link**

**Date:** 1/29/2017 12:29:26 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Bayonne, New Jersey 07002

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink And Verizon

---

**Description**

Hello there on your lifeline broadband it says that Verizon and Century link are supposed to provide life line broadband in my state wich is New Jersey. Both companies say that's not true. I've spoken to both numerous times and they always say the don't provide life line broadband. Please help me. My name is (b) (6) . My Tel. # (b) (6) . Email (b) (6) .  
ThanksqThanksqq

---

[Ticket: # 1423546 - Forgery](#)

**Date:** 1/29/2017 4:15:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Framingham, Massachusetts 01701

**Company Complaining About:** T Mobile

---

## **Description**

I thought the Netflix film, Endless Summer, was not written in the phase of time as presented.



---

**Ticket: # 1423549 - Media Matters is intentionally lying about Trump's exec order.**

**Date:** 1/29/2017 4:20:57 PM

**City/State/Zip:** St. Clair, Michigan 48079

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

We President Trump did not ban people based on their religion. Media Matters is intentionally smearing President Trump and Rudy Giuliani as anti Muslim - see Media Matters head line.

Here is the link to their site - <http://mediamatters.org/video/2017/01/29/rudy-giuliani-brags-he-crafted-trumps-muslim-ban/215163>

They Rudy Giuliani Brags That He Crafted Trump's Muslim Ban

Giuliani: Trump Asked Me To "Put A Commission Together, Show Me The Right Way To Do [A Muslim Ban] Legally"

---

**Ticket: # 1423589 - Verizon Bundle Contract Renewal 11/2017****Date:** 1/29/2017 5:30:05 PM**City/State/Zip:** Cranford, New Jersey 07016**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

**Description**

Received message on TV stating it was time to renew my contract. It told me to call the Number on the screen. Spoke to rep who renewed contract for \$140.00. Best customer service with Verizon ever. Was told she would send a new faster router that I said I didn't need, but her system wouldn't allow her to send so she scheduled a service call. Received several e-mails, phone calls to confirm which I did. Day of service, Verizon Supervisor called asking me how bad I needed service. I said I don't only need router that can be sent to me. He said I was down as new service. Told him I have had service for six years. He said they were short techs and he was cancelling. I said fine. Two hours later a service tech buzzed me and I said his boss cancelled him. Renewed contract end of Oct. 2016. Following months received my bill, it was for \$160.00. Called Verizon spoke to Lisa, who corrected my bill. Told her the story & that apparently there is a limitation to their IT system because it blocks sending router. Following month received bill for \$161.09 went to call Verizon. They removed their telephone number from there bill. Finally got through and spoke to Emil. He reviewed my file and called me back on Sat. 01/21/17. He told me he got me a price of \$150.00. I said no. The price quoted to me at renewal was \$140.00. He put me on hold and spoke to his Supervisor who said to reduce my price to the \$140.00. He asked if I was near my computer and I said no. He said he would read me my contract including the clause if I cancel within a certain period there is \$250.00 penalty charge. I agreed to what Emil's read to me of the contract. He also said he would need to schedule a service call. I told him it wasn't necessary to just send me the router. He said I should have it by Wednesday. I explained I hoped so because I have wasted a lot of time, effort and am frustrated with this process. I thank him for his service and finally ending this Verizon nightmare. When I went on my computer there were two e-mails from Verizon. One was to log into my account and view my contract, the others was that there is service call for Wednesday. I think probably because of their system limitation. I was unable to access my Verizon account to view my contract. It wouldn't let me. I tried as existing and new customer. It didn't recognize me. I tried calling Verizon at the number that had been on their billing, 1-800-837-4966. A message said the number was changed, disconnected or no longer in service. Now I can't contact Verizon by computer or by phone. Wednesday 01/25/17 the Verizon service tech comes and I asked if he had the router. He said it's more complicated then that. He needed access to the room with the box(live in multi family bldg.). Called Board Member for a key. Then the Tech said he didn't need that room. He asked for a step ladder which I gave him. He proceeded to remove the hallway ceiling tile to Shaw me a small box that he said he would need to drive some holes and run a wire through the wall and along my dining room kitchen, hallway wall and ceilings. I said absolutely not. I am happy with the service and speed I have. I don't need a new router. Then we went the bedroom closet which I was totally unprepared to do and started to remove stuff. I said that then he would put the wire on the on the floor under the rug, but then he has to move furniture which he said he is not allowed to do. Posted on FB my situation asking if anyone had a working telephone number for Verizon. Then On Thursday, 01/26/17 I saw another Verizon truck and flagged down the Tech asking him for a working number. He proceeded to tell me that Cranford is updating to fiber optic and I should have received two or three letters notifying me. I did receive the letters. I have spent from the end of Oct. 2016 speaking to different Verizon service reps and not one told me about the fiber optic update. He gave a number

which I called and spoke to Laure who was very anxious to take care of me. She told me about FIOS and speed. I told her I was happy with what I had. I told her about not being allowed to access my contract, no matter how I tried. Laura told me I had no contract because the customer I suppose to access the e-mail contract while the service rep is on the phone with me. That is not what Emil told me. In summary: no letters were received by me informing of fiber optics. 2. Speaking to various service reps since the end of Oct.2016, no one told me about fiber optics. 3. No one told me that I had to review my contract on line with the rep Emil on the phone. He asked if I was near my computer when he called and I said no. He said he would read me the contract which he did and I agreed to the the conditions and terms (\$250.00 cancellation fee) \$140.00 monthly fee.) 4. The change of telephone number wasn't advised. Leaving the customer in the dark about service is no way to run a reputable business. I want the contract originally negotiated the end of Oct. 2016 for \$140.00. Certainly Verizon overlooked their customer in their update processes. It has been extremely exhausting and frustrating.

---

**Ticket: # 1423637 - lewd and lascivious behaviors**

**Date:** 1/29/2017 6:19:11 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Phoenix, Arizona 85067

**Company Complaining About:** Facebook.com-yahoo.com- Youtube.com

---

## **Description**

mariah carey- kylie jenner- blak china- beyonce- cher- brittney spears- nikki minage- exhibit lewd and lascivious behavior and it is allowed and unregulated on yahoo.com- youtube.com- facebook.com- etc. yet lewd and lascivious behavior is censored on national and public television- if these lewd and lascivious females are so interested in the pulic seeing their bare titties and bare behinds- why dont they just walk around completely nude or take pornographic nude pictures- because it is not publicly acceptable- the FCC needs to censor these females and other public nude exhibitionist

---

[Ticket: # 1427476 - obscene language , no notice AOL](#)

**Date:** 1/31/2017 2:58:45 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Grovetown, Georgia 30813

**Company Complaining About:** Wow

---

### **Description**

viewing aol for news up dates and scroll down where the media posted twitter accounts with obscene language posted.

---

**Ticket: # 1428535 - Trump News**

**Date:** 1/31/2017 8:19:56 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Nashville, Tennessee 37211

**Company Complaining About:** President Donald Trump

---

### **Description**

What is the FCC rule concerning the President of the US owning a media site? This a clear conflict of interest. An information site is a standard format for a politician but running a separate site and promoting it as a new agency is subterfuge.

---

**Ticket: # 1428680 - internet scam and fraud**

**Date:** 1/31/2017 10:21:50 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Flint, Michigan 48504

**Company Complaining About:** Airbnb

---

### **Description**

I received an email through a well known vacation rental website claiming to be the "owner" of the property I was interested in. after several emails I booked the property, only to find out it was a scam. I was out \$7,000.00. I have all the account numbers, swift codes, Name and address of the bank in which the money was sent and much more information. this took place from Nov.2017 to the end of Dec. 2016.

---

**Ticket: # 1430708 - Facebook**

**Date:** 2/1/2017 6:53:36 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Anchorage, Alaska 99503

**Company Complaining About:** <https://www.mtasolutions.com/contact>

---

## Description

[<https://www.facebook.com> (b) (6) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]]

While logging back onto the Wasilla Public Library network I tried another avenue to check the privacy and visibility of my Alaskan Star 7.0 for non registered users. Note I have attached the picture "snip its" that anyone can view, open access and continue to scroll without having an active account.

Please when you can provide me with full cyber coverage to monitor and collect the IP addresses.

let's hope we can change the way facebook operates and change the legislation on Cyber terrorism and bullying.

(b) (6) [REDACTED], BBA  
Government Official



---

**Ticket: # 1436232 - FCC is being hijacked**

**Date:** 2/4/2017 3:57:31 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Mentor, Ohio 44060

**Company Complaining About:** Fcc

---

### **Description**

Ajit Pai is trying to gut any attempt to make the internet more available to more people by preventing 9 companies for competing fairly with the largest tele-com corporations. He is a know advocate of destroying net neutrality and is obviously a Trump toady for the plutocrats.

---

**Ticket: # 1436262 - ONGOING SYSTEMIC EGREGIOUS NET NEUTRALITY VIOLATIONS**

**Date:** 2/4/2017 4:15:19 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Pompano Beach, Florida 33062

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I was reading the latest disturbing article(s) regarding the Cable TV industry with great interest. Please review and implement an action plan to thoroughly address this extremely troubling issue. Media reports continue to underscore the ongoing widespread and systemic egregious, dubious, nefarious and possibly illegal business practices in which the Cable TV Industry routinely imposes on Cable TV consumers. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC and other captains of the Cable TV industry continue to violate the letter and spirit of a multitude privacy, business and contractual laws and statutes throughout the City of Pompano Beach, Broward County, the State of Florida and/or the Nation. Please coordinate, collaborate and cooperate on Federal, State and/or local jurisdictional levels in addressing these concerns potentially impacting adversely the public's telecommunications, finances, policies, trust, confidence, and quality of life issues. Thank you for your time in this matter and hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Pompano Beach, FL 33062-6631

---

**Ticket: # 1436278 - Fire Fox did not confirm 2/4/2017 Loggin 3:02pm**

**Date:** 2/4/2017 4:19:39 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Roosevelt, New York 11575

**Company Complaining About:** Uniondale Library Uniondale New York 11553 Computer #2

---

**Description**

Fire Fox sync did not confirm logging at 3:02pm at Uniondale Library ,Uniondale .,New York 11553.

---

**Ticket: # 1436751 - Google wrongly defines "fascism"**

**Date:** 2/5/2017 12:05:44 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Davenport, Iowa 52803

**Company Complaining About:** Google

---

## **Description**

When one searches for the definition of fascism in Google, it attributes it to right wing governments. This is patently false disinformation. I have two masters degrees in international affairs where I concentrated on fascist regimes. Every fascist regime ever established has been liberal Left and socialist. Google has a social responsibility, based on the epistemological influence of their service, to provide factual and accurate information to the public. This blatant and patently false, seismic error should be punished.

---

**Ticket: # 1439314 - Net neutrality**

**Date:** 2/6/2017 6:18:34 PM

**City/State/Zip:** St Anthony, Minnesota 55418

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Please defend consumers and oppose rule changes that impact net neutrality in a negative way.

Thanx, (b)

---

**Ticket: # 1439650 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 2/6/2017 9:18:35 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Kahului, Hawaii 96732

**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

**Description**

DO NOT TAKE AWAY Net Neutrality!

---

**Ticket: # 1439779 - Ajit Pai**

**Date:** 2/6/2017 10:37:24 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Brooklyn, New York 11237

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

### **Description**

I'm very concerned about the direction of your agency under this former Verizon executive, and worried about his recent actions to restrict access to broadband for low-income families. I do not think he is impartial and I believe he wants to give away internet freedoms to the highest bidder (i.e. his former employer). A VAST MAJORITY OF AMERICANS SUPPORT NET NEUTRALITY, AND WE WILL BE HEARD.

---

**Ticket: # 1446151 - internet**

**Date:** 2/9/2017 2:40:45 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Raven, Virginia 24639

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

### **Description**

Why are internet users being slam dunked??? I am 67 years old, live alone, use the internet for important issues. I am not a terrorist, nor con artist, using the internet for purposes other than self help, keeping up with relatives, local news, weather, etc. The real crooks may be under the radar with you, keep your ears, eyes on them, would you please?



---

**Ticket: # 1449368 - IT Technical Assistance Fraud****Date:** 2/10/2017 6:41:10 PM**City/State/Zip:** Littleton, Colorado 80127**Company Complaining About:** Tech Support For Microsoft

---

**Description**

I had googled VIPRE Antivirus Software for a technical support number. I believed I was calling VIPRE but instead the number I called was answered tech support (1-855-718-9786). I was made to believe that I had reached VIPRE tech support and allowed this tech support individual "Shawn" access to 4 of my computers as I believed it had been infected with a virus. Shawn reported that all 4 computers had been infected with a virus from overseas (he actually showed all the apps listed as if they were on my computer's directory) and that he could clean all my computers and install a Firewall on each computer (as none of the computers had Firewalls) for \$999.00. He also shared some of the passwords we use on our email accounts. When I said I would call my bank and the IRS immediately to notify of my breach of security, Shawn told me there was no need as he could see they had not gained access to my files. I told him I would have to call him back after talking to my husband. I realized my mistake and called VIPRE tech support and learned the virus I reported was not a virus but an advertisement. When I called the number back listed above, it was answered "tech support" and I asked who they were tech support with -- he responded "Microsoft."

---

**Ticket: # 1450929 - consumer fraud Skin Royale and Eye Royale**

**Date:** 2/12/2017 3:13:28 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Douglasville, Georgia 30135-1502

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

I was offered and paid for a sample of skin royale for \$4.95 and eye royale for \$5.95 which is the shipping. I was then charged over \$170. for the sample. I was NEVER given an opportunity to cancel nor did I agree to anything. Once they got my credit card it said "Thank you" When I received the product again I had no agreement or cancellation information I had to get that from the credit card people. So I thought it was a true sample. I have filed a dispute with my credit card company. I do feel this is internet fraud when you are NOT asked to sign up for anything and do NOT agree to anything. They need to be taken off of the internet. My credit card company said they are pain to deal with and they hear this same story numerous times. So it 's time for it to stop.

---

**Ticket: # 1451834 - Comcast lied about data usage cap**

**Date:** 2/13/2017 12:23:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Fox River Grove, Illinois 60021

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

On 02/13/2017 I received a notification on ALL of my unencrypted internet traffic (via a javascript code injection) by Comcast that I had "exceeded my data usage"

On October 2015 I signed a two year contract with comcast, I specifically asked if there was a data cap or limitation and told, "no, there is not".

Today (02/13/ 2017) I called comcast at 8am CST and, when I asked, was told that "We have always had these 1TB limits". This was in a recorded call I had with comcast. (attached) Looking through my email (as well as news reports) I found this was only introduced in November 2016, a little over half way through my contract. I would not have signed up if I knew they were planning on capping my internet usage during my contract period. This is simply a way for comcast to charge me more money instead of honoring the amount in the contract agreement. In the first few months of my bill I went over the 1TB amount multiple times without any contact or fees, this is simply a way for them to add \$50/month on top of my contract price to keep the same service and data usage I have always had. If I go to a provider that does not limit my use, I would still have to pay Comcast's contract cancellation fee. It seems there is no way for me to keep the service I agreed to in my contract without paying comcast additional money in some way.

Attached is a call where the Comcast Representative tells me the cap has "always been in affect" a google search will show that this is a complete lie and after I got a call back from Comcast (no recording unfortunately) a sales rep admitted that they only implemented this in November 2016. (Over a year since the contract start date) This article published last year by the Chicago Tribune also talks about the change coming in after my contract start date:

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-comcast-data-cap-0710-biz-20160708-story.html>

---

**Ticket: # 1454721 - Advertising Disclosure**

**Date:** 2/14/2017 2:32:44 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Berlin, New York 10009

**Company Complaining About:** Vodafone

---

## **Description**

I believe this post -

<https://www.facebook.com/britneyspears/photos/a.79096253233.80143.39677118233/10155028694928234/?type=3&theater>

as well as many other posts celebrities have posted about Air Bnb have been paid for. There is no disclosure that these are adverts. Please look into this. Thank you

---

**Ticket: # 1457384 - A&TT**

**Date:** 2/15/2017 3:52:17 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Fontana, California 92337

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

I have a virus on my computer, this what my computer say, I been with A&TT for two year or more I ask A&TT for virus Protection A&TT said you have to down load it how would I know that if I know I would have done by now, A&TT said we can clean it you may for that. why do I have to pay for clean it, I been paying for virus protection I don have. A&TT Can't bring up my account when I call in, I call in five time call sent out Philippines, they can't hear me or interference, Supervisor Donna said their nobody but her an have to pay for cleaning computer.

---

[Ticket: # 1458181 - Comedy Central: The Daily Show](#)

**Date:** 2/15/2017 8:14:05 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Burnsville, Minnesota 55337

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

The commercials for The Daily Show, on Comedy Central's website, specifically the episode that aired on Wednesday Feb. 14 2017, were significantly louder than the show itself. This violates Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation Act.

---

[Ticket: # 1460233 - Net Neutrality for the Internet](#)

**Date:** 2/16/2017 5:26:31 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Pasadena, California 91104

**Company Complaining About:** Private Citizen

---

## **Description**

The current administration is a threat to a free and open Internet. I am writing to urge that the FCC recommits to an Internet that is indicative of a democracy.

---

**Ticket: # 1460344 - Net Neutrality and Availability**

**Date:** 2/16/2017 6:00:36 PM

**City/State/Zip:** College Station, Texas 77840

**Company Complaining About:** Sudden Link

---

## **Description**

You would think that living directly next to Texas A&M, one of the most prestigious schools in Texas, and you would have plenty of choices for internet. Nope, not at all. Just one. It's Sudden link and frankly it's legal monopoly sickens me and the rest of the county. Sure atat, Verizon or google could come and givery the area service, right? Nope. Apparently Sudden link has a "contract" with the the Bryan city council about accepting other data providers in the area. What's even more frustrating is this only applies to consumers as other business have public wifi and their source is nothing on what the average citizen can get. This is so wrong on so many levels. I figured I shoot a complain to FCC first to see what happens before Texas A&M students planned a massive petition. At least the one good thing about living next to college students is that they have time to protest small injustices affecting their community.



---

**Ticket: # 1460538 - Intentional dishonesty in the news reporting**

**Date:** 2/16/2017 7:34:13 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sacramento, California 95817

**Company Complaining About:** Cnn Nbc, Cbs,abc, Newspapers, Tv Shows Tv News Radio Shows And News

---

**Description**

CNN posted an absurd depiction of Trumps inauguration crowd size, they posted a picture taken an hour prior to the ceremony. They showed 5 blocks empty to the base structure of the Washington monument. If you try the interactive Gigapixel device that zooms x 30 you can easily see the truth as these others have noticed in addition to my self! Many do not do due diligence and trust the news and media shows. This must be stopped ASAP at least for the public channels you can control! PLEASE PUNISH THE LIARS!

<http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2017/01/politics/trump-inauguration-gigapixel/>

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player\\_embedded&v=uvDC1Lk3RVg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=uvDC1Lk3RVg)

<http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2017/01/politics/trump-inauguration-gigapixel/>

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player\\_embedded&v=OaLXCwNr6Co](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=OaLXCwNr6Co)

cnn debunks itself via the interactive gigapixel device

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player\\_embedded&v=0SbFGQVSaiY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=0SbFGQVSaiY)  
fake CNN news

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player\\_embedded&v=E0s0zozyYFI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=E0s0zozyYFI)

Trump Mafia fake pics proven lies!

---

**Ticket: # 1462032 - Fraud on on internet**

**Date:** 2/17/2017 4:07:37 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Gainesville, Texas 76240

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

### **Description**

I was referred to a Software Company on internet. Was given a phone number to call and sign up. There was a valid web site with that name, but I used the phone number given me to transact my business. They told me to scan my check for a 3 yr contract and send it to them. Starting having problems and asked for a refund. they stopped calling me back. I called the number on web site for the same name, and was told I was not one of their customers. Refused to help me

---

[Ticket: # 1463135 - Internet open](#)

**Date:** 2/18/2017 5:25:00 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Needham, Massachusetts 02492

**Company Complaining About:** Rcn

---

## **Description**

We must maintain net neutrality and an open internet!!!

---

[Ticket: # 1463262 - Attack on net neutrality](#)

**Date:** 2/18/2017 8:03:31 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Wilmington, North Carolina 28405

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

## **Description**

Warning! Trump and Pai had better be careful. Americans do NOT like it when our freedoms are under attack. We are not Russia and we will not allow you to undermine our hard fought freedoms. We can get pretty mean. Don't test that theory.

---

**Ticket: # 1467238 - Privacy issue**

**Date:** 2/21/2017 6:39:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Newington, Connecticut 06111

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

[http://www.connecticutforsale.com/hartford/newington/home/\(b\) \(6\) -Newington,-CT-06111/G10177971/photos](http://www.connecticutforsale.com/hartford/newington/home/(b) (6) -Newington,-CT-06111/G10177971/photos)

[http://www.connecticutforsale.com/hartford/newington/home/\(b\) \(6\) -Newington,-CT-06111/E251233/photos](http://www.connecticutforsale.com/hartford/newington/home/(b) (6) -Newington,-CT-06111/E251233/photos)

This website is impossible to contact I need to have my pictures removed of my home the person has not replied to me and I'm having problems trying to get in contact.

---

**Ticket: # 1469524 - DO NOT TRANSLATE**

**Date:** 2/22/2017 6:25:44 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Cupertino, California 95014

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

## **Description**

DO NOT TRANSLATE

THIS IS TO INFORM YOU I CONTACTED HIGH LEVEL UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS REGARDING COMPUTER SCIENCE SPAM COMPUTING - JUNK FAXING - JUNK EMAILS - MONTY PYTHON SPAM - SPAM EMAILS - SLAMMING - UNWANTED CALLS - UNWANTED TOUCHING - DISCONNECTING ME - HANGING UP ON ME - (COMCAST HAS TO GIVE ME BACK ALL MY MONEY COMCAST HAS EVER STOLEN FROM ME - USED OF MINE - PULLED OUT OF IT - USED ON OTHER PEOPLE - USED ON SOMEONE ELSE - USED ON EVERYONE ELSE (BUT ME AND IT WAS ALL MY MONEY) - (RETRO-ACTIVE WITH INTEREST). COMCAST OWES ME FOR BEING ON MY MUSIC'S FREQUENCYS TONES AND WAVES - TAKING MY HOME FROM ME - (I HAVEN'T BEEN THERE FOR 5 YEARS) - I NEVER SOLD THESE FREQUENCY'S TONES AND WAVES - I NEVER SOLD ANY OF MY HOMES - THEY WERE STOLEN FROM ME - MY LOCKS WERE PICKED - WINDOWS BROKEN - DOORS TORN DOWN - SLAMMED INTO - ALL THIS COMCAST HAS TO GIVE BACK TO ME (RETRO-ACTIVE WITH INTEREST) (ORAL SEX AND DICK SEX WILL NEVER BE ACCEPTABLE ON PAPERWORK OR ON THE AIR WAVES). YOU WILL NO LONGER BE ABLE TO DICK ME AROUND - ALL THE POSITIVE YOU TURNED AROUND TO NEGATIVE - ALL WILL HAVE TO BE GIVEN BACK TO ME - (NEGATIVE YOU WILL NO LONGER HAVE ACCESS) (AT&T - ATT UVERSE - ATT DIRECT TV - GARBAGE - PG&E (PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC) WATER - COMET TECHNOLOGIES / SAN JOSE WILL HAVE TO GIVE ME ALL MY THINGS MONEY BACK)

I WAS SEXUALLY ASSAULTED AND RAPED AND ALL LOCAL FIRE DEPARTMENTS AND ALL LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS ARE AND HAVE BEEN ON IT - THEY'RE USING SIRENS - RED CURBS - CURBS - ALL LOCAL AND ALL CITY'S I'VE BEEN AT - WHEREEVER I GO ARE ALL ON IT - (SHAME ON YOU) (SHAME ON ALL OF YOU). DONALD TRUMP CALLS THE RAPE AND THE SEXUAL ASSAULT (SHE'S NASTY). THEIR ARE MANY LANGUAGES ON THE SEXUAL ASSAULT - VIETNAMEES MEXICIANS - I CAN HEAR THE TONES. THEY HAVE BEEN USING THE SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT EVERYWHERE - I WAS AT THE REAL SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT TWICE - THEY WANTED ME HANDCUFFED FOR THE ELECTIONS. THESE ARE BAD PEOPLE. EVERYWHERE I'D GO I WOULD HEAR THE WORDS SAN JOSE - THIS BROUGHT AROUND THE REAL POLICE REAL FIRE REAL SHERRIFFS WHERE I WAS AT - EVEN ON A DAY TRIP. ITS AS THOUGH THE SEXUAL ASSAULT FOLLOWS ME AROUND. BOTH THE SEXUAL ASSAULT AND THE RAPE HAD TO DO WITH MUSIC. I WAS TRAMATIZED BOTH TIMES. I WANT EVERYONE OFF AND OUT OF IT. BOTH EMPLOYEES AT BANKS AND ON THE PHONES WOULD ALWAYS SAY TO ME 'NOT AT THIS TIME' - THEY ARE STREAMING AT STORES THE SEXUAL ASSAULT MUSIC AND THE RAPE MUSIC WITH THE COMMERCIALS. A REAL MAN SEXUALLY ASSAULTED ME - I THINK HE'S WITH THE SAN JOSE POLICE - THEY'VE CALLED ME A RAT ON TV AND PLACES I'VE BEEN I CAN HEAR THE WORD RAT AND SAN JOSE.

I AM A FAMOUS COUNTRY MUSIC SINGER - I WANT ALL MY MONEY BACK - THERE'S NEVER GOING TO BE ANYMORE 1/2 - I WANT 100% OF ALL MY MONEY BACK.

I'M WITH HILLARY CLINTON. DONALD TRUMP IS JUST A MESSENGER - I WORKED FOR PALM INC / SUNNYVALE CA (CELL PHONES - HP BOUGHT PALM INC) I TOLD MY BOSS THEY'RE ALL MESSENGERS - I'M DOING ALL THE WORK.

CNN NEWS AND FOX NEWS SMEARED MY NAME (I WANT THEM OFF OF ALL MY SCREENS) CHARACTER ASSASSINATED ME - ALL THIS THAT LANDED ME IN THE REAL WORLD - I DON'T WANT TO BE IN THE REAL WORLD - I NEVER WANTED TO BE IN THE REAL WORLD - I BELONG IN MOVIES TV ONLY - I CAME FROM MOVIES AND TV - MY BODY WASN'T MADE TO BE IN THE REAL WORLD - I'LL DIE IN THE REAL WORLD.

I WORKED FOR HEWLETT-PACKARD FOR MANY YEARS - MERCURY INTERACTIVE / SUNNYVALE - ABBOTT LABS / REDWOOD CITY - MOLECULAR DEVICES / SUNNYVALE - I'VE WORKED COMPUTER COMPANY'S - HARDWARE SOFTWARE AND BIO-TECH - I WORKED FOR ATTORNEYS EARLY IN MY CAREER - I HAVEN'T WORKED FOR A FEW YEARS. I AM PURSUING MY MUSIC CAREER.

I NEED TO MOVE OUT OF CALIFORNIA ASAP - THE HARASSMENT BOTHERING BUGGING FOLLOWING ME TORTURING ME ETC - I NEED TO BE OUT AND OFF THE CALIFORNIA SYSTEM ASAP. THE SEXUAL ASSAULT AND THE RAPE IS IN AND ON THE CALIFORNIA SYSTEM. THEY ALWAYS SAY I'M ON IT.

THE ASIA PACIFIC REGIONS / THAILAND / CHINA / SINGAPORE / NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA / - VIETNAMEES / NORTH AND SOUTH KOREANS / MALAYSIA / ASIA / PHILIPPINES / PORTUGUESE - ALL ASIAN DECENTS - THESE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN A REAL BOTHER - THEY BRING IN 'THE HEADS' WHEN THEY SEE ME. I WANT TO BE DISCONNECTED FROM ALL THESE PEOPLE - THEY INTERCEPT MY CALLS - INTERCEPT CUSTOMERS - INTERCEPT EMPLOYEES - THEY HAVE BEEN CONTROLLING THE WORLD - I NEED TO DISCONNECT FROM ALL 'THE HEADS' AND ALL THE ABOVE. I HAVE A PHONE CONNECTION WITH THE HEADS - I WANT TO BE DISCONNECTED. I HAVE A CONNECTION WITH THE WORDS 'THESE PEOPLE' AND 'YOU GUYS' I WANT TO BE DISCONNECT - THE WORDS THESE PEOPLE / YOU GUYS ARE CONNECTION WORDS. THE HEADS TOLD ME I CAN'T HELP YOU. THEIR ON TV / THE INTERNET / PHONES / COMPUTERS / AND THEY COME AS SECURITY MAINTENANCE AT TIMES AS MAIDS IN HOTELS A LOT OF HOTELS EVERYWHERE. THOSE TOO ON THE SEXUAL ASSAULT AND THE RAPE.

I'M ALWAYS READING SEEING AND HEARING AN OLD PATTERN - REAL ESTATE AGENTS ASKING FOR A FUNDS LTR - THINGS PEOPLE SHOULDN'T BE READING - DEPRESSING - GLOOM - MISERY - DISADVANTAGE - MISERY - DEPRIVED - SLUGGISH - POVERTY STICKEN - ALL NEGATIVE WORDS - THE FUNDS LTR DOESN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH MONEY - THEIR JUST WORDS AND TRIGGER NUMBERS - WORDS IN A SONG - THEY'RE ALL TRIGGER WORDS AND NUMBERS - THEY POINT THEIR FINGERS AT THE TRIGGER WORDS ON PAPERWORK OR PAPER TO TRIGGER YOU ON A PARTICULAR WORD WORDS OR PHRASES THEY ARE SHOWING YOU - WHEN THEY DO THIS YOUR TRIGGER HAS BEEN SET - THEN YOUR TRIGGERED WORDS ARE EVERYWHERE YOU GO ON THE WORDS THAT WERE POINTED TO - THEY ARE PUTTING WORDS IN YOUR MOUTH - CUSTOMERS DO THIS TO RECEIPTS TOO TO CONTROL THE EMPLOYEE TO PUT WORDS IN THEIR MOUTHS. ITS A

BACK AND FORTH THING - CUSTOMERS TRIGGER EMPLOYEES - EMPLOYEES TRIGGER CUSTOMERS. (THE ASIAN DECENTS ARE ALWAYS ON IT) - THEY HAVE TO GIVE ME ALL MY MONEY BACK. I WANT ALL THE ASIAN DECENTS OFF MY THINGS. I'VE SEEN THEM SWITCH RIGHT BEFORE MY EYES - THEY ARE WHITE THEN THEY SWITCH TO ASIAN DECENT. I WANT TO STOP ALL THE SWITCHING. WHEN I TELL THEM I'M GOING TO CALL THE COPS - THEY LAUGH AT ME. THEY ARE THE COPS.

I'M AT A PLACE - CUPERTINO CA - WHERE REAL COPS ARE WORKING IN GROCERY STORES BANKS CAR LOTS RESTAURANTS STORES - EVERYWHERE - EVERY BUSINESS IS THE SAN JOSE POLICE STATION - MAINLY THE SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY CALIFORNIA. THEY HAVE MY NAME AS (b) (6) - I HAVE LEGALLY CHANGED MY NAME TO (b) (6).

I NEED HELP - PLEASE DISCONNECT ME. THE CALIFORNIA SECRET SERVICE TOLD ME TO CALL THE FCC.-

I'VE PROVIDED YOU WITH A 2016 PHOTO OF ME - THEY ARE TRYING TO FORCE AND MAKE PEOPLE BELIEVE I AM OF ASIAN DECENT - THIS IS A LIE - NO WAY IN HELL.

DO NOT TRANSLATE



---

**Ticket: # 1471916 - Service & Billing Issues with Frontier Communications****Date:** 2/23/2017 6:14:08 PM**City/State/Zip:** Moreno Valley, California 92553**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that he contracted services through Frontier Communications. He signed up for service on 01/12/2017. The package was quoted at a rate of \$34.99 per month (50 mbps). He also agreed to pay \$4.00 per month for virus protection. The consumer stated that they were also offered a \$200.00 Amazon gift card. The consumer stated that he has received his first bill and the bill is \$76.94. (The confirmation number for his order : (b) (6) ). The consumer requested that Frontier review the recordings from this sale as he has been billed twice the agreed upon amount. The consumer attempted to contact Frontier to resolve this issue. However, when he called Frontier, he was placed on hold for 20 minutes, no one returned and he gave up after holding this long. The consumer requested that Frontier honor the price provided during the above mentioned sale. He stated that this equates to bait and switch.

---

**Ticket: # 1472859 - Frontier DSL service is unacceptable - Not getting service for which we pay**

**Date:** 2/24/2017 12:08:20 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Kiel, Wisconsin 53042

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

## **Description**

The consumer stated that she subscribed to Frontier's DSL/internet service. The service being provided was "acceptable" until recently. The consumer stated that they have constant outages, dropped connections, and today; she cannot get on line at all. The consumer could not contact Frontier, online. Nor, could she could access the internet to file an FCC complaint! The consumer stated that the service became very bad on February 14, 2017. Frontier did send out a tech to check on the problem. The modem was changed. The consumer was also informed, during one visit, that the port at the station was affected mice in the junction box. Another time, she was advised that the lines were corroded. She has received multiple excuses for why the service is no longer working properly. The tech advised that they changed a switch and then had her changed the password in the modem. However, service still has not been repaired. The consumer stated that, most of the time, service is not working at all! The consumer stated that she is not getting the service for which she pays. This has been an on-going issue and she requests that it be immediately rectified. The consumer runs a dog kennel and pet photography business and requires access to the internet. Frontier fails to recognize the importance of providing the consistent quality service for which she pays.

---

**Ticket: # 1473793 - Concern over Net Neutrality & FCC Rulings**

**Date:** 2/24/2017 4:24:00 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Bridgewater, Virginia 22812

**Company Complaining About:** All Of Them.

---

## **Description**

"The Federal Communications Commission in a 2-1 vote has exempted smaller internet providers from certain reporting requirements under the net neutrality rules approved under the Obama administration." -- The Hill. This has been verified by other sources.

This is a complaint to YOU, the FCC, directly, about this ruling. I want these reporting requirements enforced for ALL providers. The "smaller internet providers" you're exempting are multi-million dollar enterprises, who are going to jump at the opportunity to throttle ACTUAL small businesses, as well as political viewpoints they disagree with.

Hold all internet providers to the same standard.

---

**Ticket: # 1474061 - Gatekeeper (Suddenlink) bullying small rural WISP****Date:** 2/24/2017 5:37:02 PM**City/State/Zip:** Prescott, Arizona 86305**Company Complaining About:** Sudden Link

---

**Description**

Suddenlink sold us, a small rural WISP, an 1Gbps optical private line with no internet then a few months later claimed we were reselling their internet services and told us they would disconnect it if we continued to sell our own Internet service in Lake Havasu. We then went through the motions of paying legal counsel to explain that Suddenlink is in the wrong as this is called gatekeeper bullying. Rather than seek more expensive legal counsel I have decided to reach out to you. Our internet services we sell relies on our Internet bandwidth in our data center and not Suddenlink. Suddenlink is merely a transport mechanism (private line) to our internet services we sell from our datacenter where we peer with multiple carriers. They also sell middle mile services to cell carriers in the area as well without any fuss. We ceased operations for 2 months because of this bullying. After 2 months they finally admitted they were incorrect but still billed us \$2318/mo for those two months. Then they immediately removed data caps from their residential cable service (used to be 300gb) and offered upto 1Gbps unlimited for \$99/mo in their lake havasu market to put us out of business. So we thought great a giant mega corporation has us on their kill list. Next I tried reaching out to Suddenlink to get our circuit moved to another market in Arizona where we have a more prominent foothold. I was told this would not be an issue by multiple people at Suddenlink. It's been over 3 months and we are still being billed \$2318 in lake havasu even though we are out of business there and requested the service be moved to our new location in camp verde, az. I have emailed their director of channel sales multiple times and find that only their small business loyalty specialist is the only person who will return my calls. If I call into regular business support they refer me to channel sales who I get no return contact from ever. Please review the attached PDF transcripts of my email as I feel like we are being further bullied by suddenlink. We work with many other carriers such as centurylink with ZERO issues.

---

**Ticket: # 1475048 - Comcast bills for excess data due to China hack attempts**

**Date:** 2/25/2017 4:14:47 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast implemented the terabyte data plan. Any usage above 1 TB in data goes into extra billing fees. I do not trust the security of Comcast network, so I put their gateway into bridge mode, and used a carrier grade router inside my home to protect my network. Comcast is not blocking Chinese IP address is from attacking their residential IP network, so every Comcast home is at risk but my home has to pay for the data of the attacks because I'm using my router instead of theirs. I've sent them the router logs and their immediate statement back was that they do not do any mitigation. I get two months of grace of overusage. After that , They will bill me for all of the data being used by Chinese network attacks, and they will not protect their customer, an American citizen. Instead, they will charge me for it for an attack because they don't want to mitigate. I find this morally and ethically reprehensible, and I'm stuck in a contract with them now being only my second month into an agreement with them. I will be penalized if I stay with them, and I will be penalized if I leave them. I feel that this is your responsibility is tantamount to a scam against its own consumers.

---

**Ticket: # 1475983 - ISP provides awful and unreliable service**

**Date:** 2/27/2017 12:44:23 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Stephentown, New York 12168

**Company Complaining About:** Fairpoint

---

## **Description**

Hi I'm a college student that is currently studying in the IT/Networking department, so I constantly have to rely on internet for school work.

Unfortunately my ISP which is Fairpoint Communications from upstate New York, provides the absolute worst internet service I have ever experienced. I even received better internet when I lived in the middle of nowhere in Nevada.

Unfortunately Fairpoint is the only ISP in my area which I find strange considering I don't live too far from the nearest city that offers multiple ISPs. Well the internet service that Fairpoint offers here is a measly 4mbps Download and .5mbps Upload. But I believe that is falsely advertised because multiple speed tests have shown 1.5download and .2Upload. I find these speeds and service completely unacceptable in 2017. Basically only one device at a time can connect to the internet in order to do anything online. And studying to be an IT I have over 50 internet connected devices in my home. Every day I experience multiple crashes and am forced to restart the router at least 25 times a day. And even when I am downloading a tiny 50MB update, the internet still manages to crash. I have called multiple times for customer support and have only gotten through once and they told me they would send an IT to my area, that said IT has never shown up to replace our router. Also when I call, the call suspiciously drops on their end and then I am forced to wait another 30mins or more for someone to answer.

I absolutely find their internet service and customer/tech service completely unacceptable and unreliable.

Also recently they put up a billboard saying that my entire area now offers 50mbps Download, this billboard is probably 2mins away from my home. I called them hoping to be able to upgrade, and they told me that that service is unavailable in my area, now that is absolutely false advertising.

Please, I really hope someone can do something about this company's unacceptable service and ways. I'm asking this for everyone's sake in my area, no one should have to deal with such terrible service in 2017 when Brodband now is standardized at 25mbps by most other companies.

Thank you for anything you're able to do.

---

**Ticket: # 1476758 - Slow dismantling of Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 2/27/2017 1:50:24 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Englewood, Colorado 80112

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Good morning,

I hope you are well. It is disappointing to see that the Republicans and now the FCC are starting to go after Net Neutrality yet again. Every so often, there is another swipe at it and every time, it is overturned due to public outcry. I've read articles (ComputerWorld, consumerist, BusinessInsider, PDF release of the vote), about how the chairman (Ajit Pai) feels smaller companies should not need to worry about transparency requirements and focus more on growing business. Please see below for a list of issues and possible issues with this thinking.

1) Companies (large or small) should be required to provide the service they say they are providing. For example: A company can claim you will reach 1gig/sec, however in reality, they only have the infrastructure in place in 1 city that can allow this sort of throughput. Technically its not incorrect, as its available somewhere and possible for that town. But many people might not know that. And therefore sign up for a service that is not possible. They should be required to provide accurate data to end-users so they can make informed decisions.

2) Pai belief: It takes too much time or "burdensome" to process this paperwork every year. Response: Companies are in business and paperwork is required. Commissioner Mignon Clyburn (under Obamas administration) figured this might take about 7 hours a year. Once the infrastructure is in place, speeds/fees do not typically change unless there is an upgrade to existing equipment. If the upgrade does not happen, a quick test is all that is needed to confirm numbers are still the same. This does not take too long. Paperwork (legal and whatnot) are required. Businesses know this when they take it on. If profit margins are even remotely close to what TimeWarner and Comcast are pulling, the company can afford this

3) This exemption is for companies with less than 250,000 customers. But it also exempts subsidiaries of larger companies. Which "subsidiaries" they are still owned by a parent company with WAY more than 250,000 customers. So they should be held to the same standards, as the parent company will typically help dictate what the smaller company does. Especially if its between profits and loss.

4) Pai "This is to protect 'Mom and Pop' ISPs." If it s a mom and pop ISP, the ISP should be able to quickly and easily provide pricing plans. This wont take hours and could be done by the mom or pop. My college years was in a small town where a place called "ISDN" provided internet from his basement to the town. It was him and 1 other guy. They knew the services they provided and what to expect. Excessive paperwork would have been almost a non-issue since it didnt vary greatly between the areas.

As for me... I have the displeasure of having Comcast as my provider. This change does not technically directly impact me. But all changes that are widely impacting have to start somewhere. You remove 1 piece, then another, then another and eventually, its dismantled and people dont realize it until their bills are astronomical due to hidden fees, overcharges, rental fees, etc. With this in mind and the announced desire to gut/remove Net Neutrality rules by Pai and O'Rielly, I feel it is in everyones best interest to voice concerns when possible.

In short - please do not try to dismantle net neutrality laws. Sadly, they had to be put in place for a reason and need to be kept. Otherwise, these "mom and pop" companies (not ISPs) will not be able to pay the fees associated with the premiums that ISPs will require for guaranteed throughput and streaming. Which will potentially hurt WAY more people than the 'mom and pop' ISPs that this 2-1 vote is supposed to help.

Thank you for your time. Please contact me if any additional info is required.

(b) (6)



---

**Ticket: # 1478691 - FCC Policies Regarding Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 2/28/2017 12:00:09 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Royersford, Pennsylvania 19468

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

## **Description**

Ajit Pai is not fooling anyone. The consumer will be the loser if net neutrality policies are allowed to be rescinded. He needs to understand how exceptionally concerned and frustrated the American people are with him, every time he takes the podium. If this level of laissez faire attitude regarding consumers continues, you can guarantee a phone call from my representatives in Washington.

---

**Ticket: # 1482290 - internet service complaint**

**Date:** 3/1/2017 6:29:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

The dsl service provided by CenturyLink is not as advertised. The service varies in delivered speed from the "rated" speed of 7mbps to zero service, and anywhere in between, many times throughout the day, every day. Sometimes the slow downs to approx. 1-3 mbps are only for a few minutes, but often there is zero bandwidth. I depend on wifi calling for my business and it is not unusual for calls to drop due to the dsl signal dropping to zero.

CenturyLink spent several years trying to find the source of the problem, without success. They offered my a year of service (such as it is and has been) at 1/2 price due to my complaints of poor and unreliable service, but the problem persists.

Finally, a few months ago the senior CenturyLink service representative, Brad Althaus, came to my home with one of his senior technicians (Brad had been to my home previously on multiple occasions while trying to find the "problem") to explain to me that CenturyLink service is not the problem, and that the problem I am experiencing must be due to my equipment. He made it clear that CenturyLink was washing their hands of my issues even though there has been no change in the problems we experience daily. I have forgone calling CenturyLink to complain due to fears that they would terminate my service altogether.

It is pretty clear to me that CenturyLink is lying to me when they say the problem is in my equipment. I believe they have oversold the dsl service in this area and the variability of the bandwidth they provide is dependent on how many of their customers are using their dsl.

---

**Ticket: # 1482357 - New FCC Commisioner - REMOVE THIS PRICK**

**Date:** 3/1/2017 7:01:34 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Richland Hills, Texas 76118

**Company Complaining About:** Charter Communications

---

## **Description**

So, the FCC is supposed to watch out for the consumer right? This prick Pai is doing everything in his power to remove all the Title II restrictions and carrier regulations that make our internet open and free.

---

**Ticket: # 1483984 - Annual Income report**

**Date:** 3/2/2017 3:37:37 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Marrero, Louisiana 70072

**Company Complaining About:** Directv

---

## **Description**

Direct TV is in violation of due process right denial refuses to provid Annual Income report to support meaningful programs and activities and services being blocked and redirected deferr delay illegally transferred exemptions rule modified endowment of contract changing classification SEC to illegally boot denying full access , unlimited access of family true value worth . (b) (6) wife to (b) (6) Of (b) (6) Marrero, Louisiana 70072 Demand Annual Income report and final disclosure and mandate memorandum is due to (b) (6) and family of Freedom and Indendence of equal opportunity protection right by sealing under the same constitution of the UnitedStates due by 03/02/2017

---

**Ticket: # 1484630 - Qyestionable practice**

**Date:** 3/2/2017 7:07:37 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Phoenix, Oregon 97535

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

A computer security company with a New York phone number, 914-205-9105, about my computer's security. They threatened to disable internet access if we did not contact them to "fix" the problem. After being on the phone with someone saying they were in the Philippines for hours they charged us a large sum with poor results. We then contacted a company we trust who handles this on another computer for less money. An attempt to get a refund from the original company has resulted in a runaround . Repeated request are diverted. How can we find out who this really is? Can you help??

---

**Ticket: # 1492766 - Internet connectivity/latency issues for over 7 months**

**Date:** 3/7/2017 10:22:53 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Laramie, Wyoming 82072

**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

## **Description**

At around starting at 6pm to 11pm everyday of the week, the internet latency increases about 4 times the number of packet time outs increase significantly some days are worse than others. This causes any sort of voice over IP to become extremely unreliable and anything that relies on latency such as gaming to become a unusable.

I have asked every time nicely if they have a higher tier of tech support or a way to escalate my ticket. (Someone who understand the basics of packets/IP addresses.) I was told time and time again they do not. However this last time the man did escalate it I am not mad at him or the people before who did not escalate this issue earlier, because I am firmly believe it to be a company policy to do this. I am very unhappy with Charter as a company, having been repeatedly lied to for 7 months. Their tech support is designed to always claim that there is no issue and whenever I bring up all the proof and evidence of this problem it has always been dismissed completely. Now I received a call from the tickets escalation and the first sentence says that this, "seems to be out of my area of expertise". I am sick of trying to get through their oppressive tech support techniques so I am filing a formal complain with the FCC in hopes of shedding light on this issue. Below I have attached some screen shots showing what I have stated above. I have much much more data to share if they have any questions.

---

**Ticket: # 1494666 - at&t/direct tv**

**Date:** 3/8/2017 6:05:42 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sacramento, California 95822

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

I subscribed to att internet and direct tv services in October 2016, I was told be representative at AT&T located at 1441 Meadowview Rd c, Sacramento, CA 95814. If I would sign up, I was eligible for two \$250 gift cards as a special promotion. That made my decision to sign up and on March 8 2017 I had not received anything, so I called att. After two hours of being transferred from one person to another, nobody would help me. I requested to talk with manager, regional manager and I was not allowed to talk with them. Department that handles rewards said that there was nothing they can do and simple passed the bucket to customer service. I contacted customer service and they stated rewards department could only help me.

I feel att has done a bait and switch, I was promised one thing and received another. Now I am in a 2 year contract and they simply have wiped there hands of any fault. I am left with no means of resolving issue.

---

**Ticket: # 1500064 - Cables outside our house are exposed/ Comcast doesn't honor their appointments**

**Date:** 3/11/2017 1:23:09 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Commerce Twp, Michigan 48390

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

One year ago we had a new cable put in from the street to our house. We thought everything was properly installed and under ground, how it is supposed to be. This week, with the winds we had one very tall tree falling down and to our surprise the cable wire was really under the rocks on our landscape. I called Comcast, to made an appointment for 48 hours later. I took the day off work to wait for them. In the morning The Xfinity van was outside my house. As soon I open the garage door to meet the guy, he drove away and didn't come back until now. He didn't even left the van! I called Comcast 4 times and first they put me in a "escalate service" appointment, but nobody called or showed up. My last call yesterday I was promised that the supervisor would call me back until maximum at 8PM. Never received a call. This morning I called them back. Got an appointment to put the wires under ground for April (today is March 11th). Talked to the supervisor Mark, who promised me that would call back in 1 1/2 hours. Three hours passed by and I haven't heard from them! What a poor service...and nothing is solved. This is a hazard matter, who responsibility and poor installation belongs to Comcast and nobody moves to solve the problem. I'm very frustrated. Who will pay for my day off work?



---

**Ticket: # 1503433 - Gouging**

**Date:** 3/14/2017 10:25:18 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Lauderdale Lakes, Florida 33319

**Company Complaining About:** Thezebra.com

---

## **Description**

Below are the quotes from thezebra.com

When I applied to AllState the rate quoted was \$180. Mercury would even give me a quote as would StateFarm not give me a quote. This website lies.

Your estimated rates:

MercuryAd    \$67/mo

State Farm    \$71/mo

Allied    \$80/mo

Allstate        \$88/mo

---

**Ticket: # 1507218 - Open Internet Transparency Rule****Date:** 3/15/2017 8:45:33 PM**City/State/Zip:** Santa Barbara, California 93110**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

**Description**

Cox's pricing page at <https://www.cox.com/residential/pricing.html#internet> shows a 12 month promotional rate that is identical to the "regular" rate that is slashed out. After canceling my TV service I was told my rate would go up by \$10 per month despite the fact that the regular rate listed on their website was the same as what I was paying. After spending time on the phone with a different rep I was told that the "regular" rate is actually \$10 more than what is shown on the website. She wouldn't disclose this until I gave her a street address for service.

---

**Ticket: # 1508189 - Re: internet speed- compensation**

**Date:** 3/16/2017 12:57:23 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Brandon, Florida 33510

**Company Complaining About:** Bright House

---

### **Description**

I was advised I would be provided 80\$ credit and it has not been applied. Contacted rep who personally handled it over 10 times promised resolution no follow up. This is a follow-up to your previous request #1339115 "internet speed"

---

**Ticket: # 1512768 - ZEUS Virus****Date:** 3/19/2017 1:59:54 PM**City/State/Zip:** Longmont, Colorado 80503**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

**Description**

I had a message pop up on my computer yesterday afternoon, 3/18, stating the following: 'Don't restart your computer. Windows detected ZEUS Virus. The infections detected indicate some recent downloads on the computer, which in turn has created problems on the computer. Code B2957E. Call 1-844-400-4903.' When I called the number I was told that my IP address had been compromised and that they (I asked who they were associated with) and I was told 'Microsoft' would fix it for a cost of \$499. After I said I needed to think about it the session was immediately ended. The people I spoke with had an Indian accent and, due to the lag time of responses, I presume they are located outside of the US. After my conversation I went on line and looked for Microsoft scams and sure enough it stated that Microsoft NEVER has customers call in for fixes, which was also confirmed by a gentleman from the Geek squad today. I hope you can investigate and potentially prosecute. How easy it would have been to fall for the scam and give them my credit card number. Very scary stuff!!

---

**Ticket: # 1517571 - Desperate market disadvantage Xfinity Mendocino County California**

**Date:** 3/21/2017 7:56:30 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Albion, California 95410

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Mendocino county California customers are subject to a desperate pricing disadvantage compared to other California Customers as stated by Xfinity's customer loyalty team member because there is no other equal competitor provider in the county. As a Mendocino Customer we are not eligible for X1 HD TV or more importantly reduced price packages! Mendocino Customers are paying more for less service compared to other California customers. Troubling when this corporation is using our public rights of way access and airwaves!

---

[Ticket: # 1518228 - internet neutrality](#)

**Date:** 3/22/2017 10:50:25 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Davie, Florida 33325

**Company Complaining About:** Directv

---

## **Description**

I would like to voice my opinion as a consumer for internet neutrality.

---

**Ticket: # 1519916 - deceptive offer and failure to be transparent**

**Date:** 3/22/2017 6:49:05 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Gahanna, Ohio 43230

**Company Complaining About:** Wowway

---

### **Description**

WowWay offers 100mbps for 49.99/mo no-contract and refuses to change my current 70mbps \$51/mo for the 100mpbs without signing up for a 2 year agreement. I do not wish to sign a agreement. They state i cannot cancel and connect again due to a 90 day waiting period but refuse to provide me the documentation stating this as a customer.

---

## **Ticket: # 1520850 - Frontier Communications Service is Inconsistent and Not Provided as Advertised**

**Date:** 3/23/2017 11:48:58 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Jasper, Georgia 30143

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

### **Description**

The consumer called the FCC on today's date to report a service issue involving her internet service with Frontier. The entire time that we spoke, please note, there was severe crackling on the phone line making it impossible to hear the consumer! The consumer was very upset and stated that she is losing \$200.00 per day, every day, that the internet does not work. When she relocated to her present residence, it had been after she had confirmed that Frontier could provide her with the speed of 24mbps, for internet service. She did file a complaint last year and discovered that the Frontier representative had intentionally lied about the speed. The consumer is extremely frustrated because the deception was confirmed by another Frontier rep that listened to the sales call and then reconfirmed by Frontier technicians. The consumer has two modems. Because the speeds could not be provided, she was provided with two modems....for which she pays. Each line is supposed to receive 12mbps internet access. The consumer has always telecommuted, as she is an administrative consultant. Therefore, before even breaking her lease to move to her current location, she had contacted Frontier. Although, Frontier now knows that this representative was deceptive in obtaining her business, the consumer stated that Frontier seems totally unconcerned that they are not even able to deliver the, now promised, 12mbps, speed. The consumer stated that Frontier had recently re-visited her property in order to upgrade her from the 6mbps, to 12mbps. This was only after she had called day after day for an entire week after constantly losing money due to the loss of work. Reps constantly provided conflicting information regarding the level of service that could be provided at her location. Finally, she was told that the speed of 12mbps could be provided and the technicians came out and replaced the two 6mbps modems with two 12mbps modems. The consumer stated that she would have stayed at her last residence, IF Frontier had just been honest. She stated that the house, in which she now resides, is a little bit nicer and the fact that the rep advised that the 24mbps could be provided had assured her that she could work from that location and have access to the required internet services necessitated by her employment. She has accepted the last response provided to the FCC regarding the 24mbps. However, the consumer also stated that Frontier never sent her a copy of that response as required by FCC Rules. Furthermore, they are not delivering what was provided, to her, in place of the fraudulent offer. She asked that I read that first complaint response and provide a copy to her. A copy was sent through this same complaint system. The consumer stated that she called Frontier and received a call back stating that they were working on the present problem. She was later advised that the problem was beyond their level. She has not received any further updates with regard to the repair of her line. Again, the consumer requested that Frontier repair her internet AND phone line....immediately. The internet is not working as promised. Nor, is the consumer receiving the service for which she pays. The consumer stated that she did not work at all yesterday. Nor, can she work today. She stated that over these two days, she has lost \$400.00 in income and she is missing all of her deadlines. Her clients are furious with her. This is impacting her consulting business in a severe manner. She has no where else to go to work - Nor, is she sure of any local locations where she can obtain access. Therefore, she stated that she will need to travel to a metropolitan area to find access to the internet



in order to meet these deadlines. She stated that she has a child that is college age and her funds are very limited at this time. She cannot afford to not work and Frontier is causing her a lot of stress because she cannot simply get the service, for which she pays. Nor, does she have access to an off site location (She works from home and has no local office), that can provide her with internet access.

Again, the consumer requested an expedited repair for her internet service issues.

---

**Ticket: # 1522137 - Windstream Internet Service Not provided as sold/billed****Date:** 3/23/2017 5:17:43 PM**City/State/Zip:** Rincon, Georgia 31326**Company Complaining About:** Windstream Communications

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that he signed up for Windstream's internet service on 03/15/2017. He stated that he had made an inquiry, on line, which referred him to the toll free number for Windstream. When the consumer called into Windstream, he was advised that their company had just upgraded his area and they could sell him 100mbps for a rate of \$160.97 per month...which would include satellite TV service with Dish Network. He was promised a bundled bill as well. This never happened. Windstream responded on 03/18/2017. When the installation was completed, he was advised that they had mailed a modem to him and he would need to wait to activate service until the modem arrived. The modem arrived later that day. When the consumer activated the modem, he observed that the service was extremely slow. He then called in to Windstream and techs had him run a speed test on the Windstreamtest.com web site. The internet was running so slow that it would not register on the site. He was advised that there was a provisioning problem and it would be corrected. However, after about 3 days, they finally stated that he could NOT get the 100mbps at his location. The techs advised that he could only receive about 1mbps. The consumer stated that he is not even receiving 1/4 of 1mbps ! The techs advised that this is the best that it can get in this area and there is nothing that they can do! He called customer and was advised the same thing regarding the speed. He was advised that, "we charge what we charge"! The consumer stated that he expected a different price based on the fact that Windstream cannot provide the 100mbps as quoted. The consumer stated that he is paying \$73.98 + \$9.99 for the modem/\$84.00 per month for internet. He was advised by a supervisor that they do not charge over \$34.99 for 1mbps and explained that this is what the consumer was being charged, not for the higher speed. The consumer stated he is actually being charged double the amount quoted by the supervisor. He was advised that he received a \$15.00 credit on his bill because he cannot obtain the promised speed. He also stated that he was double charged for the Federal USF Fees and the GA USF Access Fund. When he questioned these double fees, customer service hung up on him. The consumer stated that Windstream offers a 30 day satisfaction guarantee. When he questioned this guarantee, he was told that it was not valid for his area and he must pay a \$20.00 per month early termination/cancellation fee! After enticing the consumer into taking their service, through pure deception, Windstream has stated that none of the items quoted/mentioned apply to his area....not even the service guarantee! The consumer requested a full refund of any monies paid. (He paid \$160.97 to start the service). Conveniently, Windstream has stated they have NO record of this payment and then stated that "most likely" this payment went to the TV services. No one will provide him the factual information. The service is bundled with Dish Network's TV service. He has experienced no service issues with the TV service. However, if the consumer is required to go elsewhere for internet, he wants to cancel the whole agreement based on Windstream's deception because they cannot and will not deliver what was promised to him. He also requested that the sales recording from his transaction be pulled and reviewed. He stated that he had been advised that Windstream had fiber services. However, after the installation, he was advised that this is copper service. The consumer stated that he will only accept a full refund and cancellation of all services, including TV. He also requested an apology for all of the lies/deception.

---

**Ticket: # 1522792 - Windstream Internet Service Not provided as sold/billed**

**Date:** 3/24/2017 7:47:36 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Rincon, Georgia 31326

**Company Complaining About:** Windstream Communications

---

## **Description**

The consumer stated that he signed up for Windstream's internet service on 03/15/2017. He stated that he had made an inquiry, on line, which referred him to the toll free number for Windstream. When the consumer called into Windstream, he was advised that their company had just upgraded his area and they could sell him 100mbps for a rate of \$160.97 per month...which would include satellite TV service with Dish Network. He was promised a bundled bill as well. This never happened. Windstream responded on 03/18/2017. When the installation was completed, he was advised that they had mailed a modem to him and he would need to wait to activate service until the modem arrived. The modem arrived later that day. When the consumer activated the modem, he observed that the service was extremely slow. He then called in to Windstream and techs had him run a speed test on the Windstreamtest.com web site. The internet was running so slow that it would not register on the site. He was advised that there was a provisioning problem and it would be corrected. However, after about 3 days, they finally stated that he could NOT get the 100mbps at his location. The techs advised that he could only receive about 1mbps. The consumer stated that he is not even receiving 1/4 of 1mbps ! The techs advised that this is the best that it can get in this area and there is nothing that they can do! He called customer and was advised the same thing regarding the speed. He was advised that, "we charge what we charge"! The consumer stated that he expected a different price based on the fact that Windstream cannot provide the 100mbps as quoted. The consumer stated that he is paying \$73.98 + \$9.99 for the modem/\$84.00 per month for internet. He was advised by a supervisor that they do not charge over \$34.99 for 1mbps and explained that this is what the consumer was being charged, not for the higher speed. The consumer stated he is actually being charged double the amount quoted by the supervisor. He was advised that he received a \$15.00 credit on his bill because he cannot obtain the promised speed. He also stated that he was double charged for the Federal USF Fees and the GA USF Access Fund. When he questioned these double fees, customer service hung up on him. The consumer stated that Windstream offers a 30 day satisfaction guarantee. When he questioned this guarantee, he was told that it was not valid for his area and he must pay a \$20.00 per month early termination/cancellation fee! After enticing the consumer into taking their service, through pure deception, Windstream has stated that none of the items quoted/mentioned apply to his area....not even the service guarantee! The consumer requested a full refund of any monies paid. (He paid \$160.97 to start the service). Conveniently, Windstream has stated they have NO record of this payment and then stated that "most likely" this payment went to the TV services. No one will provide him the factual information. The service is bundled with Dish Network's TV service. He has experienced no service issues with the TV service. However, if the consumer is required to go elsewhere for internet, he wants to cancel the whole agreement based on Windstream's deception because they cannot and will not deliver what was promised to him. He also requested that the sales recording from his transaction be pulled and reviewed. He stated that he had been advised that Windstream had fiber services. However, after the installation, he was advised that this is copper service. The consumer stated that he will only accept a full refund and cancellation of all services, including TV. He also requested an apology for all of the lies/deception.

---

**Ticket: # 1524375 - Broad Band Privacy**

**Date:** 3/24/2017 4:27:40 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97225

**Company Complaining About:** Federal Communications Commission

---

## **Description**

The rules that former FCC chairman Tom Wheeler had put into place would limit companies like Comcast, Verizon, and AT&T from selling customers' online habits to the highest bidder. The U.S. Senate just repealed those rules. This leads to a possibility of violation of several other privacy and due-process laws: What's to prevent the NSA or the FBI from other law enforcement agencies from simply buying a subscription to big data services that can track this information and simply "find" information that they would need a warrant for?

This is a major "right to privacy" constitutional issue, and cannot be allowed to stand.

---

**Ticket: # 1526272 - Chairman Pai's unfair attacks on Net Neutrality and low income families**

**Date:** 3/26/2017 10:29:49 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Ladson, South Carolina 29456

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

**Description**

Dear Federal Communications Commission,

My name is (b) (6) expressing my concern on a issue that involves your current chairman, Ajit Pai. Last year the FCC took an important step forward on bridging the digital divide by updating it's Lifeline program; as you know for over 30 years Lifeline has brought telephone service to to millions of people, as you know back in early February, your current Chairman, Ajit Pai decided to take internet from low income families, basically taking internet from the poor, in a way to limit Lifeline broadband options and has frozen Lifeline implementation, basically keeping millions of poor people in the dark ages.

Pai's failure to move forward on Lifeline has disproportionately harmed Black and Brown people people, who are far less likely to have home internet access due to systemic racism that has impacted the broadband market, in which these communities overwhelmingly report that the high cost of service is their primary adoption barrier.

That being said, this was the first step of Chairman Pai's plan to gut Net Neutrality, their is still more to go, Chairman Pai needs to leave the current rules of Net Neutrality the way they are, The internet needs to stay open for everyone, we need to bridge the digital divide, we demand that we have more privacy online, hold Chairman Pai accountable for what anything he tries to do to undermine Net Neutrality or any other attacks that he plans to do to it, us as the American people will fight tooth and nail to make sure Chairman Pai keeps the rules of Net Neutrality intact and he will become an ally by protecting Net Neutrality the same way his predecessor, Tom Wheeler did.

In conclusion, I end my complaint

Please respond back to me as soon as possible and I will email you in return also voicing more of my concerns.

Thank You!

---

**Ticket: # 1526292 - Fraudulent/ False information**

**Date:** 3/26/2017 11:15:52 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Visalia, California 93291

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

This website just makes up opinions, with zero fact checking. This is yelling fire in a theater with no fire. <https://www.dangerandplay.com/>

---

**Ticket: # 1527141 - Charter Spectrum Outage - Decatur Alabama****Date:** 3/27/2017 12:39:58 PM**City/State/Zip:** Decatur, Alabama 35601**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that they are experiencing constant problems with Charter Spectrum's services. She stated that today, there is a total outage of the services to which she subscribes. She stated that there is a message on the TV services indicating that the service is temporarily off the air (all channels). She stated that her internet service is also out completely. The consumer stated that the On Demand service is out of service most of the time. It is either out of service, or "no access at this time", etc. She stated that this particular issue has been a problem for 3 months. The consumer stated that Charter took over for Bright House Networks and since they took over all services operate at a totally unacceptable level. The consumer is not receiving the services for which she pays. She stated that it took her 10 attempts to reach Charter. She stated that there have been outages in the whole state over the past three weeks. Today, the customer service rep did not even know that Decatur, Alabama was out of service. The consumer repeated twice that she had NO service and the customer service rep stated, "Oh, Decatur is out right now". She stated that the customer service reps do not have information when you call, they are not helpful. Nor, will they provide credits for these constant problems. The consumer requested appropriate credits for these on-going issues. She also requested that services be properly repaired and restored. The consumer requested the services for which she pays.

---

**Ticket: # 1539018 - Unwanted spam e-mails without unsubscribe**

**Date:** 3/31/2017 10:46:50 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Arlington Heights, Illinois 60004

**Company Complaining About:** Multiple - Hard To Know The Source

---

## **Description**

I receive multiple e-mails daily from several sources that I believe are related because they all advertise cruise lines or travel. I have never done business with any of these companies. Nor is there a working "unsubscribe" button on any of the e-mails. I am providing .pdf file printouts of these spam emails.



---

**Ticket: # 1539041 - Unable to opt out of CPNI with Verizon**

**Date:** 3/31/2017 10:52:45 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Washington, District Of Columbia 20002

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

## **Description**

Hello,

Today, March 31, 2017 from 9:30am to 11am myself and my wife attempted to exercise our legal right to opt out of our ISP collecting CPNI. Our ISP is Verizon. We logged into our account and followed directions for opting out (<http://www.verizon.com/about/privacy/customer-proprietary-network-information>), going through "my services", and the option was not available.

We were directed to call 1-800-333-9956 - a specific line set up for Verizon customers to opt out of CPNI - where we entered the phone number on the account, verified through our online account information. The auto response is that it cannot complete the request, and the line is disconnected.

We then use the last recommend option from the Verizon site included above, calling billing services. The representative, Ms. Ford (how she identified herself), was incapable of understanding or listening to our issue, speaking over us several times, and put us through to the 1-800-333-9956 number again, which we explained previously did not work. Following the line being cut again, Ms Ford called back to ask what happened. We explained, and she said plainly that this did not happen. Myself, the account holder, and my wife are on the call, and we emphasize that yes, this did happen, and it is not her place to tell us our reality. We explain this is our legal right, and we have followed all Verizon guidance on opting out, via our online services, through the automated phone service, and through contacting billing, and Verizon is unwilling and unable to provide us the ability to opt out of collecting our CPNI.

They say they are not able to provide us with this option because our service is provided through our apartment building. When we accelerated the issue to Ms. Ford's supervisor, Ms. Ward, Ms. Ward entirely blamed Ms. Ford for the issue and said we should speak with a different division; Ms. Ward never gave the name, just that the number was 1-800-501-1172. We informed Ms. Ward the issue was not with an individual employee (Ms. Ford), but rather that we were aware that the FCC had brought suit against Verizon recently for not allowing customers to opt out of CPNI and would be reporting this issue to the FCC. Ms. Ward apologized and transferred us to 800-501-1172, where the line was immediately cut. Ms. Ward had offered to give us this number before transferring us, and luckily, we took the number down and were able to call back.

Upon reaching a representative (Ivan), we reiterated that we wanted to opt out CPNI and that we were on a "multiple apartment dwelling/HOA" account and directed to this number by previous attempts to opt out of CPNI. Ivan transferred us to the help desk because he did not know how to complete our request. The help desk was unable to complete our request and filed a note in our account.

We are reporting this issue to the FCC because we believe our legal right to withhold our browsing data is being denied/impeded by Verizon. We would like to report that Verizon continues to deny

customers their legal rights. We tried for over an hour today to opt out of CPNI and were denied at multiple points.

Our request is twofold: first, please investigate Verizon's inability to allow customers to opt out of CPNI. Second, please support our legal right to opt out by directing us to a more capable and timely method of opting out of CPNI collection. We attempted to exercise our legal right to opt out for 1.5 hours today without success, and this is not sufficient for Verizon's compliance with FCC regulations.

Thank you for your service and attention.

---

**Ticket: # 1541311 - DirectTVnow service unuseable - (b) (6)**

**Date:** 4/1/2017 1:54:03 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Buffalo, New York 14209

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

### **Description**

I prepaid for 3 months of DirectTV now and I have been unable to use the service due to errors, I have contacted the company and requested then to cancel the service and refund me the money and they are unwilling to when I have not been able to use the service as advertised and they acknowledge that the technology has not been serving as advertised. It is clear this technology is still in the Beta phase.

---

**Ticket: # 1541629 - bogus offer to get \$\$**

**Date:** 4/1/2017 10:37:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winchester, Illinois 62694

**Company Complaining About:** Federal Govt. Grant

---

## **Description**

Suggestion to obtain money/grant

---

**Ticket: # 1543111 - Skin royale and eye royale creams**

**Date:** 4/3/2017 1:01:14 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Kresgeville, Pennsylvania 18333

**Company Complaining About:** Skin Royale And Eye Royale

---

### **Description**

internet promo was paying for shipping of \$4.95 & \$5.95 and get free sample of the above mentioned items for trial period. Did not mention fees after trial period. I was charged on my Visa \$89.95 and 87.95. This is false advertisement. I would not had taken the trial sample. The creams are not do what they predict - tone and reduce facial lines. I am unable to get back my monies. I am totally dissatisfied.

---

**Ticket: # 1554080 - Internet Service with Frontier is Completely Down - Cannot Run Business /Process Credit Card Transactions**

**Date:** 4/7/2017 4:29:11 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Santa Monica, California 90405

**Company Complaining About:** Frontier Communications

---

**Description**

The consumer called the FCC to file a complaint about their internet service that is provided by Frontier Communications. She stated that she was waiting for Frontier to respond, to her business, in order to repair her internet service. The consumer has experienced constant problems since Frontier took over from Verizon. However, in January, 2017 the service went out all together. Since the above mentioned outage, Frontier has not provided the service for which they pay. The consumer stated that the level of service, being provided is totally unacceptable. Frontier had promised to replace the phone line from the pole all the way up to the point of where it connects to the modem. Frontier stated that they can see that the line was severely degraded due to weather. Frontier has stated that the line was replaced. However, the consumer had the line inspected and the result is that the line is the original/same phone line. The consumer stated that it still even has the same paint on the line....that was there prior to supposedly being replaced.

Frontier stated that the service had been repaired/fixed approximately three weeks ago/at the end of February. However, this is not true. The consumer has been calling every day to beg Frontier to repair the service because they cannot even process credit card transactions! The consumer stated that the service is extremely poor, customer service is terrible, and there is no concern for the negative way in which this impacts their business.

The consumer stated that everything works off the internet and Frontier seems to be totally unconcerned that this business is losing customers/money due to the terrible service that is being provided by Frontier.

The consumer also stated that Frontier has promised, several times to come out the same day. However, they never show up ! The consumer was promised a repair visit, before 5:00 pm - today! Thus far, no one has showed up to repair the service. The consumer stated that this is the way they operate and she would be extremely surprised if they do show up at all! The consumer further stated that she had her employee check the status of the service call while we were discussing this complaint and the manager confirmed that they would not be there today! The consumer advised the Frontier manager that she would be filing an FCC complaint. The Frontier manager advised that the FCC is not opened tomorrow Nor, will she be there tomorrow but stated that the repair service will be out tomorrow. She also explained that she could not provide a time for the repair visit.

Please note: The billing statement is under UnUrban (b) (6)

---

[Ticket: # 1554751 - Company refuses to help disabled people](#)

**Date:** 4/7/2017 11:53:25 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Westfield, New Jersey 07090

**Company Complaining About:** Valve

---

### **Description**

I have been told Valve company has not made any headway to assist people with disabilities in using their product. I would like an investigation into their company to determine the extent of the Federal law that they have allegedly broken.

---

**Ticket: # 1562998 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 4/12/2017 7:29:29 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Tinton Falls, New Jersey 07712

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello, I'm making a complaint about the forthcoming proposal to hand over the enforcement of net neutrality rules to the Federal Trade Commission. Ajit Pai is wrong to do this because the FTC will not enforce these rules. This is a violation and attack of net neutrality and freedom on the internet. I urge Ajit Pai to do his job and protect net neutrality. As a frequent user of the internet, I'm concerned for the freedom I have when expressing my free speech when net neutrality is under attack. There will be a rude awakening if these proposals are made. Protect net neutrality at all costs. Restore privacy and keep the internet free and independent.



---

**Ticket: # 1568452 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 4/15/2017 10:52:28 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Middleboro, Massachusetts 02346

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

## **Description**

Net neutrality is vital to the health of our economy and democracy, private corporations which have given hundreds of millions to both major parties and elected officials can't be trusted to keep the best interests of the people and the economy at heart.

---

**Ticket: # 1574806 - 2 modems issued to other names after connecting**

**Date:** 4/19/2017 1:52:55 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Meriden, Connecticut 06450

**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

## **Description**

had issues with internet service. contacted Cox, picked up new modem. could not connect thru customer service. told to go back to store n get another modem.

after 2 weeks modem disconnected from internet. was told again unit issued to a different name. our personal wyfi has disapeared from connection menu

twice now. feel like my personal info may be at risk with Cox.

---

**Ticket: # 1576700 - Censorship of the altRight on Google/YouTube****Date:** 4/20/2017 11:41:39 AM**City/State/Zip:** New York, New York 10029**Company Complaining About:** Google/youtube

---

**Description**

I am what people would call a "Patriot". I don't get my news from MSM because it has become exceedingly clear that these outlets are, at once, a monopoly and a propaganda arm of the CIA. The MSM sham has created a market for hundreds of credible alternative web-based news outlets to emerge and emerge they have. Unfortunately, these outlets have come under massive attack over the last two months by Alphabet/Google/YouTube, Twitter, Amazon and Facebook. It appears that these corporations are working in cooperation with (b) (6) (all too curious that this man is the former lover of (b) (6) of Pizzagate fame) of Media Matters under the new NDAA to bring the flow of information from these outlets from what was an open fire hose to a trickle. The few dozen sites that I subscribe to are screaming about being demonetized, personally threatened, having their user stats defrauded, trolled in the comments section by an army of bruts hired by Google and taken out of the public's eye despite their popularity through the adjustment of the company's algorithms. It is your responsibility to stop this BLATANT CENSORSHIP. Despite whether or not you do or do not agree with the content of these sites, this ABRIDGEMENT OF OUR FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDOMS CANNOT STAND. We expect to see: 1) the delinking of the MSM (including Google, Facebook and Twitter) from the CIA's direct influence; 2) the complete eradication of any and all attempts at censorship of any kind of speech that is within the law on the Internet; and 3) punishment for the activities that I have described above (and more, no doubt) that have already taken place. One final thought: It is very evident that the altRight has really touched a nerve with their reporting on Pizzagate. Even a first grader could figure out the connection between (b) (6) and (b) (6) and their link to the Clinton camp and exactly what it is that they are trying to cover up with this level of censorship. So, either your name will go down in history as being part of the solution or part of the problem. Please deal with this ASAP.

---

[Ticket: # 1577736 - Facebook Advertising/ truth in advertising](#)

**Date:** 4/20/2017 3:55:33 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Ferndale, Washington 98248

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Advertisers on the internet give deceptive advertisements to get your attention. When you click on the app, it is nothing about what they say it is. They even allow political lies to be used by advertisers too get your attention. It is wrong and needs to stop. Don't we have a right to know who it is before we click on the app?

---

**Ticket: # 1578592 - Continued Spam on my email DESPITE UNSUBSCRIBING SEVERAL TIMES**

**Date:** 4/20/2017 11:41:40 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Diego, California 92107

**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

**Description**

I continue to receive spam daily on my email. An irate neighbor who I complained about signed my email up for all kinds of X-rated things and despite unsubscribing and blocking, I continue to receive them. Here is an example: (b) (6)

Dish Network spam with no way to unsubscribe. You click on the button to unsubscribe and it goes to an order form to buy Dish. "ansalthebr.com" is who is messing this up. I went on their website and tried to tell them to stop but there was no way to contact them. This is not the only time "ansalthebr.com" has sent me a bunch of spam. They do it everyday. Another company is "sellwealthrio.com." Please help.

---

**Ticket: # 1580188 - internet job scam**

**Date:** 4/21/2017 4:14:46 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Cokato, Minnesota 55321

**Company Complaining About:** Virgin Mobile

---

## **Description**

In my search for work i filled out a profile on a sight called Care.com for child care providers looking for work. I was contacted via email with information retrieved from this sight for a child care position this gentlemen was looking to fill for a nanny position. At that time i was unavailable but inquired as to the time and days that would be needed for services.

I have attached the correspondence that i have had with this person, with the email address of a (b) (6) but he signs off as (b) (6).

The priority mail envoplope had a return address of Clarity Credit Union, 2541 Maple Grove RD. Duluth, MN 55811

Ship date of 04/13/2017, Expected delivery date of 04/15/2017

Cashiers check from Clarity Credit Union- p.o. Box 500 Nampa, ID 83653-0500. Routining number of 240382"324173422"0100000746" check number 240382

State bank of Howard Lake MN called clarity credit union via phone number available on the internet and they identified this check as a fraud. In addition to the lack of water markings and density of an official cashiers check.

I reported this to Wright county Sheriffs office on 04-18-2017 now I'm filing this with you and the ICC which what was recommended by the sheriff in an attempt to shut down and prosecute this individual for his actions.

I'm a single mom with 2 children that is just trying to make ends meat in life and IRATE at the fact of people trying to take advantage of those that are determined to find work to make a living instead of ride the county or state support system!

Pleeaase bring this low life to justice!!!

---

**Ticket: # 1581113 - Spam Emails that you cannot unsubscribe from**

**Date:** 4/22/2017 1:19:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Vancouver, Washington 98682

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

In the last week, I've been getting a ton of Email addresses. Many, if not most, have characters at the beginning of the Email (-/ etc.). When I open them, and go down to the bottom where the "unsubscribe" link is and click on it, it just takes me to whatever it is they're trying to sell me and there's nowhere to unsubscribe. That doesn't seem legal to not let you unsubscribe. Every time I open my Email, I have anywhere from 30 to 50 or 60 new Emails. I don't know how to stop it.

---

**Ticket: # 1581473 - Service outages**

**Date:** 4/22/2017 9:44:05 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Waterford, California 95386

**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

## **Description**

The spectrum Internet service is the only available service in my area so I have no choice but to use them. They charge the same as big companies like comcast and AT&T but give far less service. Every weekend they either have an outage or speeds are far below what I pay for. When trying to contact customer service they all of a sudden have curtain hours you can call to report an issue even though in the paperwork it says they have 24 hours service availability. And if you do get someone all they do is say they are sorry and give one of two answers, either they are aware of the problem and are ready working to resolve it, but have no ETA. Or they say they have systems down for maintenance, or speeds are slow due to maintenance. I'm not the only one, you can go online to their Web sites or read social media and see dozens of complaints of the same thing almost daily, they even have only a 1.2 star rating, but obviously don't care because they know if you want Internet in most their areas you have no choice but to live with it.



---

**Ticket: # 1581776 - FLESH EATING MIDWEST PLANT**

**Date:** 4/23/2017 3:30:00 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Chester, Illinois 62233

**Company Complaining About:** Newwavecommcom

---

**Description**

IS THERE A PICTURE OD THE PLANT,WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW===STORY WAS ON FACEBOOK.

---

**Ticket: # 1592343 - Chairman**

**Date:** 4/27/2017 2:51:32 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portage, Indiana 46368

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I use internet every single day of my life, like many people do. I do simple things on the Internet: reading news, history, and instructions on daily problems that need fixing, I spend time watching videos on YouTube, Vimeo, and sometimes even Facebook, I like to write a lot in my time both on the internet and just on my computer, and I do many other things but that's not really what I want to talk about. What I want to know is why the newest chairman of the FCC wants to get rid of Net Neutrality and why you want to trick people with a name like "Open Internet". People all around the world, not just in the US will be effected by "Open Internet". Remember the domino effect back in the Red Scare years? That is what will happen to the internet if your Chairman presses this terrible idea of "Open Internet". I would much rather see more regulation on what should be online and what shouldn't (oppression of free speech mind you) than having SUPER rich ISPs like Comcast sell out all my information. If Net Neutrality ends, I will bounce my IP so many times, I will put money toward finding out every politician's own information, and making life a whole lot harder for the people that are in favor of this. The Internet is a utility now. People use it like they use electricity, plumbing, and everything else we provide to each other daily because it's apart of our daily lives. There is a reason why the print companies are all focusing their news on the Internet, it's because no one is really buying news paper any more. Don't you personally get annoyed when ads get recommended to you because of what you search? Sure it's nice to see stuff that is more directed to you but there is a lot of stuff that is happening in the background that most of the public doesn't know about with that information. And it WILL become worse if "Open Internet" is a thing.

Also it's really sadly funny that you put "Open Internet" in front of Net Neutrality, really showing your guns there.

---

**Ticket: # 1593338 - Chairman Pai is Colluding with Commercial Interests To Harm Consumers and Lying About It**

**Date:** 4/27/2017 7:09:52 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Castro Valley, California 94546

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

The GREAT MAJORITY of citizens are for Net Neutrality. We recognized that no one entity shall have greater priority over another on the public internet. This is how it was designed, and this is how we maintain EQUAL ACCESS for ALL. As soon as we allow the maintainers of the public internet to ACTIVELY decide what traffic arrives when and to where, we are impacting freedom of speech and removing a CRITICAL forum for citizen communication by allowing anyone with enough money to decide what speech can be heard, by whom, and when. The worst part: this attempt to SELL OUR FREEDOMS is being done in the name of increased profits, and has ABSOLUTELY ZERO PUBLIC BENEFIT. Chairman Pai, and those who blindly serve his corrupted interests, should be ASHAMED of themselves for KNOWINGLY MISLEADING THE PUBLIC - there is INSUFFICIENT COMPETITION because of INSUFFICIENT REGULATION. "Freedom" in this case should mean :the Freedom to Communicate", not, "The Freedom to Make As Much Money As Possible." This is disgusting, and MUST END.

---

**Ticket: # 1594374 - frequency interference**

**Date:** 4/28/2017 12:02:48 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Brooklyn, New York 11205

**Company Complaining About:** Sprint

---

## **Description**

I have tried to explain that frequency interference is happening from region two on my internet address and my cellphone number (b) (6). I live in Region one nyc, ny. The internet address is good and I am getting some messages back, but I have not been hearing back from jobs or housing which is strange. I have contacted the service provider, and I noticed that the email server is changed weekly, which is strange as well. Why would they not have one person delegating the exchange to accounts that is a problem.

my name is (b) (6), and this is not a ftc issue. my internet is quasi on my phone because I have taken initiative to contact law enforcement. I understand that. it is to cut down on the amount of bad frequency interactions. The email issue is effecting my housing search sometimes, and communication with law and legal authorities online. (b) (6)

---

[Ticket: # 1594406 - internet neutrality](#)

**Date:** 4/28/2017 12:13:28 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Davis, California 95616

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

Preserve Net Neutrality -- leave current regulations in place.

---

**Ticket: # 1595444 - Fraud @att**

**Date:** 4/28/2017 4:50:14 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Palatka, Florida 32177

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

Att is committing fraud by telling & charging people for there so called u-verse. When they know the system is a DSL system.

They also cannot give customers detailed or itemized Date usage their being charged for on a bill.

The FCC many years back made at&t and other phone companies itemize their long distance calls for the same basic reason.

Att on their website offers DSL and u-verse high speed. They swapped me at the 1/17 after I told them NO u-verse because there cannot provide TRUE u-verse to my home. They did change me and I had issues ever since.

Before 1/17 , my DSL system never hardly ever used any DATA. Since att installed this fraudulent u-verse they are claiming I am using 28 to 50 gigs plus a day. And now 4/17 over 1000 gigs plus??

I sent an email and talked to George Martin at att and asked for usage? He told me att would not and could define or itemize a Customers DATA USAGE...

( How then does the Music companies record and certify data on Down loaded Music? Which they use to take people to court. Oh, through the internet providers !!! An itemized data record of the customer being challenged by the music company and their Lawyers and the Courts.)

Last I looked att is one of those providers?

Now I have asked att to return my services back to my original DSL deal, Which is also advertised as my choice via att' website. As well as any other customer. ( I have also been told by att employees that att is misleading customers to get them off of the so called DSL and to U-verse!

I received a call from a George Martin from the chairmans office. I asked to be changed back to my DSL service.

He stated maybe and when I asked when he finally admitted He lied and att would not return my DSL services.. He sounds like a general security or gopher if you ask me. He knew nothing about att systems? No knowledge of Fiber optics or what happens to dc voltage when ran thru contaminated water logged phone lines?

Now I asked him as other att personal I talked to on the phone? I asked which is fastest? Electricity goes thru a copper line Or the speed of light going thru a hollow tube? In simple terms a person can actually watch a lighting strike. ( which is visible electricity ) or the light from the Sun starting at our atmosphere coming down hitting a reflector and bouncing back to the atmosphere?

Electric can be timed but light is so much faster it' s hard to figure it's speed without a computer or being a mathematician!

Bottom line att claims the U-verse by using fiber optic lines and the speed of Light !!! This is their Main basis of U-verse ! And there main deal for the ability to show TV to att's customers?

Now att is charging customers for true u-verse when they know they cannot do this through old water contaminated copper phone lines.

While they have some fiber optic lines in different areas they system is flawed when it goes back to the old copper lines.

I have had service personal say what they are doing in MY area and others is just jacking up the old DSL system. The average customer knows No difference.

Now the upper management is making thousands if not millions of dollars in bonus's off these fraudulent lies about u-verse.

Now att claims u-verse will do the same speeds and systems thru copper lines as per fiber optic's? So if true then att should be able to run their TV system (u-verse ) to my area or home? They cannot but they only offer direct TV which has no connection to any phone lines copper or fiber!

All I ask is for my DSL service Returned to my old status and to scrap there lying u-verse system in my home.

( Att has only a copper phone cable installed around 1971/72. The copper cable has been contaminated. With water for many many years, also the same cable has had lightning strikes as well. The issues will and do cause the cable performance issues. There is No way att can even claim this line can handle U-verse? Now True U-verse requires a complete Fiber Optic line or cable.)

( also here something to help you out,

Back when there was dial up internet? The internet requires 2 modems? One to send and one to receive? Now it starts with 14/400 bauds then went to 24, then 33 and finally 52 K and the DSL. Now while everyone was upgrading to faster modems att , & bellsouth was not upgrading to match all the customers modems. So while I had a 52K modem , bellsouth/att was only using an old 14/4K modem. So when people's computer in this area hit the bellsouth/att modem the data they sent or received down shifted to their speed of 14/4K. The providers did not want to keep paying for these expanding modems? Do you think customers were informed?) Now there doing something of the same? While some area are fiber, mainly Test Areas . Most of the US still has old damaged copper lines or cables. Att has started jacking up the power of the DSL system and calling it U-verse. And it is FRAUD. If my line is True U-Verse then let's ask att to run the TV through my system as is ? And while we are at it lets increase the internet speed to 100Mbps ?

Now remember that att is claiming my system is Fiber lined and will run True U-verse ?

I bet they will lie to you the FCC as well..

Look at what the president /chairman gets a years in pays? Well one site has him at over 26mil?

The FCC should look at all customers phone and internet and other att billings?

FCC charges on phone bill was \$6.50 when I had a landline? And all the other false charges?

Who knows what's on the direct tv bills? They have. It started on the internet only billing yet.

Please advise !!!

Thank you

---

[Ticket: # 1595883 - Citizen complaint](#)

**Date:** 4/29/2017 12:01:06 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Saint Louis, Missouri 63123

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

### **Description**

Reinstate Net Neutrality and put these ISP under title 2. Protect Americans and not At&t. Do your jobs!!! I fought for this in 2014-2015 and I am not going to let you ruin the work of millions of people. You work for us!!! Stop taking these bribes. I am a citizen and a voter and guess what, I am paying attention!!!!



---

**Ticket: # 1596724 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 4/30/2017 11:55:33 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Okeechobee, Florida 34974

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

The idea of net neutrality ending is without a doubt the most terrifying thing I could imagine happening in the modern world. Every person, business, and entity has a right to the internet no matter their income. They have a right to the same speeds, the same sites, and the same ability to own their own sites. And they deserve to be easily accessible. The whole reason most people don't even have cable television is because of how ridiculously and unnecessarily expensive it is to get five decent channels. Net neutrality should not, under any circumstances, end,

---

**Ticket: # 1597064 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 4/30/2017 7:12:37 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Duluth, Minnesota 55812

**Company Complaining About:** Charter

---

## **Description**

Please keep the net neutral. Removing this blanket of equality from the web will basically limit and but bars on what you can access on the internet. It will favor the wealthy, those that can afford surcharges in their internet bills, websites that are currently free to the public may refuse access without payment. This would be limiting the freedom of American citizens. This is not OK.

---

**Ticket: # 1597472 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 5/1/2017 7:02:53 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Blamby State, Alaska 59371

**Company Complaining About:** All Of Them

---

## **Description**

If net neutrality is removed, America will be that much closer to an uprising from the working class. Without a unrestricted internet access to distract them, the working class will realize just how shitty they have it, and things will get much worse for everyone involved. The working class will not be able to afford higher internet price rates, and it's a pretty stupid idea to try and jack the prices.

---

**Ticket: # 1260031 - Internet Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:52:43 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Issaquah, Washington 98027

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

I implore you to ban internet data caps and keep the internet open and fair.

---

**Ticket: # 1007538 - AT&T Data Cap policy is anti-competitive and I have no other reasonable options**

**Date:** 5/28/2016 11:10:11 PM

**City/State/Zip:** West Union, South Carolina 29696

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

AT&T has changed their billing structure instituting data caps on wired highspeed/broadband service. This will effect my family adversely as we use streaming video services to augment the Over-the-Air television we receive. I have three major issues.

1. The structure of the deal is designed to incetivize you to continue paying for a subscription television service. As a courtesy they will wave overage charges if you are subscriber to Uverse television. This has the net effect of creating a hidden cost on competative streaming services. Microsoft was embroiled into antitrust charges for Internet Explorer being bundled with Windows, and Google has been penalized in the EU market place for elevating their search results above competitors. This policy has the clear effect to create an artificial scarcity to raise the cost or diminish the value of competaitive video offerings. Granted these are allegations but the actions are not less brazen and should be legally reviewed.
2. The next problem is one that effects not just the wiredline service but the wireless service. If data is to be bill on a usage based model. Then there needs to be clear transparency and standards/regulatory oversight on the meters that measure and charge for data. This is an established pratice in the delivery of electricity. The meter is on sight, physical and can be audited by customer and service provider. It is a neutral device. However the meter for data usage is a webpage (remote) and has no methods for test/verification of accuracy. Thus it has no way to be audited by the customer. At the end of the billing cycle we have to trust that AT&T has correctly measured and billed for data. This needs particular scrutiney in AT&T case as they deliver an IP television/phone service. Does the data from a POTS phone call count? I suppose the reason customers are given unlimited data for uverse subscribers is because they cannot distinguish traffic from their own television network or "regular internet" traffic. Furthermore, does this not prove the point in complaint 1? If their subscription television and POTS products are delievered via an IP network just like all the other streaming services, then does exeption on bandwith caps for their serivce not show that they are unfavorably favoring their IP product versus a competitors? AT&T will try to explain that their network is different because it is managed service, but when Netflix and others try to pay to cache content to reduce network interconnect congestion this was not enough to prevent this policy. Even though a point of curiosity the complaint remains. If i am to be charged for usage based billing, then as a customer I should have a physical meter that has passed 3rd party regulatory / standards certifications like the watt hour electricity meter has. The physical meter also allows the customer to audit in a cost efficient manner the accuracy of the measurement. To further this point, how much is a GigaByte? the technical definition is  $2^{30}$  bytes. But hard drive manufactuers define it as a base 10 value of 1,000,000,000 bytes. When I am consuming data or the product how am i to accurately judge my usage. Because the data meter is remote and the measurement is not real time I will have no way of knowing when I exceed my usage limit. Resolution of these measurements are a problem

as well. They typically measure in .1 Gigabyte resolution. However If I am trying to fully use my service their could still be valuable data going unused.

3. The practice not only causes a chilling effect on video services, but other internet products as well. For instance software is delivered without physical media now. Many consumers are unaware of the data silently without their control being transferred to maintain the security of their computers. In a multi-device household these data caps could be exceeded by the marginal of one of these such updates. Thus consumers will be tempted to turn off security updates because they are now paying for them. This is a security hazard. Also this could chill the purchases of digital content such as games, movies, music and ect...

AT&T will rebutt that 600GB is over and beyond the average household consumption. However their "generosity" is not relevant as they can change the rules at will and that does not address the technical complaints above. Furthermore they will claim that data caps have been in effect for a long time and they will cite their previous 150/250 GB cap limits. However they were not universally enforced across their entire service area. Additionally, because they were not enforced, they had the effect of not existing. Also, because they were not enforced there was no credible way to complain because the lack of enforcement created no adverse effect. Now that caps are being enforced the complaints above are valid and the argument that there were data caps previously are moot.

As a personal note, I have no interest in a subscription television product because the customer service in the industry is entrapping and hostile. Although I have never done drugs in my life, I can't imagine the relationship would be much different between me and a traditional subscription video provider than a drug user and his dealer. As such I will never ever do business with such of these institutions and purchase any of these products.

While I technically have another option available to me it involves paying the county \$7000 dollars to run a fiber line and connecting me to the municipally managed internet service. The expense is so high for connection that the end result is that its "not an option".

Thank you for listening, I hope the complaints are constructive and useful in any investigation you have ongoing.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1026929 - Internet service**

**Date:** 6/8/2016 11:22:29 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

Internet service is very slow and at times is unusable. I was supposed to get up to 1.5 meg but usually only receive .350 to .600. My upload speed is always under .8 m. After a year of complaints they admitted they cannot provide the contracted service and reduced my monthly bill. This is not what I want and would gladly pay full price for full service.

Century Link has not been up front and honest with us about the service they are providing. I believe that Century Link is in violation of 47 code of federal regulations 8.3 - transparency. They have given us false information as to the service promised. Once again after repeated calls, the only remedy they have provided is a reduction in our bill but we want the service as promised. For this reason, we feel Century Link is in violation of the open internet order and we are requesting the FCC investigate the issue. We have attached a copy of the typical service they provide.



---

**Ticket: # 1028938 - XXX XXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 6/9/2016 8:08:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Oakland, California 94611

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I am a Senior Network Engineer. I have made the internet work for my employer for 18 years, so I have some experience and knowledge in this area.

Major Telcos are behaving like spoiled children, and seem more interested in siphoning off as much cash as they can, rather than investing in building a better network. I know what it costs to build a good network and how it can be done. That's not happening. Bandwidth scarcity only exists because it's artificially induced so that the telco can charge more.

And now they want to damage the core functions of the greatest democratizer to ever exist in human history. That's unacceptable.

I would request that the FCC bring the hammer down so hard on these companies that they will finally stop this strategy. Require transparency in their forwarding policies and prohibit bandwidth caps.

Last year the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out. But now the same cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

Comcast is breaking the rules, and the FCC should put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should not be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an open, public process to decide where and how to enforce these rules.

The Open Internet rules prevent ISPs from picking winners and losers online by slowing down some websites and applications while speeding up others. But now Comcast has found another way to pick winners and losers: it applies arbitrary data caps, but exempts its own video content while counting all competing video services toward those caps. This is a textbook case of an ISP abusing its power for its own competitive advantage. In addition, Comcast's caps favor its own traditional cable service by discouraging customers from cutting the cord.

I don't want Comcast messing with my choice of video services by privileging its own content and punishing the rest. That hurts me, and it hurts the online video services I might use if they compete with Comcast by offering better price, quality and selection.

There's no legitimate reason for data caps to exist at all. Comcast has admitted that its caps have nothing to do with managing congestion. Moreover, Comcast is limiting Internet use with data caps while charging a monthly fee for customers to get out from under those caps. This discourages broadband Internet use overall, and especially "cord-cutting" by users who'd rather give up their expensive cable TV packages and watch TV online.

As a Comcast customer, I should be able to choose freely whether I want to subscribe to Comcast's traditional cable service or whether I want to watch video online instead— just as I should be able to choose which online video I want to watch. Comcast is interfering with these choices.

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: Comcast hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.

These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by Comcast. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. If you'd like to contact me about my complaint, please do so via email.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1031545 - slow internet**

**Date:** 6/11/2016 2:08:49 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

slow internet, dropped internet, lack of bandwidth, overloaded lines, can't stream any video, can't use webcams, promises to improve with no results, not getting the service that I'm paying for and was promised. I believe Centurylink is in violation of Transparency and Disclosure 47code of Federal Regulations 8.3 Transparency.

---

**Ticket: # 1031576 - Violation of Open Internet order**

**Date:** 6/11/2016 2:24:40 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

As a century link customer, Century link was not transparent about ongoing major issues with their service such as: over loaded lines, poor infrastructure, over loaded capacity. With these issues listed above has effective my internet service. I'm not able to use century link service during certain time of the day, Internet bogs down, will not upload videos , and not able to watch movies. I pay for services and I'm not able to use this service to full potential. With lack of communication between century link and me as a customer I feel Century Link is in Violation 47 code of Federal Regulation 8.3 transparency.

---

**Ticket: # 1031585 - slow internet**

**Date:** 6/11/2016 2:26:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

### **Description**

slow internet, dropped internet, lack of bandwidth, overloaded lines, can't stream any video, can't use webcams, promises to improve with no results, not getting the service that I'm paying for and was promised. I believe Centurylink is in violation of Transparency and Disclosure 47code of Federal Regulations 8.3 Transparency.

---

**Ticket: # 1067405 - Illegal Online Gambling Scheme****Date:** 7/3/2016 11:35:10 PM**City/State/Zip:** Fort Myers, Florida 33901**Company Complaining About:** Csgolounge

---

**Description**

This video provides evidence of the fraudulent behavior these owners of a gambling site perform on a daily basis: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_8fU2QG-IV0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_8fU2QG-IV0)

In short, popular 'Youtubers' make videos about betting real money on video game weapon camouflage, called 'skins'. These gambling websites are completely unregulated and free for a person of any age to participate. A popular site, called 'CSGOLounge', is the point of contention. These YouTuber actually own this site, and could be potentially manipulating odds. This can't be proven. However, what is proof is that there has been no disclosure. In fact, the actual owner of the site claimed he 'found this cool site'. In reality, he founded it. Incredibly ironic in hindsight. (b) (6) is his name. A friend of his ProSyndicate is equally responsible. Children see these videos and think they can and should gamble. With nothing to stop them, they might as well, sadly. As of this year, the skin gambling industry circulates billions of dollars. That's insane for an unregulated industry, and it needs to be stopped. Please watch this enclosed video for a better look at the proof.

---

**Ticket: # 1076006 - Data Caps****Date:** 7/8/2016 4:54:09 PM**City/State/Zip:** Middlebury, Indiana 46540**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast is rolling data caps out in this area with short notice. I have been a customer for over 10 years and think this practice is unfair. I never had a data limit before but now there is one. They say it is for fair pricing but they do not lower my bill if I do not go over the cap but will charge me 200.00 more if I do or I have to pay an additional 50 dollars per month for the same thing I am pay for now. They say this is a trial in this area but if you call comcast to speak out against the trial no one really wants to hear your complaints is slow to escalate your complaint to any one who would report the situation up to the level of management that would make a decision affecting the data cap. They want you to think it is ok because they say it is fair. They can not tell you how the measurement data tools work or even what tools they are using to determine how much data you are using. There are countless articles on the internet how their measurement tools are wrong and people are being over charged. They are not showing enough transparency on why the need the caps in place and how the data is being measured.

---

**Ticket: # 1084768 - XXXXX XXXXXXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 7/14/2016 12:40:29 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Roswell, Georgia 30075

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Given how powerful regional telecommunication monopolies already are, I hope that the FCC will take this liberty-minded appeal seriously.

From last year, the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out. Unfortunately, those cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

Comcast is breaking the rules, and the FCC should absolutely put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should not be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an open, public process to decide where and how to enforce these rules. Let's continue with the theme of government transparency.

The Open Internet rules prevent ISPs from picking winners and losers online by slowing down some websites and applications while speeding up others. But now Comcast has found another way to pick winners and losers: it applies arbitrary data caps, but exempts its own video content while counting all competing video services toward those caps. This is a textbook case of an ISP abusing its power for its own competitive advantage. In addition, Comcast's caps favor its own traditional cable service by discouraging customers from cutting the cord.

I don't want Comcast messing with my choice of video services by privileging its own content and punishing the rest. That hurts me, and it hurts the online video services I might use if they compete with Comcast by offering better price, quality and selection.

There's no legitimate reason for data caps to exist at all. Comcast has admitted that its caps have nothing to do with managing congestion. Moreover, Comcast is limiting Internet use with data caps while charging a monthly fee for customers to get out from under those caps. This discourages broadband Internet use overall, and especially "cord-cutting" by users who'd rather give up their expensive cable TV packages and watch TV online.

As a Comcast customer, I should be able to choose freely whether I want to subscribe to Comcast's traditional cable service or whether I want to watch video online instead— just as I should be able to choose which online video I want to watch. Comcast is interfering with these choices.

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: Comcast hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.



These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by Comcast. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. However, in the event that you would like to contact me personally, please do so via email.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1104420 - Deceptive Billing issue with AT&T U-Verse****Date:** 7/26/2016 1:42:37 PM**City/State/Zip:** Saint Joseph, Missouri 64501**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

Earlier this year, AT&T solicited the consumer by offering U-Verse service and the advertisement indicated that he could save money. Internet and Phone service was advertised for \$59.00 per month (this included taxes and surcharges). The consumer is blind. He had his health aide read the complete advertisement to him, before he contacted AT&T. When AT&T was contacted, the rep confirmed everything in the advertisement. The rep acknowledged that he would save \$14.00 per month and the rate would be approximately \$59.00 per month...give or take about one dollar. The installers responded and stated that they did not believe the new service would work based on his existing equipment located in the home that he rents. (The home has a PBX service). The techs called the office and they were instructed to install the equipment and the installer was advised that the equipment would work. That evening, the consumer had internet service. However, he had NO phone service. The service crew was sent back several times to repair the problem. However, there was no way to make the phone work. The last time that a tech responded,...without any notification, he/AT&T decided to bring a second and separate line to his home so that the internet would reside on one line and the phone service on the other. This was never discussed with the consumer. Nor, was he informed that AT&T would not honor the U-Verse price that was quoted. When the tech left that day, both services were working. The next problem that the consumer experienced is that emails that were being sent to him were not being received to his inbox. This took on month to resolve this reported issue - AT&T had not programmed the computer into their system. Around April, 2016; the consumer began receiving two separate bills. He was advised that during the transition, the bill would be taken care of by AT&T. However, he was only provided with a credit for about 9-10 days because the email service had not been working along with credit for a few days on the phone service, when it also had not worked. Shortly after all of the problems had been addressed, he then received another billing statement. This is the date that he received two separate billing statements because he now has two lines in lieu of one phone line to the home that carries both the internet and the phone service. AT&T has failed to honor the \$59.00 price that was quoted and the AT&T reps have stated that this is because his service required a second line. He stated that he is now being threatened with disconnection because his phone bill is due today (07/2/2016). The internet bill is due on 07/28/2016. He stated that he is elderly and blind. He must have access to emergency services. The consumer also stated that IF the phone goes off, his alarm system will not operate. He lives in the middle of a rural area. The consumer called AT&T regarding the fact that he has the two bills and the amount totals \$84.13 !! He explained that he is elderly and made arrangements to rent the present residence in which he resides. He stated that it provided the owners with an occupant and him with a place to live. He has tried to explain, to AT&T, that the present billing is not affordable to him and it is not what was promised when he responded to the U-Verse advertisement. The consumer respectfully request that AT&T honor the promotional pricing for U-Verse service as he originally contracted. The consumer was never asked about the second line. Nor, was there any disclosure that AT&T would not honor the bundled pricing.

---

[Ticket: # 1105712 - Comcast is blocking VoIP/SIP traffic over UDP 5060 but is denying it](#)

**Date:** 7/27/2016 1:22:39 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97214

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## Description

Since I moved to Comcast Cable Modem from Century Link DSL, my VoIP services have stopped working. I have done much troubleshooting to figure out what was going on. I would see the SIP packets leaving my house but would never come back. I finally realized they were blocking UDP 5060 when I used another SIP client and I was able to make calls. Looking at the packets, the difference is the new SIP client was using an alternate UDP port as the source port. Changing my Asterisk PBX to use a different port seemed to fix the problem, at least in my case.

There is no reason for them to block inbound UDP 5060 to houses. This would ever only be used if I wanted to register a SIP client to my home phone system while away from home. Their own block page nor their customer service agents talk about this 5060 block at all. They just said there is a problem with my modem or router.

Their lack of transparency about filtering services that they themselves sell (home telephone service) is bad made worse by their denial they are even doing it.

I've attached a wireshark capture which was the only way I could find out what was happening. I highlighted the part of the packet showing the new port number (50060 in this case) which allows SIP to work. If the contact port is UDP 5060 it will fail because they are blocking it.

Thanks

---

**Ticket: # 1168091 - AT&T U-Verse Debited Bank Account for \$508.21 without Permission**

**Date:** 8/30/2016 1:26:19 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Antonio, Texas 78240

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

The consumer stated that they signed up for a bundled U-Verse package, with AT&T in May, 2016. Service was installed on 05/23/2016. However, on 05/26/2016, the service indicated that there was a "loss of signal", on the TV. When the consumer contacted customer service, they were advised that they experienced a lightening strike and that AT&T would come out and repair the service. Thus far, two technicians have attempted to repair the service. However, the service still has not been repaired. AT&T stated that they would work on the issue and thought that perhaps this is related to a weather issue. AT&T then took \$508.41 out of their bank account, in June. When the consumer called about this transaction, she was advised that this was for the installation of the service. The consumer stated that she had responded to a promotion, for the bundled package, and the installation was advertised as being free. The consumer stated that when they initiated service, the AT&T rep requested their bank card number for the purpose of verifying their identity. AT&T explained that there would be a one time charge for \$1.99. However, AT&T used the card to automatically debit their account as stated above. The consumer had to go to her bank to obtain her monies back because AT&T refused to listen to them/would not return the money. The bank charged \$28.00 to place a stop payment on the transaction. During a call to AT&T, the consumer tried to explain that \$402.00 PLUS the \$508.41 would total more than \$910.00! The consumer stated that this was for a period of less than one month! The consumer stated that she never agreed to pay automatically. Nor, did she authorize anyone to automatically use their bank card. AT&T was supposed to reconnect her services, yesterday. However, this still has not happened. The consumer has requested that AT&T turn services back on, issue appropriate credits for the full length of time that services have not worked. The consumer has a receipt showing that she has paid a total of \$402.00 (1 payment of \$202.00 and a second payment of \$200.00). However, AT&T refuses to listen to them because of the \$508.41 payment that was rescinded by their bank. The consumer feels AT&T has taken complete and full advantage of them. They do whatever they want. The consumer has stated that she feels that AT&T has engaged in very deceptive business practices and this is totally uncalled for behavior. The consumer requests that AT&T provide the service for which they signed up and they request that they provide the service at the rates advertised in the promotion. The consumer stated that there was no other disclosure regarding anything other than the total price shown in the advertisement. Therefore, they stated that everything is included in the bundle....the equipment, all services that are part of their package, etc.

---

**Ticket: # 1247819 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/8/2016 10:37:54 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Schaumburg, Illinois 60194

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information. Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves. I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legit reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Time Warner (now Spectrum). I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

(b)

---

**Ticket: # 1218182 - Open Internet/Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 9/25/2016 5:59:30 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Highland Park, Illinois 60035

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

To Whom it May Concern:

Clear issues include:

- Blocking of information on the Internet.
  - o For example:
    - ☐ Most searches related to computer science, security certificates, computer networks/network infrastructure, ports, etc., return only forum results.
  - Inconsistency of data.
    - o For example:
      - ☐ I visit a website/do an Internet search and see information.
      - ☐ I navigate away from the website or search.
      - ☐ Minutes later I go back to the same website or I perform the same search again.
      - ☐ Result when I go back to the same website:
        - 1. I see different information.
        - ☐ Result when I perform an identical Google search for the second time:
          - 1. Information returned in my search results is different.
      - o For example: a search for "Clarisonic Mia 2 charging cable" on google shopping returned approximately 20 shopping results the first time I searched for it. The second identical search performed less than 5 minutes later returned approximately 2 shopping results.
      - ☐ Slow speeds.
      - ☐ No connection.
      - ☐ Lack of transparency about network activity and infrastructure on my home network.
        - 1. For example:
          - o I have asked Comcast what a solid mux server is (see image).
          - o I have asked why there are remote logins and unauthorized file transfers (SFTP). See images.
          - o I have asked which infrastructure IP addresses (b) (6), etc. belong to.
          - o I have asked many questions. The bottom line is: I still don't have an answer to most of them. I have been a target of cybercrime activity and I am unable to find information to circumvent it.
- Lawful content blocking, slow speed, lack of connection, and non transparency (amongst many other things that are not applicable to this particular law) have been apparent for a number of years. I have contacted Verizon, Comcast, Apple, The Geek Squad, etc. in person and on the phone a number of times to try to resolve the issues. Despite my effort, the problems are still very real. I will very much appreciate help in resolving this matter. Thank you.

---

**Ticket: # 1220239 - Internet Speed Issue**

**Date:** 9/26/2016 4:01:35 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Atlanta, Georgia 30317

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

Although I contract with AT&T for "Up to 3 Mbps download," I never get that bandwidth. I have contacted them repeatedly and get no improvement. My speeds often are a third or less of their claimed download service. A speed test today showed a download speed of .41 Mbps.

Per Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations § 8.3 – Transparency, AT&T has failed to "disclose accurate information regarding the network management practices, performance, and commercial terms of its broadband Internet access services sufficient for consumers to make informed choices regarding use of such services and for content, application, service, and device providers to develop, market, and maintain Internet offerings."

---

**Ticket: # 1230027 - Slow Internet Speed****Date:** 10/1/2016 3:57:01 PM**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

**Description**

I consistently experience slow internet speeds where it can take up to a minute or more to load a page. I am not experiencing the speeds that I was promised when I signed up and for what I am paying for. For the past few years, I have experience speeds that rivaled being on dial up. I was never informed by Centurylink that they oversold the bandwidth, that I wouldn't have enough speed to accomplish my work, and that they oversold the lines and now none are available in Winlock. They never told me they had major issues with their service to Winlock and that they have no intention of upgrading my service or providing me with the service at or near what I am paying for. I called Centurylink about a year ago to find out why my service was so slow and was told that the server was full. I asked how many people were on the internet and was told it was 12 people, yes 12 people. This is beyond unbelievable. Centurylink is being discriminatory toward rural Winlock and needs to be held responsible for their deceiving marketing tactics and not fulfilling their promise on the internet speed I am paying for. There is a lack of transparency and honesty with their customers. I currently have no other DSL provider available to me in my area.



---

**Ticket: # 1237111 - Verizon G1100 router cannot disable block to VoIP**

**Date:** 10/6/2016 3:55:39 AM

**City/State/Zip:** N/a, Massachusetts 00000

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

## **Description**

I just installed my new G1100 router (FCC id 2ABTEG1100) which is from Verizon as part of my contract and serviced by Verizon. I used to have an Actiontec router from Verizon which lacked the WPA2 only mode when using a custom passphrase. I upgraded to the G1100 to fix this issue, which it has fixed, and to improve wireless coverage, which it also seems to have done.

However, a problem has been introduced which cannot be solved by Verizon's router tech support division. I use VoIP phones and apparently this router has SIP ALG enabled by default. According to Verizon this cannot be disabled. From what I've read, SIP ALG rewrites VoIP packets, sometimes unnecessarily and if not done properly or if even done at all, it can cause garbled voice and disconnection of VoIP calls.

I would prefer to use the Verizon router as it is warranted, serviced, and updated by Verizon and I prefer this arrangement instead of investing in my own equipment, especially as Verizon TV requires a Verizon router anyway.

Regardless, I have the G1100 and I am currently not provided an option to possibly improve a part of my internet access, that is VoIP. I don't believe SIP ALG enabled improves security. It is a feature separate and apart from the firewall because having it enabled does not improve security as far as I know. By the way, the Actiontec did allow this feature to be controlled by the user.

So, the bottom line is that my internet access is being hindered because SIP ALG cannot be disabled and packets are being rewritten without my permission so I am not receiving or sending what I request when using VoIP. Many conversations are garbled at times. When using my own router or the older Actiontec from Verizon this does not happen, so I think the problem is clear.

Even if Sip ALG could be disabled, the G1100 firewall does not offer granular control or transparency, so if something else is being blocked the firewall requires me to not have any overlapping rules. Unfortunately, it automatically creates rules for the TV set top boxes which I can't remove or alter. This is a problem because the ports I want opened or forwarded cannot because the firewall rule for the STB is taking precedence. And they occupy around 30,000 ports. This is obviously unnecessary. Again, I feel this hinders what could be more open access to the internet.

Furthermore, the firewall cannot be disabled, just set to "low". This is a point of principle, not practicality because the firewall shouldn't be disabled really. But it goes to show the user has no control over what is being blocked, again infringing on net neutrality.

Otherwise, I like the G1100. I know Verizon might switch to IP TV in the future but until then they should not let it infringe on open access. And certainly no one at Verizon has an explanation for why SIP ALG cannot be disabled, an obvious hindrance to open internet access.

Currently, the router is set to low firewall which is an improvement from medium firewall, but there is usually garbled voice at some point during every conversation which I suspect is from SIP ALG.

Instead of being forced to use the Actiontec router to fix the VoIP and TV firewall issue and purchasing my own access point to fix the WPA2 security issue, I would be more satisfied if Verizon would fix the firewall and SIP ALG issues.

If not, I suppose it would be polite of them to offer something else for my inconvenience of having to purchase my own network equipment to gain open access.

By the way, there were even some firewall rules in the G1100 with the name of "Verizon Voicewing". This service was discontinued in 2009 so I have no idea why some firewall rules from a discontinued 2009 service are present not in the old Actiontec router but in the new G1100 from 2016. This is a bit puzzling especially since FiOS digital voice does not pass through the router or the internet. It makes me further skeptical of some possible intention to knowingly hinder open internet access to VoIP.

---

**Ticket: # 1247907 - Comcast Data Caps on broadband Internet****Date:** 10/8/2016 11:13:30 AM**City/State/Zip:** Stow, Ohio 44224**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Implementation of Data Caps on broadband Internet is unnecessary. There are no legitimate reasons to do this, and Comcast is one of several cable provider/ISPs making this change and claiming that it will spur innovation and customer choice despite the reality of monopolistic scenarios all across the U.S. for said services.

Adding data caps without addressing wifi security abuses, certified monitoring hardware and software, unfair "bundling" practices (i.e. TV subscribers have no Internet data cap somehow), etc. is putting the cart before the horse. It makes no sense to have the limitations of the caps without having ways to monitor and control the usage at the customer level properly. In addition, transparency regarding the actual use and the data that the Comcast has collected that has (internally) justified their decision to implement the cap has zero peer review. At this point, they can make up any justification they want, repeat it often, train their reps to parrot it, and no one can verify their claims as to total throughput, trends of normal use, price points and increases, etc. The common U.S. customer can only live with whatever they allow us to have, with little information and rights to even have a conversation back with them, let alone hope to argue or fight their decision.

FCC: Please strongly consider fighting back at the root cause and representing the common citizens of the U.S. by regulating/legislating that data caps for broadband Internet become illegal as soon as possible. Just as with the fight over Net Neutrality, this threatens the present and the future of an open Internet. Thank you for your hand work on our behalf, and your attention on this matter.

---

**Ticket: # 1259614 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:00:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Jose, California 95148

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

Please force Comcast and other companies from having data caps. This is so, so important.

---

**Ticket: # 1246496 - Data caps**

**Date:** 10/7/2016 11:09:08 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Houston, Texas 77019

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

If I'm not a Comcast customer, but hate the precedent they are setting, how can I be helpful?

I'd like to know this as well. I'm on TimeWarner (or I suppose Spectrum now) currently with no caps but know it's only a matter of time, even with the merger stipulation.

EDIT: Filed. I'm not a writer or poet or whatever but this is what I said (I'm sure I did a shitty job):

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information.

Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves.

I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legit reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Time Warner (now Spectrum). I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

Me

---

**Ticket: # 1257962 - Comcast (and other) data caps.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:37:16 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Medford, Oregon 97501

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.



---

**Ticket: # 1259535 - Capped data policy for broadband internet**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:50:43 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Maplewood, Minnesota 55117

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast will be implementing 1TB data caps in MN on Nov 1st.

First are foremost, this action should not be allowed be Comcast, or any internet provider.

Capping internet access has no grounds in reality, it does not cost the company any more if I use 1mb or 10GB, that's simply not how wired internet works. This action to "cap" access is nothing but a money grab in a monopolized market, used to punish cord cutters and stifle innovation and growth. Comcast has an extensive history of inaccurately measuring data usage, as seen in it's test markets. There is no expectation of accuracy or transparency for tracking data usage, not should it have any oversight to that information in the first place. The idea that they will push a pop up to tell you are at your limit may not align with actual usage, and such data packet manipulation used to push a message like that should not be allowed in the first place.

Comcast and other internet providers have created a monopoly in almost all markets, making underhanded agreements with the local authorities to give them sole access to the PUBLICLY funded infrastructure. This monopoly should never have been allowed, as it fosters unchecked actions by these companies at the detriment of the customer and innovation. Because I have no choice about my internet provider, I am forced to accept high prices, slow speeds, poor customer services, and in some cases, fraudulent charges that are impossible to resolve.

Internet is a core component to modern life, and to treat it as anything other than a utility is erroneous and criminal. Just as we cannot put a cap on how long you can talk on your land-line utility phone, you should not put a cap on how much data I use on my land-line broadband internet.

The modern age is here; full of Netflix, e-books, online classes, online job hunts, video conferencing etc. Almost everything we touch in our modern lives uses the internet in some way. What will happen if we limit that access? How many students won't be able to do their homework? How many scientists won't be able to check on their experiments? How many breakout software developers won't be able to test their work? How many families will have to wait to watch the new Disney movie with their children? How many people won't be able to check on their medical results? How many people won't be able to access their news, weather, or traffic? All because they have hit some fictitious "Cap" that says they cannot access without paying up more.

To say that a 1TB cap is generous is a bald faced lie. No cap is generous. As our internet driven lives continue to grow and become more and more innovative, our data usage will only increase. This will impact us as each year goes by, stifling us and bleeding us dry in an already over-strained market.

Please, I implore you, for the sake of all of our futures and our access to the information of the boundless internet, stop Comcast for implementing data caps. Stop all of them. Internet is a utility, and the luxury of having unlimited access in our own homes is a basic right (Obama stated that internet access is a basic human right).

This must be fixed now, it cannot wait any longer. Waiting has only allowed these companies to continue to push their agenda that is anti-net neutrality and anti-open internet for all. This must be stopped.

---

**Ticket: # 1245777 - Internet Data Caps by Comcast**

**Date:** 10/7/2016 8:51:50 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Colorado Springs, Colorado 80920

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information.

Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves.

I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legit reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Time Warner (now Spectrum). I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1245511 - Unacceptable ISP data caps and FCC failures to protect the American public and an open internet**

**Date:** 10/7/2016 8:13:49 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Kirkland, Washington 98034

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Unethical price gouging business tactics undermines the benefits of an open and available internet and stymies american innovation.

Major ISPs have been given federal funding to expand and improve America's networks and build out the information superhighway, which never came.

13% of Americans still don't use the internet, and people from households earning less than \$30,000 a year are roughly eight times more likely than the most affluent to not use the internet.

Apart from not investing and building out American infrastructure ISPs have successfully decimated an open market.

The lack of competition in this space has created unfair market conditions where companies can successfully lobby for these unethical types of changes.

Obviously, you the FCC is familiar with lobbying given that your CEO Wheeler, worked as a venture capitalist and lobbyist for the cable and wireless industry, whom the FCC is now responsible for regulating.

How that is ethical or legal is beyond comprehension, because it's neither of those things and is overtly \*\*\*very shady\*\*\*.

Because of your lack of transparency and accountability, we have some of the most expensive, slowest internet in the world compared to most of the modernized countries and this is dramatically slowing the pace of innovation.

These price gouging techniques are frankly, complete bullshit. There is no substantial reasoning for why there are data caps except to gouge American businesses and consumers for something they've already paid for time and again for a service that is not improving.

These data caps serve nothing and nobody except for the pockets of these ISPs while taking complete advantage of the american public and successful technology businesses, all the while impacting our nation detrimentally.

The internet is a public utility that should be widely available without usage restriction.

I can't believe they try to justify charging consumers both for the service and again for the tax payer dollars from government funding, along with charging businesses (e.g. netflix) for something that ISPs incur no actual additional cost for.

Bandwidth ISPs claim is not a problem in one breadth, which they use to justify why they aren't spending money in innovating/expanding our infrastructure, but in the second breathe want to charge me and businesses similar to netflix because it's a "precious commodity". Which is it?

Over the decade from 1994-2004 the major telephone companies profited from higher phone rates paid by all of us, accelerated depreciation on their networks, and direct tax credits an average of \$2,000 per subscriber for which the companies delivered precisely nothing in terms of service to customers. That's \$200 billion with nothing to be shown for it.

You (THE FCC) are supposed to regulate interstate communications by radio, television, wire, satellite, and cable in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. territories.

The FCC is supposed to work towards six goals in the areas of broadband, competition, the spectrum, the media, public safety and homeland security, and \*modernizing itself\*.

Data caps are a threat to broadband proliferation, greatly impacts Americans and American businesses and innovation negatively, and how the FCC allows these unfair business practices for a medium that should widely and freely available (i.e. a public utility), along with allowing these organizations to hide behind a guise for why they aren't actually doing anything to improve our infrastructure and instead are hoarding this money away -- is unacceptable and needs to change.

Things need to change, and these organizations and the FCC should be held accountable.

-(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1245593 - Internet Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/7/2016 8:24:54 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sunbury, Ohio 43074

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information.

Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves.

I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legit reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Time Warner (now Spectrum). I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1245942 - Data Caps are never the way forward. Ever.**

**Date:** 10/7/2016 9:27:46 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Mclean, Virginia 22102

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## Description

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information.

Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves.

I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legitimate reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Verizon . I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

(b) (6)



---

**Ticket: # 1245971 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/7/2016 9:32:55 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Troy, Ohio 45373

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## Description

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information. Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves. I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legit reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Time Warner (now Spectrum). I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1259259 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:25:36 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Chicago, Illinois 60630

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

Inconsistency:

Comcast is offering service to people who DO have a choice in ISP at much lower rates. Area's that have google fiber or similar services get 10 times the bandwidth for the same price. Where as areas that do not have the competition are stuck with standard Comcast pricing. I was told by a Comcast representative that because they raised their data caps to 1TB from 300GB, that they can charge

more for unlimited bandwidth because fewer people will need it (\$35 before the change in caps, \$50 now). Since when does lower demand for a service mean that they should charge more.

---

**Ticket: # 1247208 - Recent Data Caps added to Comcast Internet Services****Date:** 10/8/2016 1:43:55 AM**City/State/Zip:** Spokane, Washington 99204**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast recently added data caps to more states that they service. These data caps give consumers a 1 terabyte limit per month on their internet service. After 1 terabyte is reached a \$10 charge per 50 gigabytes is added to the monthly bill for that month. Once Comcast has infrastructure set up in a region the volume of data has less cost impact than the rate that the data can get to a specific place, similar to water or electricity.

There are a few problems with this, first it sets Comcast up to break net neutrality by allowing them to decide what does and doesn't count against their imposed data cap. They could allow their own services to not charge data, and essentially create a tiered internet service encouraging consumers to use their service instead of a 3rd party service. Technology continues to utilize more bandwidth and data. Where 1 terabyte seemed infinite a few years ago, it has quickly become small when factored against streaming services, big data, and graphics applications. Comcast will essentially decide the fate of new companies that utilize these newer technologies.

Second Comcast doesn't provide a 3rd party non-biased source from which to determine if a customer is going over the data cap. This empowers Comcast to charge unwitting customers more money whether they have gone over their data cap or not. A customer has no non-biased way of determining their data usage. This creates a power dynamic where Comcast has hidden information about the customer that they can then use to extract more money in overage fees. Comcast operates as a broadband monopoly in many regions, and without transparency of data usage, they hold power over the consumer's internet access.

These data caps are bad for consumers, small businesses that operate from home, and for new technology companies. In fact they are only good for Comcast's bottom line.

---

**Ticket: # 1247892 - Comcast data cap**

**Date:** 10/8/2016 11:07:30 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Tacoma, Washington 98407

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast is imposing data caps on internet service at 1TB.

This data cap creates a box that online entertainment services like Netflix would be forced to compete in against Comcast's own entertainment services, such as their XFINITY Stream TV service, which are not subject to the same restrictions. This dangerous precedent will allow Comcast to edge out it's online competitors or force online consumers to pay overage charges in the future as entertainment requires more and more data throughput. It's anticompetitive, anti-consumer, anti-innovation, and I don't think it should be allowed.

Full disclosure that I am not a current Comcast customer, but I have been planning to switch back as they have faster speeds than CenturyLink which allows more efficient 4k streaming. However, this type of data cap limits the capabilities of 4k streaming and is anticompetitive. I would like to see a ban on data caps.

---

**Ticket: # 1247921 - Data caps stifle growth and innovation**

**Date:** 10/8/2016 11:20:04 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Lynbrook, New York 11563

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

With the recent Comcast roll-out of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Full disclosure, I am not a Comcast subscriber, but am submitting a complaint because if they are successful, it is only a matter of time before other ISPs follow suit. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information.

Data caps are not only a massive hindrance to paying customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. Comcast's cap even excludes "Comcast related data" from their cap.

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion:

<https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that gone unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves, or worse yet, manipulate and restrict the distribution of knowledge and education.

I urge you to please consider outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL, or at the very least placing heavy restrictions on the use of data caps. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is any legitimate reason for them to exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Data usage is only going to increase and expand exponentially as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. They do nothing but stifle innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we

ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1247970 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/8/2016 11:45:49 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Auburn, Washington 98002

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

With the recent Comcast rollout of nationwide 1TB data caps I feel it is crucial that I submit my complaint. Data caps are a problem and without swift action will be a much larger issue in the near future limiting not only innovative uses of the Internet but the entire global flow of information.

Data caps are not only an inconvenience to those customers but are simply against net-neutrality at its core. This is nothing more than a money grab and attempt to get people to stick with the dying cable TV model. It even excludes Comcast related data from that cap!!

It unnecessarily impedes emerging video technologies such as 4k streaming while simultaneously punishing those that dare to download large games or files. It's not even rooted in network congestion: <https://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130118/17425221736/cable-industry-finally-admits-that-data-caps-have-nothing-to-do-with-congestion.shtml>

For example: streaming 4k content according to Netflix uses roughly 4.7GB per hour. Doing that math that's ~7 hours PER DAY before hitting said 1TB cap. Multiply that by 2 or 3 other members of a household and you can watch at most a few hours per day. This is assuming you do absolutely NOTHING else with that Internet connection.

The further encroachment of data caps sets a dangerous precedent that unchecked will stifle innovation and let ISPs control the flow of information into households. This is something that needs to be curbed quickly to prevent ISPs restricting the flow of information simply to benefit themselves.

I urge you to please consider restrictions or outright banning of data caps on hardline Internet connections such as cable and DSL. I further ask that you investigate data caps on cell data to determine if there is actually any legit reason they exist. T-Mobile is a great example. They allow very specific traffic to NOT count towards a data cap. This is also against net-neutrality.

Full disclosure: I'm not a Comcast customer, I am with Time Warner (now Spectrum). I do not have a data cap but average right around 2TB per month with what I consider normal usage, at least for the next generation. Data usage is only going to increase and at a rapid pace as new technologies emerge.

I'll say it a second time, please consider a ban on data caps. This is nothing but the stifling of innovation, holding onto an archaic business model, and lining of pockets of ISP executives. What we ACTUALLY need is more innovation, more competition, and a stronger Internet presence as a country.

Signed,



(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1259647 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:04:04 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Jose, California 95148

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

---

**Ticket: # 1261059 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 9:47:12 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Chicago, Illinois 60613

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

A great threat facing innovation for our country today is the monopolized market of internet service providers. The Internet has quickly gone from a luxury to a necessity for everyday life, and even more so for people like me who work from home.

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency: Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit. This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services for work will be hit just as hard especially as the size of applications increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any online conversation regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky

enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

We need to open the free market to other ISP's and increase innovative pursuits for better internet access as the rest of the developed world is starting to leave us behind.

---

**Ticket: # 1256808 - Comcast rolling out data caps in my area**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:13:38 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Hercules, California 94547

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment

---

**Ticket: # 1257303 - Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:48:34 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sunnyvale, California 94085

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Why this is flawed:

1) There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

2) Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

3) Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP. Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.



---

**Ticket: # 1255805 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 11:32:47 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Bluffdale, Utah 84065

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

(Even though I copied this from Reddit, I do fully agree and would articulate these exact same words)

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1255855 - Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that hav**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 11:40:28 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Seattle, Washington 98144

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in

their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1257620 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:12:58 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Yardley, Pennsylvania 19067

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**[Ticket: # 1255956 - Comcast Data Caps](#)**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 11:56:04 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Hayward, California 94541

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast just enabled data caps on my account. There is no transparency with data caps, it stifles competition, and gives me the consumer little choice to this monopoly.

---

**Ticket: # 1255974 - Data Caps On Home Internet Usage**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 11:58:05 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Costa Mesa, California 92627

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but



for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256329 - End data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 12:40:37 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Cameron Park, California 95682

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256362 - Say No to Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 12:41:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19130

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256445 - internet data caps need to be eliminated without having to pay an additional fee**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 12:48:00 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Douglasville, Georgia 30135

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256593 - Uncapped Internet access for innovation in an increasingly data dependent world and user protection.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 12:58:48 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Martinsburg, West Virginia 25403

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256598 - Comcast Data Cap - Houston, TX**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 12:59:10 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Houston, Texas 77057

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but



for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256664 - Don't allow Comcast to use data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:03:24 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Amityville, New York 11701

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC. We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules.

Some users may be currently exempt from data caps but this behavior will absolutely roll down hill to other ISPs once they realize that consumers will accept it. Then you'll have to deal with your own little small town version of Comcast with little recourse.

---

**Ticket: # 1256685 - Comcast Complaint Regarding Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:04:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sacramento, California 95822

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Regarding Data Caps. There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256791 - Uncapped internet access**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:12:22 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Houston, Texas 77005

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Data caps should be abolished. It is a flawed concept.

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256792 - Data caps should not exist.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:12:22 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Malden, Massachusetts 02148

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256760 - Data Cap Policy**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:09:55 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Columbia, South Carolina 29204

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but



for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC. We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules.

Some users may be currently exempt from data caps but this behavior will absolutely roll down hill to other ISPs once they realize that consumers will accept it. Then you'll have to deal with your own little small town version of Comcast with little recourse.

---

**Ticket: # 1256789 - Data Caps and Customer Service**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:12:16 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Columbia, Missouri 65203

**Company Complaining About:** Mediacom

---

## **Description**

Mediacom has numerous times been contacted by me in regards to the inconsistent internet speeds provided by them. Consistently the internet dropping and slow speeds compared to what I am wanting to pay for. They have not augmented a fix for me and I have tested my equipment with Charter Communications and have had no issues. I have no choice in internet provider and what some oversight over all internet companies to provide consistent service like utility companies.

Another complaint would be regarding the data cap. It is ridiculous to put a cap on internet which is becoming a daily necessity for the world. A good overview of why data caps should be allowed to limit customers:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC. We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules.

---

**Ticket: # 1256805 - Comcast Data Cap**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:13:24 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Francisco, California 94109

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is flawed. Their 3rd party's measurement tools are hidden from the world, and as applications use more and more data, it's restrictive.

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency.

It discourages cord cutting and stifles competition.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to.

---

**Ticket: # 1256840 - End to Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:16:21 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Laurel, Maryland 20707

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1256825 - Internet Data Caps****Date:** 10/12/2016 1:15:22 PM**City/State/Zip:** Littleton, Colorado 80123**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Accuracy and Transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent. However that is not the case at all. There is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public. Just in 2015 alone Comcast received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement (1). Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discouraging Competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example, Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this (2). As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes normal, users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. Non-stop streaming takes under a week to reach the 1TB limit or for a family of 5, just 30 hours. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will be happy to provide through cable.

This isn't just for videos of course. People who use clients like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of video games increases. Data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

1. <http://tinyurl.com/ha2x7j4>

2. <http://tinyurl.com/qfdj6vc>

---

**Ticket: # 1256830 - Comcast 1 TB data limit**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:15:49 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Lake Stevens, Washington 98258

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but



for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment

---

**Ticket: # 1256832 - Data Cap (Data usage policy)**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:16:01 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Marietta, Georgia 30066

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

The data usage policy is still an unfair practice. There is no limited amount of data in the world that we can run out of. Limiting it / rationing it is absurd and a practice that only benefits the company using the cap.

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency so companies can abuse this "meter" and most people would not even notice or know how to prove it.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition people that choose to consume digital content rather than cable are being suppressed due to a data cap.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to most users, including me, do not have much of a choice on reliable internet. This is due to regulations and lack of competition.

Please help us get rid of these trust and monopoly practices.

---

**Ticket: # 1256910 - Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:21:04 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

It's not right that Comcast can charge extra for going over data caps. They have already demonstrated a clear lack of concern for the average consumer by charging millions in false fees, and they have displayed a pattern of flouting the federal laws of the United States. They have made an investment into Internet infrastructure, but this investment was heavily subsidized with federal funds. It is time for the FCC to take dominion of this infrastructure to preserve our rights and to uphold federal laws and regulations. Do it without data caps, with a clear objective to protect users' privacy with a special regard to fourth amendment rights, and a clear mission to preserve transparency of control and authorities to alleviate concerns of a conflict of interest between government-controlled Internet and government policies.

---

**Ticket: # 1256966 - Unvalidated and non-open testing of data meters****Date:** 10/12/2016 1:24:19 PM**City/State/Zip:** Muncie, Indiana 47304**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast recently rolled out a 1TB data cap (counting both upload and download) to most of its subscribers in central IN, myself included. The only way to enforce such a cap is with some sort of data meter that constantly monitors the data flow to and from the cable modem. Unlike gasoline pump meters, natural gas meters, or power meters, there is no oversight to ensure that the data meter monitors only a particular customer accurately. Also, unlike the above meters which only measure what you actually use inside your car or house, data meters will measure all attempted TCP or IP retransmissions due to congestion or data loss further down the line. Thus, a nefarious ISP can simply cause increased congestion on their network, with the net result of all clients that must go through that congestion having increased data usage. The end customer is not responsible for causing lost packets or having to retransmit packets, why should they be the one holding the bill? Additionally, there is no clarification that the meters do not also count required data flows to and from the cable modem that are required for it to function. We're simply to trust a company that has just been fined for Cable's version of cramming [ <http://arstechnica.com/business/2016/10/fcc-comcast-charged-customers-for-things-they-never-ordered-must-pay-fine/> ] and has historically been at the bottom of customer service in an industry at the bottom of customer service ratings.

Even a Comcast exec has also stated there are no technical reasons for a data caps [ <http://arstechnica.com/business/2015/08/comcast-vp-300gb-data-cap-is-business-policy-not-technical-necessity/> ].

With wireline service, data caps should be banned as the meters measure things that are outside of the end customer's control, there is a lack of transparency and trust of the meters, and there is no technical reason for implementing it as a network congestion control scheme due to the availability of zero-rating certain provider's content.

---

**Ticket: # 1256948 - Uncapped Internet access, for innovation in an increasingly data dependent world and user protection.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:23:07 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Lowell, Massachusetts 01852

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

[Ticket: # 1256983 - Comcast data caps](#)

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:25:22 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Littleton, Colorado 80127

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast is implementing data caps on my internet usage with no transparency on how they are metering my data. This limits my ability to use a service I pay for to its fullest ability. There is no other option in my area with comparable speed.

---

**Ticket: # 1257029 - Comcast's impending data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:28:59 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Orchard Lake, Michigan 48324

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

To Whom It May Concern,

Recently the United Nations indicated that Internet access is a fundamental human right. We use the Internet every day for research, entertainment, communication, and in some cases, employment.

Comcast has recently started rolling out data caps to our area which restrict what we can and cannot use the Internet for.

According to Netflix, the most popular streaming service in the world and a trusted American company, one high-definition streamed video starts at around 2GB per hour. For our family of three, at a minimum, we're using 128GB of data per month. Say one of our household members is a homemaker, and uses the television sparingly throughout the day. This value could easily escalate to a third, or even half of our bandwidth cap just for visual entertainment.

We may also want to use the Internet to browse Youtube videos, read newspaper articles, and play online games. Video games are 40GB per download, minimum, and possibly more with ongoing updates. With one child in the house, that could easily use another third of our bandwidth.

One of our household members is allowed to work from home some days of the week. Purchasing an exclusive business line at \$120-\$200 per month seems excessive just for the opportunity to save a commute is a massive barrier.

If one of our household members uses the Internet to communicate with loved ones over video chat often, a single terabyte could easily be consumed in a matter of days.

Our ISP, Comcast, is offering, for an additional \$600 per year on our already ridiculous \$1500 per year cost for Internet access, the opportunity to avoid bandwidth caps.

With no guarantee of accuracy or transparency in measuring bandwidth, this is discrimination at its very core. Without reasonable competition in the area (Comcast is the only high-speed Internet in the area offering the speeds it does,) there are no alternatives available. These practices must end.

---

**Ticket: # 1257064 - Comcast data cap**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:31:43 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Lumberon, New Jersey 08048

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I do NOT want a response from Comcast... The purpose of this complaint is to express my utmost displeasure to the FCC in regards to the data cap policy that Comcast is currently implementing on their user plans.

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable, and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed?:

1) There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

2) Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common, using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place. Thus, users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will influence users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services, which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use download services like Steam will be hit just as hard, especially as the size of games increases. Data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

3) Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.



In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs, but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have, which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment, and I strongly feel that this needs to change.

---

**Ticket: # 1257075 - ISP Data Caps (Comcast)****Date:** 10/12/2016 1:32:11 PM**City/State/Zip:** Port Richey, Florida 34668**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity. Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit. There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth. Source: /u/ReadingTheAir

---

**Ticket: # 1257107 - Comcast Data Caps****Date:** 10/12/2016 1:34:23 PM**City/State/Zip:** West Lafayette, Indiana 47906**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast has recently notified me that they will be placing a data cap on my connection. While I do not anticipate being impacted by this cap, I believe that this data cap is unnecessary. If it were not for the lack of competition for internet providers, I would have already terminated my contract with Comcast. However, the lack of competition means I have no alternative but to accept the cap. The cap is not a response to market pressure, but a classic example of a monopoly enterprise leveraging their position.

In addition, the measuring of data usage is poorly regulated and opaque. Without additional regulation or transparency, how can there be any confidence that Comcast is not abusing their position to misreport usage. Without oversight and a competitive alternative to Comcast, my ability to leverage any of my market power is effectively taken away by the actions that Comcast has taken to cut off markets to better alternative providers.

In addition, Comcast data caps are anti-competitive. The cap is designed such that people are less likely to select a streaming service such as Netflix or Amazon Prime. This form of vertical integration and price adjustment to discourage competition should not be allowed and is counter to allowing a market to operate efficiently.

Comcast and its anti-competitive actions are destructive to innovation and are inappropriate. Again, if any legitimate alternative were available I would gladly and quickly switch providers in a heartbeat, but the regulatory structure pursued by Comcast has resulted in a lack of choices for me.

I appreciate you considering my concerns and attempting to fix some of these issues on my behalf.

---

**Ticket: # 1257179 - Comcast data caps.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:39:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Boston, Massachusetts 02215

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC. We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules.

Some users may be currently exempt from data caps but this behavior will absolutely roll down hill to other ISPs once they realize that consumers will accept it. Then you'll have to deal with your own little small town version of Comcast with little recourse.

---

**Ticket: # 1257248 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:44:12 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Wilmington, North Carolina 28409

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I'd like to officially complain about Comcast's data caps rolling out in November. It is absurd that in 2016 we have wired data caps. There is no guardsmen of accuracy or transparency, it discourages competition, and we have little choice of what ISP we must subscribe to. Please eliminate data caps.

---

**Ticket: # 1257344 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:50:54 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Hopewell, Virginia 23860

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.



---

**Ticket: # 1257431 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:57:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Seattle, Washington 98107

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast recently informed me that they will begin implementing a 1GB data cap in my area. Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

This policy is flawed for the following reasons:

1. There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency.

Internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

2. Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition.

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix - which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour - is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course - data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

3. Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to.

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

While some users lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs, for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have, which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a true free market there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only

provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1257401 - Net Neutrality / Comcast's data cap policy**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:55:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Elkridge, Maryland 21075

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data caps are not at all about capitalism and innovation - it is simply a ploy to squeeze more money at no cost to them. It stifles innovation, and they are taking advantage of the fact that a majority of their customers have no other choice for internet access.

If there were more choices for people, I wouldn't mind as much. But there is no competition so they can do whatever they want.

They say 99% of customers do not hit the cap, but that will not be true in the future. Bandwidth usage is constantly increasing due to high quality photos and videos that we constantly produce. On top of that, the measurements are inaccurate and there is no transparency.

Please don't let Comcast kill off net neutrality piece by piece. I implore you.

(b) (6)

Software Engineer / Federal Contractor

---

**Ticket: # 1258690 - Internet data caps are unexceptionable in the U.S.A.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:34:53 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97233

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1257495 - Comcast Xfinity Data Cap / Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:02:03 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Woodbury, Minnesota 55129

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast Xfinity has implemented data caps in my area. This is wrong and unjust for the following reasons:

1. There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency
2. Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition
3. Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to

---

**Ticket: # 1258110 - Comcast Data Caps are unfair to consumers and should NOT be allowed.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:48:14 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Newport, North Carolina 28570

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the

FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC. We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules. Some users may be currently exempt from data caps but this behavior will absolutely roll down hill to other ISPs once they realize that consumers will accept it. Then you'll have to deal with your own little small town version of Comcast with little recourse.



---

[Ticket: # 1257668 - We need to make it clear to the FCC that we want uncapped Internet access, for innovation in an increasingly data dependent world and user protection.](#)

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:16:30 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Miami, Florida 33133

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## Description

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC. We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules.

Some users may be currently exempt from data caps but this behavior will absolutely roll down hill to other ISPs once they realize that consumers will accept it. Then you'll have to deal with your own little small town version of Comcast with little recourse.

Much like the behavior of the last Net Neutrality fight calling the FCC directly has a huge impact.

---

**Ticket: # 1257974 - Internet Utility**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:38:14 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Wilsonville, Oregon 97070

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1257814 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:24:49 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Boulder, Colorado 80301

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast has implemented a data cap for their service. This goes against the notion that the internet should be a free and open service. It will stifle cord-cutting and competition. Accuracy and Transparency of actual data usage can not be verified. And who knows if in the future they make the decision to lower the data cap.

ISP should be dumb carriers, and allow for open and unregulated access to the internet.

---

**Ticket: # 1258342 - Comcast's proposed data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:04:22 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Bridgewater, Massachusetts 02324

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1257884 - Comcast Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:31:17 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Merced, California 95341

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Why is comcast permitted to use data cap policies that are not transparent to the public? I am complaining because it Comcast has been known to limit bandwidth to competitor sites like netflix. The lack if transparency makes it difficult to hold Comcast accountable. Please address the legality of data caps for ISPs. I don't have a time limit for phone use, why should it be any different for data? A lot of data is not even the consumers fault. We have required updates for multiple operating systems, computers and mobile devices. Even smart tvs. Why should that data usage count against. Something that is completely out of our control as consumers.

---

**Ticket: # 1258041 - Data Caps on Modern ISP Services**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:43:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sacramento, California 95842

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Data caps have recently started coming to home internet services, namely Comcast and AT&T, including my own service. There are a great deal of problems with this and I'd like to raise a few in hopes the FCC stops this practice.

### **1) Lack of Accuracy, Transparency, and Accountability**

Comcast and AT&T are both in charge of tracking customer usage. This gives the companies the incentive to have inaccurate measurement systems that promote high, or exaggerated data usage. Not only are the current measurement techniques used wildly inaccurate, but Comcast and AT&T are benefiting from that while the customer is being forced to pay more for something they very possibly didn't use.

### **2) Hampers Competition**

Comcast and AT&T are also television service companies in addition to ISPs. It is no coincidence that they are instilling data caps on customers as more and more people are "cord cutting" and using alternative services to consume media. Comcast and AT&T are hedging their bets to discourage "cord cutting" (since television does not use data that is capped), and inflate the perceived cost of using entirely internet driven media.

Given a 3-5 person household that uses a service like Netflix, watching HD video, it is very easy to go well over the data caps set by Comcast and AT&T, and that doesn't include other services, such as

- \* Updated software (Windows, business grade software, or media editing software that usually several GBs in size)

- \* Purchasing digital goods (example: purchasing a digital game through a service like Steam requires customers to download the game files over the internet. Some are 60+ GBs in size, and will only increase over time as games become more advanced)

Future digital products will continue to grow in size, not shrink. Data is being utilized more and more and resolutions increase, media improves, and people consume more on the internet. Creating data caps now stifles competition because media must fall inline or customers will have to spend more just to consume it, due to these caps. It allows Comcast and AT&T, plus other providers, to dictate the future of the internet, and technology world by forcing consumers to pay more for certain products, and or services.

This is a huge conflict of interest. A media company should not be able to control what media competes with them, and control what type of media is available to customers. Holding high data media, or high consuming customers ransom through data caps is happening already, and will only worsen in the future with data caps.

### **3) Users have very little choice in ISP**

I'm lucky to have 2-3 options in my household, but many in the United States do not have this luxury. A majority of households only have one option when it comes to a provider, giving them a monopoly

in their area. Lack of competition is allowing ill practices like data caps to further limit their customers. If I do not like the idea of data caps, I have no way to "vote with my dollar" and choose another company who does use them. My options are ALL data cap utilizing businesses.

The internet is no longer a luxury. Most people cannot live without it, including me and my work. It is an essential utility for many, just like electricity.

Hampering it as AT&T and Comcast have done, and will continue to do, is wrong. I cannot fight this as a consumer, due to my options in my area, and the lack of competition in the United States.

Data caps are at the peak of this issue.



---

**Ticket: # 1258050 - Comcast and ATT data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:43:35 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Willowick, Ohio 44095

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258105 - Broadband data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:47:56 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97217

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Starting November 1st I will be subject to a 1TB data cap on my internet service. This will affect greatly how I and the people I live with we be able to use our internet service. I currently share housing with two other people and use my personal connection for work related to web development, this work can sometimes require me to download and upload whole disk images ranging anywhere from 2 to 10gb. This data cap will unfairly limit both my roommates ability to enjoy streaming services and my ability to work from home. Unfortunately, since Comcast has a monopoly in my neighborhood on speeds higher than 6 mbps I am forced to subscribe to their service to meet the bandwidth needs of our household. Comcast argues that the data caps are only to ensure the users who use more bandwidth are charged more. Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Comcast has done nothing to upgrade it's service:

With the rise of streaming services and the eventuality of larger files sizes it is obvious that network infrastructure will need to be upgraded. Just like roads need to be repaved and lanes need to be added to accommodate for traffic, network infrastructure requires upgrading and maintenance. Comcast has done nothing to upgrade their network in my area while still raking in record profits, yet alleges that bandwidth is scarce.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP. Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258139 - Comcast Data Cap Policy**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:51:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Grandville, Michigan 49418

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

The data cap policy that Comcast is introducing is a flawed consumer control measure against those who do not want a cable subscription and is a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade. This method has no guarantee of accuracy or transparency, and many Comcast customers will be forced to continue using their service as they have little choice in what ISP they can use in their area.

---

**Ticket: # 1258218 - Data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 2:55:57 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Abingdon, Maryland 21009

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258350 - Data Caps****Date:** 10/12/2016 3:05:03 PM**City/State/Zip:** Jacksonville, Florida 32250**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I am against data caps on internet usage. Like with other monopolies, most people have little choice in an internet provider to choose, as technological innovation continues to develop, data caps will stifle innovation, and internet providers will make it so that you're overcharged as much as possible, with a host of made up fees, just like every other company that has this kind of system in place. Places that have tried similar caps have absolutely no measuring ability to provide accuracy or transparency so no one knows when data caps are being reached, and it is guaranteed to be intentionally manipulated to harm the consumer.

Data caps and open internet is the only way to go.

---

**Ticket: # 1258466 - Internet and mobile data caps are bad for the future of the country**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:14:25 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Sonoma, California 95476

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Data cap policies are a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but



for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258532 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:19:51 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Issaquah, Washington 98027

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

On October 7th I received notice that my Internet Data Usage Plan will now include a data cap of 1TB. I have the following issues with this change to my service:

\* There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency of the metering. There are already multiple articles from Ars Technica regarding Comcast subscribers that have had issues with this and it was extremely difficult to get Comcast to correct the issue:

<http://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2016/09/tales-from-comcasts-data-cap-nation-can-the-meter-be-trusted/>

<http://arstechnica.com/business/2015/12/comcast-admits-data-cap-meter-blunder-charges-wrong-customer-for-overage/>

\* There is no ISP in my area that offers comparable service, so I am not able to vote with my dollar and go elsewhere.

\* Data caps stifle competition by causing services, such as Netflix and Hulu, to count against my data cap driving me to use legacy services, such as traditional cable television.

---

**Ticket: # 1258683 - Capping internet data**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:34:25 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Ferndale, Washington 98248

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

This idea of capping internet data shows no transparency on your end. This is a service by which creates distrust in your consumers. I am one of many who are furious of your proposal to cap internet data. The internet as we have come to love breeds curiosity, learning and entertainment. It is the modern generation library with the access on the fingers. Making data caps only hinders and handcuffs the ability to explore, become educated and promote personal and cultural growth. I strongly recommend and urge that you do not go forward with this important part of our society.

---

**Ticket: # 1258754 - Comcast's new 1TB data cap policy**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:39:48 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Jose, California 95125

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Dear FCC,

As we all know, Comcast is about to change their policy of the data cap to maximum of 1TB per month. Here are a few reasons why this should NOT be an acceptable change.

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in

their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258842 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:46:03 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Blackwood, New Jersey 08012

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258844 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:46:12 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Salt Lake City, Utah 84104

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

ISPs are imposing data caps that will hurt consumers everywhere; there are no upsides for users. Here is a reddit thread detailing exactly why:

[https://www.reddit.com/r/technology/comments/5749a8/we\\_need\\_to\\_make\\_it\\_clear\\_to\\_the\\_fcc\\_that\\_we\\_want/](https://www.reddit.com/r/technology/comments/5749a8/we_need_to_make_it_clear_to_the_fcc_that_we_want/)

The full text of the thread:

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.



Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1259010 - Uncapped Internet Access**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:00:56 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Herndon, Virginia 20170

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1258997 - Data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 3:59:40 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97225

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency. Regardless of anyone's stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement (<https://www.dslreports.com/shownews/The-FCC-Has-Received-13000-Complaints-About-Comcast-Data-Caps-135895>). Almost everyone who has to deal with these caps seem to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth!

Globally, international ISPs do not hinder their consumers to the degree U.S. ISPs do. U.S. consumers do not necessarily want a data cap, and should not be subjected to such a communication hindrance. Please, give us some rights.

Thank you.

---

[Ticket: # 1259041 - Please don't allow isp's to use data caps](#)

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:04:53 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Andover, Minnesota 55304

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Please don't allow isp's to use data caps; the internet usage amounts metered by isp's can be inaccurate without any transparency to the consumer, it discourages cord cutting and stifles online competition.

---

**Ticket: # 1259140 - Data Caps****Date:** 10/12/2016 4:14:03 PM**City/State/Zip:** Denver, Colorado 80231**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I am writing in to make clear that I oppose the recent data caps that Comcast has applied to my (and many others across the nations) account.

First there is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency. Currently there is no third party method for me to audit my data usage. Comcast has no obligation to prove to me or a third party that the readings they are showing are accurate.

Second this negatively affects innovation in the field of internet technologies. In the rapidly evolving environment of "The Internet of Things" more and more devices are going to be transferring and reporting data to the cloud. As a consumer I will now have to be wary of purchasing smart devices like the Philips Hue (smart light bulbs), Samsung Family Hub (smart refrigerator), and the Nest Thermostat (smart thermostat) because they will be using a portion of my artificially limited data available to my home. This will negatively effect the economy and cause the United States to be less innovative in this ever growing field.

Finally, this would be less of an issue if there was competition in the ISP marketplace. I have two options of ISPs at my address Comcast and CenturyLink. Both providers have datacaps and Comcast is the only provider to supply high speed internet over 60 mbps. This gives Comcast a pseudo monopoly on providing high speed internet access in my area, stifling competition.

Again, I oppose data caps in all forms and feel as though they should be illegible. It is the FCCs duty to protect consumers from the predatory actions of large ISPs who know that their customers have nowhere else to go.

---

**Ticket: # 1259062 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:07:28 PM

**City/State/Zip:** New Britain, Connecticut 06053

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

It would diminish my ability to work from home and still be able to indulge in simple pleasures like Netflix or Amazon Prime. In my neighborhood, Comcast is the ONLY option, and yet the fastest Internet they offer is a mere 50 mbps.

It is laughable, and bordering on criminal, that a company that has been consistently rated as the worst in the US for marks like customer service and transparency, should be allowed to get away with applying data caps on a service that EVERY American has come to rely on, whether for business or pleasure.

Make the Internet a utility, and regulate it as such. Don't let Comcast get away with this.

---

**Ticket: # 1259731 - ISP Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:13:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Liberty Lake, Washington 99019

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.



---

**Ticket: # 1259313 - Please Don't Allow Our Internet To Be Capped**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:31:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Provo, Utah 84606

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

A great threat facing innovation for our country today is the monopolized market of internet service providers. The Internet has quickly gone from a luxury to a necessity for everyday life, and even more so for people like me who work from home.

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency: Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit. This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services for work will be hit just as hard especially as the size of applications increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any online conversation regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky

enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

We need to open the free market to other ISP's and increase innovative pursuits for better internet access as the rest of the developed world is starting to leave us behind.

---

## **Ticket: # 1259326 - Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:32:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Houston, Texas 77006

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

### **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1259376 - Data caps stifle innovation**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:37:01 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Oakland, California 94610

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

## **Ticket: # 1260594 - Internet Access Problems due to Comcast Failure to Deliver Essential Configuration Information via DHCP**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 7:33:00 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005-4603

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

### **Description**

I have Comcast cable Internet service at my residence. I have had the service since around June, 2015. The Comcast Internet service requires a "cable modem" to interface between the Comcast cable and a consumer device. I have a consumer router which interacts with the cable modem, obtains necessary configuration information through the modem from Comcast's DHCP servers, and provides access to the Comcast Internet service to other devices ("served devices") on my home network.

When I initially obtained the service, I used a Comcast-provided cable modem for which there was a monthly charge. In July 2016, I purchased a modem ("new modem") for use with the service and returned Comcast's modem. The modem I purchased appears on a list published by Comcast of devices "approved by Comcast to purchase and use". In July, 2016, I installed the new modem, and returned the Comcast-provided modem, both without incident.

At the time I installed the new modem, the new modem was able to operate with Comcast's network, my router was able to communicate through new modem with Comcast's DHCP servers in the manner I expected, and the router and its served devices were able to access the Internet service provided by Comcast. Thereafter, but before 8 October, 2016, there were instances when power was interrupted or the new modem was otherwise reset, and upon resumption of power, again, the new modem was able to operate with Comcast's network, and my router was able to communicate through the modem and obtain the necessary configuration information from Comcast's DHCP servers, such that the router and its served devices were able to access the Internet service provided by Comcast.

On the morning of 8 October 2016, I had occasion to restart both the new modem and the router. Although the new modem appeared to be operating normally, the router initially was unable to obtain the configuration information from Comcast's DHCP servers necessary to enable the router and its served devices to access the Comcast Internet service. Between the date on which the new modem was installed, and the morning of 8 October, 2016, I made no configuration or software changes to the router. Thus, my router, which had been able to interoperate acceptably with the Comcast Internet service through the new modem for several weeks, and through Comcast-provided modems for over a year therebefore, was newly unable to access the Comcast Internet service.

Despite numerous attempts to obtain working service by restarting both the new modem and the router, the service did not work. Through experimentation, I discovered that I was able to access the Comcast Internet service using a device other than the router--an ordinary computer--connected to the new modem. The computer was able to obtain the necessary configuration information via DHCP, and could access the Comcast Internet service. Though further experimentation, I discovered that service through the router could be restored by changing the MAC address of the router's WAN

port, which address I believe is furnished to Comcast's DHCP servers when a request is made for the essential configuration information. I made no other changes to the router's firmware or configuration to obtain this result. To clarify, on the morning of 8 October 2016, the only way I was able to obtain working Comcast Internet service using my router was to change the router's WAN port MAC address to a different address from that which had been in use for, approximately, the last fourteen months.

In numerous telephone calls I sought an explanation for this required change in my equipment from Comcast's representatives. Comcast has not furnished an explanation, despite my initial inquiries, my attempts to escalate my inquiry to supervisory personnel, and delay of several days awaiting a return call that did not actually address the inquiry. The Comcast representatives that were made available to speak to me either:

- (1) have not understood the question;
- (2) have sought to blame the new modem, even though such modem appears on Comcast's list of approved devices; or most recently
- (3) have sought to blame the router, asserting that the router requires "updating", even though the router was able to access the service once a configuration change was implemented thereon.

#### Relief Sought:

I seek an explanation from Comcast as to why its DHCP servers did not furnish to my router the configuration information necessary to access the Comcast Internet service when requested on 8 October 2016.

If Comcast has made a change in its network that requires configuration changes in customer equipment (for example, if Comcast has implemented restrictions involving the MAC address that shall be furnished in a DHCP request or its correspondence with any other MAC address that may be exhibited by equipment involved in accessing the service), I further seek disclosure of such required changes or restrictions.

If Comcast rejected or embargoed my router or its original MAC address, whether temporarily or permanently, I further seek explanation of the reasons for any such action. If Comcast believes that behavior of my equipment caused or triggered the rejection the DHCP requests at issue, I further seek such disclosure as may be necessary to avoid repeating such behavior.



---

**Ticket: # 1259495 - Comcast data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:46:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97201

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I am a Comcast internet customer and I am deeply troubled by Comcast's rolling out of a 1 TB data cap. There are a number of issues with a private company imposing a data cap, including no promise of transparency/accuracy and discouraging cord cutting. The imposition of a cap is a slippery slope to even further restrictions on internet use.

---

[Ticket: # 1259533 - Comcast's data cap policy](#)

**Date:** 10/12/2016 4:50:12 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Pueblo, Colorado 81006

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## Description

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

1. There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency
2. Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition
3. Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to

---

**Ticket: # 1259664 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:06:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Jose, California 95148

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

---

**Ticket: # 1259630 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:02:08 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Jose, California 95148

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

---

**Ticket: # 1259654 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:05:08 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Jose, California 95148

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.



---

**Ticket: # 1259950 - Internet Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:40:57 PM

**City/State/Zip:** High Point, North Carolina 27265

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1259978 - Comcast Data Caps****Date:** 10/12/2016 5:44:35 PM**City/State/Zip:** Bloomington, Indiana 47404**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Hello, I'm submitting this complaint about the data caps going into effect on my Comcast account on November 1st. Data caps are so outrageously against net neutrality that it pains me, being in a tech field and to see how behind the US is in terms of internet connectivity to the rest of the world. How is it ok that Comcast in my area can limit people's accounts out of nowhere, charge the same (which the low income area of Bloomington can barely afford as is), and still not actively work on improving their network? Why is it that there is no way to contact anyone at Comcast that has any involvement in this unless the FCC is forced to do so in place of me?

There's no transparency or government intervention in measuring how much data is being used. Comcast claims that I'm only using 500gb per month, but just like how my Comcast bill spiked randomly for no visible reason in the past and I had to file an FCC complaint just so they'd pick up the phone about it, I fear that I will wrongfully be told that I went over the cap and just be at the will of Comcast and have to pay up for something I did not do. I imagine that there's many, many similar complaints being filed now after they announced how many more people will be subject to such caps. If a company is so untrustworthy, can't something real be done? When is the time to step in? I'm not looking to get some small reduction in my monthly bill from sending this, I'm hoping that our country can start catching up to the rest of the world, instead of being at the will of greedy companies like Comcast who have had no reason at all to improve themselves because they haven't faced any consequences that they deserve.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

---

**Ticket: # 1259979 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:44:43 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Allston, Massachusetts 02134

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

In our modern day, the internet no longer exists as a product of simple personal benefit. It is not an item purchased out of a desire for grandeur or luxury. The internet has evolved into an essential utility in order to function on a basic level in current society, as are water and electricity. The issuance of data caps on internet data restricts innovation and advancement while perpetuating monopolistic tendencies of large corporations. Furthermore, a current lack of transparency in reporting and metering practices creates an unfair market and hurts consumers unaware of the resulting inaccurate charges.

---

**Ticket: # 1260025 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:52:14 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Salem, Oregon 97304

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1260026 - comcast expanding their data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:52:26 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Middletown, Connecticut 06457

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I have recently learned that Comcast is expanding it's data caps. Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Furthermore, I find it unreasonable that a company try and "ration" something such as bits of data that flow freely through an infrastructure that customers already pay for through their monthly premium. Data caps hurt the consumer's ability to choose additional services that require high bandwidth, such as media streaming, game downloading, and more. It hurts our economy as a whole as people give up services that they would otherwise pay for. Internet, unlike utilities such as water or electricity, do not have a higher cost associated with higher usage once an infrastructure is in place. We are faced with a product which breaks the traditional supply-and-demand model because supply becomes truly infinite.

This needs to stop.

---

**Ticket: # 1260047 - Internet Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 5:54:39 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Issaquah, Washington 98027

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

I implore you to ban internet data caps and keep the internet open and fair.



---

**Ticket: # 1260377 - Data cap issue**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 6:48:58 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Alameda, California 94501

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast data cap issues lack transparency on my monthly usage and will effect my day to day life as well as the services I choose to use. These caps are after the fact of the subscription plan I signed up for and data needs will continue to grow in the future

---

**Ticket: # 1260182 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 6:16:02 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97217

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

In less than a month Comcast will be rolling out 1TB data caps to all their customers.

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly. Essentially they are trying to bypass the net neutrality issue to achieve the same result for their business, and this is not acceptable. By exploiting a loophole in the letter of the law they are avoiding its spirit.

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use.

In our society, internet use has become mandatory. From dealing with school, work, or personal relations, all essential aspects of our daily life have been integrated with the internet in a way that makes them impossible to separate. In a perfect world, there would be several different ISPs to choose from, creating a healthy and competitive market. In reality, the best case scenario is you have two options to choose from but the most common case is that you only have one ISP who offers service in your region. I am writing to you because the tyranny of a monopoly must be prohibited. It is the FCC's duty to protect the common people. I hope that many others just like me are sending you messages and complaints so you can understand just how important this issues truly is.

One further point I would like to make is that Comcast measures the data usage through a third party who doesn't make their methods of measuring available to the public. How do we know that they are truly providing us with accurate information when there is no transparency? I urge the FCC to put a stop to Comcast's shady business practices.

---

**Ticket: # 1260370 - I want UNCAPPED internet access.**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 6:47:41 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Anacortes, Washington 98221

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

<https://www.dslreports.com/shownews/The-FCC-Has-Received-13000-Complaints-About-Comcast-Data-Caps-135895>

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

<https://help.netflix.com/en/node/87>

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1260441 - ISP data caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 7:02:30 PM

**City/State/Zip:** San Francisco, California 94103

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1260488 - Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 7:11:43 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Alameda, California 94501

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Data caps stifle competition by increasing the costs to use internet services for everyday Americans. Netflix and other internet entertainment services are a threat to Comcast's traditional cable revenue. Comcast is creating restrictive data caps to deter it's customers from using services like Netflix. Other services like online gaming are being negatively affected by these caps.

Comcast bandwidth metering is inaccurate. The metered amount does not reflect my real world use. On occasions when I am out of the area and the modem is unplugged it will still show use. In other situations it will show very little use while the line is actively being used. There is no transparency regarding how overages are decided, or how the bandwidth is metered.

---

**Ticket: # 1260537 - Data Caps on Internet Access**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 7:21:21 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Marysville, California 95901

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.



---

**Ticket: # 1260772 - Comcast is rolling out data caps to consumers on a wider basis come Nov. 1st. Please step in and stop this!**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 8:18:51 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97233

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast has decided to arbitrarily roll out data caps of 1TB to all its consumers on Nov 1st 2016. This makes me very angry for a number of reasons.

First of all, there is no limitation of resources. Just because someone uses over 1TB of data, they aren't taking away any data from other consumers. Data is not a precious resource like food, or petroleum, or anything else that can be quantified as a physical object. So I can't be using "more than my fair share". I'm paying for the access, so I should be able to access that data during my time I have paid. But now, I'm scared since I am a tech saavy person, that if I don't watch my data amount used like a hawk, I'm going to get slapped with ridiculous overage fees which do not go back into improving the network, simply into the pockets of Comcast so they can line them even further.

Second, who is tracking this data, how is it tracked, and how is it quantifiable? There is no transparency here. We don't know the algorithms. We don't know who is tracking it (is it comcast directly, or through a third party they hire? Who is that third party?). And if I am say, out of town for 2 weeks, and come back to my network infrastructure being compromised or hacked, and my usage has skyrocketed, who do I talk with about that? How can I contest my usage? The media has to use at least 2 sources to prove something, and I'm supposed to take the less than trustworthy Comcast's word that their third party (again, whomever that may be, we don't know) is not inflating numbers or has "misread the meter"?

Thirdly, this stifles competition. Comcast won't come out and say it, but YOU KNOW the reason why they are instituting these data caps: Netflix. Hulu. CBS On Demand. Crackle. ANY movie or tv show streaming service that isn't owned by Comcast. They feel like those other business are drawing consumers away from the TV and On Demand packages that they can charge for, so instead of being competitive with pricing or offering better services, they simply cut people off from the competition. If that wasn't doing an end run around the Net Neutrality rules, I don't know what is.

Lastly, because Comcast has the monopoly on the internet at fast speeds in my area (and in MANY other areas), we don't have a way to voice our complaints by leaving. We're told, "Sure go to someone else", only to find that Comcast has pushed out any other business that want to compete, so you have to use them. Oh, and Comcast owns all the copper lines. The internet needs to become a utility. It is no longer a luxury for people that can afford it: it has become ingrained into our everyday lives.

These, and also other factors which I'm sure I'm neglecting to mention, are the reason why these enforced data caps are bordering on criminal. Isn't it the evil megalomaniac in Hollywood films that buys up all the resources, then inflates the price to astronomical levels, simply because they can? Heck, we all know that there are people like that in real life: just look at Martin Shkreli.

Comcast is the Martin Shkreli of Internet Service Providers.

Tom Wheeler has already smacked down a bunch of Comcast's more draconian attempts at sticking it to the consumer. Please continue to do the same and **MAKE THEM STOP**.

Thank You.

---

**Ticket: # 1261048 - Data Caps****Date:** 10/12/2016 9:43:51 PM**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97210**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

The implementation of data caps from Comcast on my service is completely unfounded in terms of business justification and an undue burden on an essential service. There is a complete lack of transparency, it creates a decrease in competition in an already severely lacking market, and provides no benefit to the consumer or company overall, apart from cheap tactics for price gouging. I currently have no other options for a reasonable cable internet and TV package other than through this monopoly.

---

**Ticket: # 1261635 - Data Caps****Date:** 10/13/2016 7:37:48 AM**City/State/Zip:** East Hampton, Connecticut 06424**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

I urge the FCC to stand with Internet users and pass strong, loophole-free rules against so called Data Caps. There is no legitimate, technical reason for these data caps. Comcast itself admitted in internal customer service guidelines that these caps aren't about network congestion. Instead, it claims these data caps are about "fairness," but the broadband industry continues to see higher revenues and profits with lower costs overall and there's no argument that these caps are based on any "fair" costs that Internet usage causes. The real reason behind these caps is to protect Comcast's monopoly over cable TV, making it more expensive for customers to "cut the cord" even if they want to choose other video options. And by exempting only its own online video application from the cap, Comcast gives Stream TV an advantage over all competing online video applications.

---

**Ticket: # 1261710 - Comcast's Data caps**

**Date:** 10/13/2016 8:49:01 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Montgomery, New York 12549

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1262654 - Comcast data caps**

**Date:** 10/13/2016 2:51:45 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Littleton, Colorado 80128

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

With the pace of technology, the data caps that Comcast is rolling out to more and more geographic areas, will only serve to line their pockets. I understand that they are a business but these actions will only stifle innovation that the telecoms should have done when they received government funding years ago.

I've personally reaped massive benefits from all of the information available, from legal sites at that, that I can't imagine that as far as we've come to only be at the mercy of those companies that want to slow our country down.

Not to mention where the US measures against other countries in regards to connectivity. Why do we consider ourselves an innovative country but handicap our ability to use those innovations?

In the sense of full disclosure, I have no issue with Comcast's service. When it works, it works great, but their business practices and associated lobbyists shouldn't set precedence for our country.

---

**Ticket: # 1267127 - Comcast's new data caps**

**Date:** 10/14/2016 5:01:39 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Fort Collins, Colorado 80525

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.



---

**Ticket: # 1267564 - Frivolous anti-consumer charges**

**Date:** 10/14/2016 6:11:49 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast recently enacted a 1TB data cap, rolling out on November 1st. Comcast is, in many areas, the only choice for many consumers and by setting data caps they are locking consumers into either paying overage fees or living without internet in a world that is increasingly reliant on internet. Also, Comcast refuses to upgrade its infrastructure in many areas, putting the United States as a whole behind many other countries in terms of broadband availability and cost to consumers. In today's world, the internet isn't a toy or a silly timewaster, but an ever so important tool that people use from school to work and well into old age.

The new charges are not adding any value, but rather restricting the same service that consumers pay for. Comcast has not made any efforts towards transparency as to how they will be allocating the new funds from these data caps. They are not required to, but simply instating a new cap with a fee does not bode well for the consumer.

---

**Ticket: # 1269108 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/15/2016 11:23:17 AM

**City/State/Zip:** San Leandro, California 94579

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast is enforcing a 1TB data cap starting Nov. 1, 2016 in my area. America is significantly behind most 1st world and some 3rd world countries when it comes to internet speeds. It is unacceptable for internet service providers to so behind in this regard. Data caps will only perpetuate the current situation and only preserve the current monopoly they have.

We need to open the free market to other ISP's and increase innovative pursuits for better internet access as the rest of the developed world is starting to leave us behind.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency: Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit. This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services for work will be hit just as hard especially as the size of applications increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

---

**Ticket: # 1273039 - Comcast Data Caps****Date:** 10/18/2016 2:58:31 AM**City/State/Zip:** Seattle, Washington 98122**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I'm writing FCC Chairman Wheeler to urge him to stand with Internet users and pass strong, loophole-free rules against so called Data Caps. There is no legitimate, technical reason for these data caps. Comcast itself admitted in internal customer service guidelines that these caps aren't about network congestion. Instead, it claims these data caps are about "fairness," but the broadband industry continues to see higher revenues and profits with lower costs overall and there's no argument that these caps are based on any "fair" costs that Internet usage causes. The real reason behind these caps is to protect Comcast's monopoly over cable TV, making it more expensive for customers to "cut the cord" even if they want to choose other video options. And by exempting only its own online video application from the cap, Comcast gives Stream TV an advantage over all competing online video applications.

Comcast also has a vertical monopoly, owning both their own content and the means to distribute it. Comcast then has reason to apply different data usage for their own content vs someone's content they don't own. There is no guarantee to any kind of accuracy or transparency other than what Comcast provides to its customers (which is a HUGE conflict of interest). In my household my options are Comcast or Century Link, and do to the work I do, Century Link is just too slow to meet my business needs. This means that Comcast has a monopoly over my cable as well for me to do business. This is not right, and as a consumer, I should have more options to choose from, to create competition and keep the market fair and balanced. Please Chairman Wheeler, fix this.

---

**Ticket: # 1275285 - Internet data caps**

**Date:** 10/18/2016 11:11:36 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Houston, Texas 77043

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

A great threat facing innovation for our country today is the monopolized market of internet service providers. The Internet has quickly gone from a luxury to a necessity for everyday life, and even more so for people like me who work from home.

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency: Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit. This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services for work will be hit just as hard especially as the size of applications increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any online conversation regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

We need to open the free market to other ISP's and increase innovative pursuits for better internet access as the rest of the developed world is starting to leave us behind.

---

**Ticket: # 1275444 - Data Cap Usage Implamentation**

**Date:** 10/19/2016 5:20:15 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97222

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Whatever or not you believe data caps are fair, there can be no argument that the meters used to measure usage should be accurate and transparent -- only they're not. For all that Comcast CEO Brian Roberts likes to claim that broadband data is exactly like electricity, and customers who use more should pay more, the company has fought tooth and nail against being regulated like a utility. There is no agency akin to FERC regulating broadband metering devices.

Unsurprisingly, there are abundant reports of ISPs charging consumers for usage while they aren't home, while their modems are disconnected or the power is out. According to DSLReports, the FCC has received 13,000 complaints about Comcast's data caps this year, many of them claiming the company's meters don't match users' own router statistics.

Ars Technica this month recounted in exhaustive detail the experiences of four Comcast customers in different parts of the country who were walloped with exorbitant overage fees -- more than \$1,500 in one case -- for broadband they insist they couldn't possibly have consumed.

Comcast's response in all cases (surprise!) was to tell customers the meters were accurate and should not be questioned. "We know that our meter is right ... with our meter, we give you a guarantee that it is perfect," a Comcast customer service rep insisted to a subscriber who disputed data charges. Who says the customer is always right?

Comcast is so confident about the accuracy of its meters because NetForecast, the firm that Comcast pays to conduct periodic assessments of its usage meters, conducted measurements in 55 homes last year -- an infinitesimal fraction of Comcast's 23.8 million broadband customers -- and found that Comcast met its goal of 99 percent accuracy.

Tech-savvy customers often turn to third-party firmware like DD-WRT to measure their usage. One subscriber has used free Tomato firmware to measure his Comcast data usage since mid-2013 and found repeated discrepancies -- with Comcast's data meter frequently producing readings at least 10 percent higher than his own readings -- and on occasion as much as 52 percent higher. At other times Comcast's readings were lower than his own or nearly identical. The company never gave any official word on what could have caused the differences.

In no case of disputed overage charges would the company provide proof the data was consumed or say what websites it was used on or by what method it was measured. "If Comcast, the nation's largest internet provider, can't determine what's pushing its subscribers over their data caps, why should customers be expected to figure it out on their own?" Ars asked.

This is not a new problem -- it's been going on for years. ISPs have an obligation under the Open Internet Transparency Rule to disclose accurate information about the performance and cost of their

services. If they are unable to provide that, there's a simple solution to usage meter problems: Abolish caps.

They exist solely to price gouge users

The accuracy of usage meters is only part of the problem with data caps. Fact is, caps on home broadband use aren't necessary in the first place. Data caps are the result of ISPs taking full advantage of a lack of competition in the broadband market to gouge consumers.

Back in 2012, a law was submitted in the Senate that would have restricted ISPs' use of data caps solely to addressing network congestion. The Data Cap Integrity Act came in response to a study from nonprofit group The New America Foundation, which concluded that data caps on broadband usage serve only to bilk customers and stifle online innovation, rather than ensuring that internet data travels the network lines unfettered.

Comcast admitted to the FCC in a disclosure document that data caps "do not address the issue of network congestion, which results from traffic levels that vary from minute to minute." A Comcast exec admitted caps are a "business policy" rather than a technical necessity.

Instead, Comcast likes to claim, data caps are about "fairness," to ensure that customers who use more pay more. But a study from the National Bureau of Economic Research found that people on unlimited data plans effectively pay less per gigabyte of data compared to those on metered plans -- about \$1.68 versus \$3.02, respectively, or a difference of nearly 80 percent. And you don't see Comcast offering to reimburse the difference to customers who consume less than their data allowance each month. Where's the fairness in that?

"Supporters of internet data caps want to have things both ways: admitting that the monthly usage limits have nothing to do with congestion, while simultaneously arguing that those who use the most should pay more (but not that those who use the least should get any discount)," Consumerist writes.

Americans already pay some of the highest broadband rates in the world. Increasingly, ISPs are gauging subscribers with overage fees on top -- or urging customers to sign up for an unlimited data plan, which in Comcast's case adds a whopping \$50 more per month.

A Pew Research Center study found that adoption of home broadband has plateaued at 67 percent of Americans, down slightly from 70 percent in 2013. The monthly cost of service is cited by non-adopters as the most important reason for not having home broadband, even though not having service is seen by two-thirds of Americans as a major disadvantage to finding a job, getting health information, or accessing other key information.

Comcast's profit margins on high-speed Internet exceed 90 percent, and Time Warner Cable's broadband margins were 97 percent in 2013, CIO reports. Comcast posted its strongest earnings in years, racking up a \$2.13 billion profit on revenue of \$18.8 billion in the first quarter. The company's expanding use of data caps will ensure that revenue stream continues to grow.

Discourage cord cutting and limit innovation

As I wrote last week, "cable providers are pulling out the stops to make [cord cutting] an expensive proposition. Broadband data caps have become streaming's Achilles' heel."

A study from The New America Foundation found that data caps undermine competition by discouraging consumers from turning to services like Netflix, Hulu, and Crackle. Another point of contention: The streaming services offered by ISPs like Cox and Comcast are exempt from their data caps, while streaming from rivals like Netflix and YouTube is not.

Research from the National Bureau of Economic Research shows home broadband data caps have a dramatic effect on consumer behavior. "We see people pull back substantially when the possibility of overages comes up," Jonathan Williams, co-author of the paper and an assistant professor of economics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, told the Washington Post.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has raised concerns that usage-based pricing could cause consumers to limit their use of data-heavy content and applications. Limiting heavy users could in turn "limit innovation and development of data-heavy applications," the GAO warned.

The New America Foundation report concurred: "The future [of the internet] is not just about streaming movies or TV shows, but also access to online education or telehealth services that are just starting to take off. Capping their future may mean capping the nation's future as well."

No market recourse for broadband users

The root cause for data caps -- apart from greed -- is that the U.S. broadband market is growing ever less competitive. Last year the Justice Department noted that 70 percent of U.S. homes have access to only one or no provider that offers 25Mbps speeds -- the standard definition of broadband. Thanks to industry-backed/written state laws banning competition from municipal broadband, that situation is unlikely to improve any time soon.

Participants in the GAO focus group on home broadba

---

**Ticket: # 1277751 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/20/2016 3:09:42 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Denver, Colorado 80224

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed anti-consumer measure that's a blatant anti-competitive measure against competitor services such as Netflix and Hulu.

Why this is flawed:

1.) There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency, I may be charged extra for a service based on a metering method that's contracted out to a third party with no grantee of transparency or accuracy. Unlike electricity which has a third party government agency monitoring the measuring methods Comcast has no such restriction.

2.) Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:  
In a market with proper competition I could simply go to a competitor who does not employ such a draconian policy, unfortunately even in a major city all competitors besides Comcast don't even meet the legal definition for broadband. My livelihood rests on a modern connection so I have no choice but to go through Comcast, it's functionally a monopoly.

3.) Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

This is a direct anti competitive measure against companies that compete directly with Comcast in the entertainment business. This measure is essentially a streaming tax with no extra services rendered with a shaky justification that crumbles under the barest of scrutiny for those that "cut the cord" and have only an internet connection in their homes.

If the FCC prevented Charter and Time Warner from imposing data caps as a prerequisite to their merger why does Comcast get a free pass in this matter?  
I urge the FCC to take measures against this practice.



---

**Ticket: # 1278314 - Comcast implements unfair 1tb threshold.**

**Date:** 10/20/2016 12:19:56 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Willard, Utah 84340

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 750413 - T-Mobile no throttling violation**

**Date:** 1/12/2016 4:11:46 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Westland, Michigan 48185

**Company Complaining About:** T Mobile

---

## **Description**

Beginning on November 10th, T-Mobile began throttling all video content to 1.5meg coming across their network under their Binge On initiative. This was not by consumer choice as it was activated on all accounts and one must opt out.

Additionally they have been evasive on answers concerning this throttling (Not mentioning it affected non partner video, making incorrect systems about being capable of throttling YouTube videos, false claims of optimization), thus possibly violating the transparency portion of the open internet rules.

---

**Ticket: # 756607 - Internet Data Caps****Date:** 1/15/2016 4:02:21 PM**City/State/Zip:** Boise, Idaho 83703**Company Complaining About:** Cable One

---

**Description**

A few months ago, I signed up for an internet promotion through Cable One. The promotion offered 100 MBPS download speed for \$35/mo. for the first 3 mo. then the price increases to approx. \$55/mo. I have started getting notifications (one of which I have never received) from them stating that I have been exceeding my 300 MBPS data cap allowed per month. I don't have tv services through them and only use the internet to stream movies from such sources as Netflix, etc. I was never informed of data caps for the internet! Cable One has indicated that if my usage, which isn't extreme being that I am the the only one using the internet doesn't decrease to within the 300 MBPS it will either be canceled or bumped into a higher, more expensive plan. I signed up with a plan I can afford and had I known there was a data cap, I would not have signed up. I feel their promotions are very misleading and lack transparency. I have never received the 100MBPS speed when I have checked. It should be more clearly stated that this is a speed that it CAN go up to but most times, it will not. The internet should not have caps!! It is merely a sneaky way for these companies to be able to charge more to those of us who don't want traditional cable/satellite tv services due to their extreme expense! Additionally, too many of these giant corporations are buying out their competitors so we the consumers have less choices and are forced into their ridiculous rates and plans. There needs to be more oversight over these companies!!

---

**Ticket: # 773762 - Fraud and deceptive trade practices by AT&T Bandwidth stolen by AT&T and resold**

**Date:** 1/26/2016 12:56:27 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Houston, Texas 77077

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

AT&T has lied to the FCC regarding complaints on file number 694443 and various other complaints cited in file number 694443.

We believe that AT&T is retaliating against us by manipulating our bill and charging us excessive amounts for services that we did not want, or purchase because of our various contacts with the FCC regarding violations.

First, AT&T claims that there was no issue with the signal coming to our address. This is correct because the issue is not with the signal, it is because AT&T chose to classify our service in their configuration files as a much weaker internet service than advertised. The promised up to speeds were impossible because the configuration cap was set below those speed deliberately and by design.

AT&T also chose to upgrade the leased modem stating that the modem that they originally supplied could not handle the speed promised at the time of sale. To clarify the despotic anti-consumer culture that has developed at AT&T we can look at their own statement in paragraph three of their response where they state: "AT&T dispatched a technician to replace the equipment as a courtesy." We would like to know: Since when is it a courtesy for the customer to receive a promised service that they are paying for?

AT&T further refused to address our findings of undisclosed bandwidth manipulation, and test results by a qualified professional that were provided to their technicians proving that they were deliberately artificially altering and lowering the quality of service their customers receive when connecting to certain services on the internet. We believe that this is deceptive trade and fraudulent as it is not disclosed to their customers.

As for the retaliation, we are now being charged nearly 130 dollars per month on a service contract that was supposed to be about 60 dollars a month. We have not requested any additional services, yet our bundled DirectTV service now has extra channels we never wanted and the price of the internet has become excessively high.

From our experience and after speaking to the technicians, we believe that this is occurring with millions of other customers, and AT&T's executives have turned a blind eye to this and deliberately set up a system of customer service where the representatives have limited knowledge. They use this simply to be able to claim ignorance when questioned regarding fraud.

If you calculate the amount of missing bandwidth from the average uneducated AT&T subscriber to be consistent with our calculated loss at AT&T's tech claim. Then you can see that the bandwidth that

belongs to the average, 2.5 customers that they are not receiving is stolen from them by AT&T and resold to another customer who is then paying for the stolen bandwidth. If the FCC would research this, I am sure they would find millions, possibly billions of dollars made from stolen bandwidth.

This behavior is not dissimilar to what caused them to be sued for 100 Million dollars for throttling cell phone data without disclosure and violating contracts.

All phone conversations with AT&T reps are available in high quality audio MP3 format for your review if required.

---

[Ticket: # 790838 - Re: \[FCC Complaints\] Re: Verizon wireless](#)

**Date:** 2/3/2016 10:11:30 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Eugene, Oregon 97402

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon Wireless

---

## **Description**

This is a follow-up to your previous request #690732 "Verizon wireless"

Please send information on formal complaints. Verizon is not complying, they claim to be sending letters that do not arrive. Also they are not responding to mail inquiries.

They want to arbitrate according to the bbb but this would mean confidentiality from public disclosure.

---

**Ticket: # 823486 - Violation of net neutrality and violation of terms of service**

**Date:** 2/20/2016 6:04:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Derby, Kansas 67037

**Company Complaining About:** T Mobile

---

## **Description**

T-Mobile, without information or consent, began throttling streaming video on or about November 15, 2015. This was done without consent or disclosure. When contacted, customer service denied changes were made without consent, but could not provide any instance of consent.

The discriminatory throttling is done through some packet inspection that detects HTML5 video and done to coerce content providers into agreeing to participate in anti-consumer agreements.

My entire bandwidth appeared limited during throttling with speeds markedly reduced.



---

**Ticket: # 883941 - Violation of Open Internet 2010 Transparency - Deceptive Trade Practice**

**Date:** 3/29/2016 6:14:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Princeton, Texas 75407

**Company Complaining About:** Rise Broadband - A.k.a - Skybeam

---

**Description**

Rise Broadband, a.k.a - SkyBeam is not fully disclosing the cost of "Just Internet" rates on their website. \*\*see attached screen shots.

The promotional rates and extra fees that are cited only appear to apply to someone that elects a Rise Broadband Active Phone Plan, not the "Just Internet", "Non-bundled pricing". I believe this is deceptive in that there is a mandatory monthly fee of \$ 7.50 they now impose for a radio you must source from them that is not included as well as a fee they impose using terminology and placement that misleads one to believe it could be a government based charge, called "carrier recovery fee". On my bill that is an additional \$2.27 per month. Together these two non-advertised charges add 15% to my bill, and not only my bill, but the bill for over 200,000 other subscribers every month. I calculate this at \$22.8 Million of revenue per year increase.

I believe that this lack of transparency in the case of the additional charge for the radio, and the misleading term and placement of the "carrier recovery fee" is a violation of the 2010 Open Internet Rules, this under Part 8 of Title 47, section 8.3 which reads:

§ 8.3 Transparency.

A person engaged in the provision of broadband Internet access service shall publicly disclose accurate information regarding the network management practices, performance, and commercial terms of its broadband Internet access services sufficient for consumers to make informed choices regarding use of such services and for content, application, service, and device providers to develop, market, and maintain Internet offerings.

In addition this company has perpetrated this on the public while being funded by the FCC program called the Rural Broadband Experiment in the approximate amount of \$16.9 Million in the last year.

I have approached and tried to reason with this organization in the last month. They are not interested in updating their advertised price to include all the charges they know must be on the bill to reflect the true cost of service.

I am asking for your review and possible intervention to correct their advertising and billing practice, and financially punitive measures if appropriate.

Best Regards,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 898270 - Internet Data Charges**

**Date:** 4/6/2016 4:00:58 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Gainesville, Florida 32608

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

AT&T just sent notice that they were unilaterally adding data charges to my contract that was signed in August 2015 and runs through August 2016. No usage limits or overage charges were disclosed, either on their website advertising materials or in fine print disclosures, prior to me electronically accepting the contract and them taking my first payment.

The low caps proposed are also unreasonably low given modern Internet usage, the fact that AT&T incurs virtually no additional cost for increased usage, and the fact that they are not narrowly tailored to address a specific congestion issue.

The email also stated that I could avoid these charges by using their own TV service. AT&T offers no TV service to my apartment complex (satellite dishes are not allowed). This move appears directly intended to get customers to switch from other streaming TV providers (such as Hulu, Netflix, Playstation Vue, and SlingTV) to AT&T's own streaming TV service announced to launch this summer.

Additionally, AT&T has been adding a charge purporting to be a sales tax to my bill despite the fact that no additional taxes and fees beyond the service charges were disclosed prior to my signing the contract and them taking my credit card information. The State of Florida does not tax Internet services.

---

**Ticket: # 931159 - CIPA**

**Date:** 4/25/2016 11:40:24 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Fort Worth, Texas 76244

---

## **Description**

Dear whatever bot is reading this,

I'm a 17 year old high school student doing a project that requires a resume template. I've been on 3 sites, all of which are blocked on the grounds of "video". I'm not sure exactly how "video" is bad, but it is hindering my so-called 'learning-experience'. I read through a lot of the CIPA policy, and have come to the conclusion that "video", especially ones regarding resumes, is not inappropriate or unsafe, does not involve unauthorized disclosure or information, and has absolutely nothing to do with any illegal activities. If you could find it in your cold, calloused, world-weary hearts to lift this ban, I'm sure several students would benefit greatly. Just remember that in your bizarre, logic-defying conquest to protect us, you are, in fact, hurting us and our education.

With the utmost contempt,  
Annoyed Student #302

---

**Ticket: # 953384 - XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 5/5/2016 3:19:17 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Long Beach, California 90803

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

## **Description**

Last year the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out. But now the same cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

Verizon is breaking the rules, and the FCC should put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should not be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an open, public process to decide where and how to enforce these rules.

The Open Internet rules say that ISPs can't charge websites and apps to be in the fast lane, so Verizon created another toll: they're charging websites and apps to be exempted from customers' data caps. Data shows that users find zero-rated content more attractive than content that counts against their caps. Thus, if web companies want to compete with those who pay, , they'll need to enroll - for a fee - in Verizon's sponsored data program. This creates a new toll for data traveling on the Internet and racks up charges for websites, applications, and content providers. Startups, small companies, and non-commercial speakers may face huge barriers if they can't afford to pay new tolls and no longer have their fair shot at reaching people online. That's not the kind of Internet I want to have.

These programs also create perverse incentives for Verizon to keep data caps low: The lower the caps, the more pressure on websites to pay up. Thus, these programs ultimately hurt Internet users like me who have less data to use on the apps they really want to use.

Finally, these plans distort my ability to use the applications of my choice by pushing me and other Internet users toward sites with deep pockets and away from those who can't afford the toll or don't want to pay it. They effectively punish me for using sites that don't pay the toll and unfairly raise the costs of the services that pay Verizon to be zero-rated (who then must pass that cost onto me).

As an Verizon customer, I don't want Verizon to turn the Internet into a place where those without a lot of money can no longer compete on an equal footing. That would hurt our economy and our democracy. I request that the FCC investigate Verizon for using this zero rating scheme to skirt the Open Internet rules.

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: Verizon hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.

These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by Verizon. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. If you'd like to contact me about my complaint, please do so via email.

The homogenization of the internet population is yet one more step toward the fraying of real democracy and simultaneously toward the whim of the power brokers. The sunlight of transparency always levels the playing field. Let us always honor the values of the people.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 957725 - XXXX XXXXXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 5/6/2016 11:06:40 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15209

**Company Complaining About:** T Mobile

---

## **Description**

Our family is a Verizon and AT&T customer, and I am distressed and dismayed that the large telecom companies would actively control the internet and media content available to us, which includes news sources necessary for deciding upon an election candidate. This is not a "pay to play" situation, this is a "pay more and let us decide how you'll play" situation with absolutely zero transparency.

Last year the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out. But now the same cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

T-Mobile is breaking the rules, and the FCC should put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should not be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an open, public process to decide where and how to enforce these rules.

The FCC rules say that ISPs can't be gatekeepers online. T-Mobile exempts the content of select video providers from customers' data caps as part of its Binge On program, but only if those video providers meet T-Mobile's substantial technical requirements. This makes it difficult for many start-ups, small players, and non-commercial speakers to join. These exemptions are available for video only, so T-Mobile is favoring some kinds of uses over others.

Not only that, T-Mobile is downgrading all video across its network just to pull off the plan, breaking video on the sites of many independent creators and small services by forcing viewers to sit through the infamous "spinning wheel of death" as videos load or buffer. After coming under fire for this controversy, T-Mobile gave video sites a way to opt out, but they still have to meet specific technical requirements to do that.

These requirements are a ridiculous and unsustainable burden for small sites, and the idea of requiring special deals to access customers flies in the face of the FCC's net neutrality rules. Imagine an Internet where small websites had to enter into technical conversations with every single cellphone company in the world, just to make sure their videos were not interfered with!

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: T-Mobile hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.

These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by T-Mobile. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. If you'd like to contact me about my complaint, please do so via email.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 962154 - XXXXXXXX XXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 5/6/2016 10:03:29 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Los Angeles, California 90013

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

FCC, millions of Americans worked hard to petition the FCC to protect Net Neutrality. The FCC did right by the American people, but AT&T, Verizon, T Mobile, and Comcast, have been violating Net Neutrality rules. They have ignored the FCC's rules, and have gone ahead with their own plans.

If individual Americans ignored the law, we'd be cited, fined, and might even have to stand before a judge to be tried for our law breaking/rule breaking. These giant telcos cannot be permitted to get away with ignoring FCC rules. They must be sternly lectured, and heavily fined until they abide by the rules of Net Neutrality as set forth by the FCC.

FCC do not betray the millions of Americans who spoke out to the FCC to protect Net Neutrality. Do not hold closed door sessions to decide something so incredibly important to the American people. Transparency in our government is most important to us as Americans. We must bear witness to what is said, and we must have a voice in these proceedings.

FCC do not betray the American people and give in to the greed and vile attempts by the giant telcos to steal from the American people what we deserve, an open and neutral Internet.

Last year the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out. But now the same cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

AT&T is breaking the rules, and the FCC should put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should not be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an open, public process to decide where and how to enforce these rules.

The Open Internet rules say that ISPs can't charge websites and apps to be in the fast lane, so AT&T created another toll: they're charging websites and apps to be exempted from customers' data caps. Data shows that users find zero-rated content more attractive than content that counts against their caps. Thus, if web companies want to compete with those who pay, , they'll need to enroll - for a fee - in AT&T's sponsored data program. This creates a new toll for data traveling on the Internet and racks up charges for websites, applications, and content providers. Startups, small companies, and non-commercial speakers may face huge barriers if they can't afford to pay new tolls and no longer have their fair shot at reaching people online. That's not the kind of Internet I want to have.

These programs also create perverse incentives for AT&T to keep data caps low: The lower the caps, the more pressure on websites to pay up. Thus, these programs ultimately hurt Internet users like me who have less data to use on the apps they really want to use.



Finally, these plans distort my ability to use the applications of my choice by pushing me and other Internet users toward sites with deep pockets and away from those who can't afford the toll or don't want to pay it. They effectively punish me for using sites that don't pay the toll and unfairly raise the costs of the services that pay AT&T to be zero-rated (who then must pass that cost onto me).

As an AT&T customer, I don't want AT&T to turn the Internet into a place where those without a lot of money can no longer compete on an equal footing. That would hurt our economy and our democracy. I request that the FCC investigate AT&T for using this zero rating scheme to skirt the Open Internet rules.

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: AT&T hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.

These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by AT&T. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. If you'd like to contact me about my complaint, please do so via email.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 965298 - XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 5/9/2016 11:17:10 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Longboat Key, Florida 34228

**Company Complaining About:** Verizon

---

## **Description**

Last year the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out.

Now the same cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

Verizon is breaking the rules, and the FCC should put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should NOT be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an OPEN, PUBLIC process to decide where and how to enforce these rules. (Remember TRANSPARENCY is important to the American public!)

The Open Internet rules say that ISPs can't charge websites and apps to be in the fast lane, so Verizon created another toll: they're charging websites and apps to be exempted from customers' data caps.

Data shows that users find zero-rated content more attractive than content that counts against their caps. Thus, if web companies want to compete with those who pay, they'll need to enroll - FOR A FEE - in Verizon's sponsored data program.

This creates a new toll for data traveling on the Internet and racks up charges for websites, applications, and content providers. Startups, small companies, and non-commercial speakers may face huge barriers if they can't afford to pay new tolls and no longer have their fair shot at reaching people online.

That's not the kind of Internet I want to have.

These programs also create perverse incentives for Verizon to keep data caps low: The lower the caps, the more pressure on websites to pay up. Thus, these programs ultimately hurt Internet users like me who have less data to use on the apps they really want to use.

Finally, these plans distort my ability to use the applications of my choice by pushing me and other Internet users toward sites with deep pockets and away from those who can't afford the toll or don't want to pay it.

They effectively punish me for using sites that don't pay the toll and unfairly raise the costs of the services that pay Verizon to be zero-rated (who then must pass that cost onto me).

As an Verizon customer, I don't want Verizon to turn the Internet into a place where those without a lot of money can no longer compete on an equal footing. That would hurt our economy and our democracy.

I request that the FCC investigate Verizon for using this zero rating scheme to skirt the Open Internet rules.

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: Verizon hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.

These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by Verizon. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. If you'd like to contact me about my complaint, please do so via email.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 975490 - CenturyLink's lack of transparency about internet inadequacy**

**Date:** 5/12/2016 6:59:24 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Winlock, Washington 98596

**Company Complaining About:** Centurylink

---

## **Description**

I am extremely frustrated with the poor internet service CenturyLink provides to me and at their lack of transparency about the shortfalls of their internet service. I work from home and rely heavily on the internet daily. If I had been informed about the abysmally slow download and upload speeds provided by CenturyLink in this area, I would have gone with another internet provider.

When I signed up with CenturyLink, I was told that I was getting 'high-speed' internet. I was NOT told that the service comes over phone lines (antiquated and slow) or that the speed I pay for (1.5 Mbps) is not even close to what I get. My download/upload speed is regularly less than 1 Mb. (see the attached file please).

I also was not told that the CenturyLink has oversold the current bandwidth, that they have no intention of upgrading the service here and that their maintenance crews are understaffed for my area!

I cannot play a YouTube, I cannot watch a TV program or a movie via the internet, I cannot upgrade my computer programs via the internet. Instead, I have to pay to order a disc with the program, then wait for it to come in the mail and upgrade that way. This is becoming a larger issue as many companies, including Microsoft, are no longer offering disc copies of the programs.

I was not informed that the service crew for the Winlock area is inadequate. If something happens to a phone line in the area that carries the internet for CenturyLink, I am without internet service until it is fixed. This often can be as long as a week since CenturyLink does not employ enough technicians. And then they don't credit me for the internet service I couldn't use even though I call and ask them to do so.

CenturyLink has been awarded money as part of the ConnectAmerica Fund II by the FCC. Portions of the Winlock area have been designated as eligible for upgrades. However, whenever I contact CenturyLink customer service to ask about the timeline and if our internet will be improved, I am told that there are no plans to improve our internet service.

In this day and age, it is ridiculous that anyone has to put up with this poor internet service.

---

**Ticket: # 979066 - XXXX XXXXX's complaint re: ISP Zero Rating**

**Date:** 5/15/2016 9:16:36 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Dayton, Texas 77535

**Company Complaining About:** T Mobile

---

## **Description**

We need to maintain transparency!

Last year the FCC protected the open Internet by passing strong Net Neutrality rules in response to the millions of people who spoke out. But now the same cable and phone companies that fought so hard to destroy Net Neutrality are creating harmful new schemes that pose a serious threat to the open Internet.

T-Mobile is breaking the rules, and the FCC should put a stop to it. Furthermore, this decision should not be made behind closed doors. The FCC should have an open, public process to decide where and how to enforce these rules.

The FCC rules say that ISPs can't be gatekeepers online. T-Mobile exempts the content of select video providers from customers' data caps as part of its Binge On program, but only if those video providers meet T-Mobile's substantial technical requirements. This makes it difficult for many start-ups, small players, and non-commercial speakers to join. These exemptions are available for video only, so T-Mobile is favoring some kinds of uses over others.

Not only that, T-Mobile is downgrading all video across its network just to pull off the plan, breaking video on the sites of many independent creators and small services by forcing viewers to sit through the infamous "spinning wheel of death" as videos load or buffer. After coming under fire for this controversy, T-Mobile gave video sites a way to opt out, but they still have to meet specific technical requirements to do that.

These requirements are a ridiculous and unsustainable burden for small sites, and the idea of requiring special deals to access customers flies in the face of the FCC's net neutrality rules. Imagine an Internet where small websites had to enter into technical conversations with every single cellphone company in the world, just to make sure their videos were not interfered with!

Altogether, these practices prove what we've always known: T-Mobile hates the FCC's Net Neutrality rules and is doing everything it can to get around them. In the long run, everyone on the Internet loses -- except carriers in the middle that get to impose data caps, charge tolls, and act as gatekeepers.

These plans need to be investigated and stopped. It's the FCC's job to protect consumers from these kinds of abuses by T-Mobile. Meanwhile, Congress should encourage the FCC to do its job and make these companies follow the rules, not interfere with the FCC's power to regulate.

Note: for privacy reasons, rather than providing my personal phone number, I'm providing the number of an advocacy group. If you'd like to contact me about my complaint, please do so via email.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 1257311 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 10/12/2016 1:48:57 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Portland, Oregon 97205

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but

for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

---

**Ticket: # 1261494 - Force ISPs to remove needless data caps.**

**Date:** 10/13/2016 1:56:54 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Hayward, California 94541

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast's data cap policy is a flawed consumer control measure against those who would go without cable and a direct action against companies that have actually innovated over the past decade rather than sit pretty on a monopoly.

Why this is flawed:

There is no guarantee of accuracy or transparency:

Regardless of your stance on the matter there should be no argument that internet usage amounts should be accurate and transparent to users affected by it. However that is not the case at all, there is no third party government agency in charge of regulating broadband metering. Comcast contracts out its metering to a third party vendor and its methods of measurement are internal and not open to the public at all. Just this year alone Comcast has received thirteen thousand complaints about their data caps and their terrible accuracy in measurement. Almost everyone who has to deal with this caps seems to have a story of their ISP charging them for data usage that would be impossible given their current bandwidth.

Discourages cord cutting and stifles competition:

Data caps exist solely as a consumer control measure to stifle competition and cause users to be biased against applications based on the data amount they use. For example Netflix which lists high quality HD as using 3 GB per hour and Ultra HD as using 7gb per hour is immediately affected by this. As Ultra HD becomes more common and using 7gb of data for an hour of video streaming becomes common place users affected by data caps will hit their limits more easily causing them to be charged overages. This will cause users to drop Netflix in favor of less data intensive services which Comcast will only be too happy to provide through cable. Families of five living in a home with heavy Netflix usage will already be pushing this current limit.

This isn't just for videos of course, people who use services like Steam will be hit just as hard especially as the size of games increases, data intensive services that would have otherwise been developed will languish on the vine as data caps cause consumers to be biased against them.

Users have little choice in what ISP they must subscribe to:

The Internet is no longer a luxury that most can live without. For many it has become an essential utility much like electricity.

In any thread regarding complaints against Comcast or any ISP for that matter the main complaint of users is that they have no choice in their ISP ("Save us Google Fiber!"). Those lucky enough to live in major metropolitan areas may be fortunate enough to have the choice of maybe two or more ISPs but for many users the local ISP is the only choice they have which grants that business a monopoly in their area. In a happier world there would be dozens of ISPs each competing with each other and vying for market share so the poor behavior of one company only provides an opportunity for another to gain more customers. Sadly most Americans don't live in that kind of free economic environment.

What we need to do:

How do consumers collectively fight this when they have little recourse in their choice of ISP? The FCC is currently investigating data caps as a practice. If we as consumers just accept data caps the FCC will have less reason to crack down so it is imperative that the public puts pressure on the FCC.



We're back to the Net Neutrality fight all over again as data caps are just a proxy issue that allows Comcast to achieve the same thing it wanted with its draconian net neutrality rules.

Some users may be currently exempt from data caps but this behavior will absolutely roll down hill to other ISPs once they realize that consumers will accept it. Then you'll have to deal with your own little small town version of Comcast with little recourse.

---

**Ticket: # 634655 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 11/4/2015 4:49:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Smyrna, Tennessee 37167

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast has added a 300 GB data cap without any communication - email/paper or otherwise. There is no reason for these data caps and I don't feel that I should have to limit my usage of a utility that is priced based on throughput/speed.

But I am mostly upset about the complete lack of transparency of the situation. The first I heard about the situation was when I went over my cap...which I had no idea existed to begin with. And their reps continue to say that these data caps have existed for the entirety of my service...

---

**Ticket: # 651431 - Data download limits****Date:** 11/12/2015 12:20:52 AM**City/State/Zip:** Oro Valley, Arizona 85755**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I am a customer of Comcast cable in Tucson, AZ. Comcast recently created a 300 GB data cap for my high-speed internet service. I have two complaints about this. First, this cap is designed to limit a consumer from using competing online television services such as Hulu or Netflix. The cap is inadequate to stream television service throughout the month and therefore designed to force a consumer to use Comcast television service. Second, I believe Comcast is not correctly computing the data-usage on my account. For the first time, I received notice I was about to go over their artificial data limit in October. I looked at the previous two months of usage and Comcast claimed I used 100 GB more data in that month than I ever had previously. Nothing changed in my data usage. Since that time, I have been attempting to log in daily to check the Comcast "Usage" data to compare it to what I did that day. The huge majority of the time (for days on end), the tool is 'unavailable' and does not load. For the first 11 days of this month, I was only able to have it work once early in the month. Comcast makes no information about how much data I supposedly use in a day available to the consumer; hence I am unable to dispute what I believe to be flawed data. If they are going to artificially cap my data usage (and charge me extra for additional usage), their accounting must be a great deal more accurate and offer the consumer an opportunity to refute their claims. For example, last month when I supposedly nearly went over my data cap, my entire family was out of town and the data usage would have been extremely low. I have no opportunity to see what usage they claimed I had in that time period to refute what I believe were flawed numbers.

In summary, Comcast is attempting to restrict my use of streaming television and force me to use only their television products. In addition, they offer no transparency in how they are supposedly accounting for my usage or allowing me to refute the data they claim represent's my data usage since their 'tools' rarely work and provide no detailed information.

---

**Ticket: # 710130 - Comcast Data Caps****Date:** 12/15/2015 7:37:56 PM**City/State/Zip:** Seattle, Washington 98168**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

These Comcast Data Caps are price gouging by definition!!! By Comcast's own reasoning behind the caps, they should charge us only for the data we use. There is also the fact that they are a monopoly in my area and my only provider of internet (a public utility as defined by the FCC). Comcast sets the cap, and then uses their own vague calculations to calculate usage with no transparency. Of course this will let corruption and greed fester. They are already giving preference to their own data streaming ventures (those will not be counted in the cap, but the others will.) It is up to municipalities to set up their own internet infrastructures and internet/streaming companies to fund those projects in lieu of minimal tax revenues. But until then, we will have to deal with the oligarchic behemoth Comcast, and I for one expect my government to protect my rights and call out these companies and enforce the rules we set for them.

---

**Ticket: # 710709 - Comcast Data Caps**

**Date:** 12/15/2015 11:37:51 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Lowell, Massachusetts 01851

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I do not currently live in an area where Comcast has rolled out data caps, however when/if they do, I will be forced to accept them, as there are 0 alternatives in my area that offer acceptable speeds (Which is a separate complaint altogether).

These data caps are being monitored by Comcast, using Comcast's algorithms, with no transparency around how they reach usage numbers.

They are also unfair competition to companies like Netflix and Hulu, when those two companies count against your data cap, but Comcast's streaming service does not.

Lastly, and most importantly, they shouldn't be allowed to exist at all. The internet and access to it is a basic human right, and even if you don't believe that you have to admit that it's at the very least a requirement for living in today's society. You wouldn't allow a cap on heat usage, or free speech, or 911 calls, or water usage (unless a severe water shortage took place). So why is this need allowed to be capped for absolutely no reason.

To summarize, please don't allow data caps, there no reason they should exist. They're anti-consumer, anti-business, and anti-America.

P.S. If you could remove mobile and cellular data caps as well, that would be awesome for all the same reasons.

---

**Ticket: # 712447 - Comcast \$30 rate hike**

**Date:** 12/16/2015 5:08:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Weston, Florida 33326

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Hello,

Comcast has changed my contract with no option of opting out of the change to include a rate hike of \$30 per month to provide the same level of service than before. For consumers it is very hard to voice our concerns since Internet is a basic service as important as electricity and water with one important difference, electricity and water have a direct material cost, if you use more water then the water plant needs to find sources for more water, it is something that is consumed. On the other hand data provides the ability to establish a link between two points, the cost is in providing the bandwidth and not the flow of information. So this extra \$30 charge is just a fee that takes advantage of their monopoly position to extract more money out of the citizens. Comcast is finding deceptive ways to move their entire price structure to fees, charging fees for every possible reason like installation charges on incomplete service installs and making contracts that they can modify at will and are designed to remove all protections from the citizen. I don't know what action can be taken but I'm worried of the future. Hopefully something good to protect the US citizen is established. Perhaps local governments can be encouraged to compete with this giant monopoly. Or perhaps Internet providers need to become utility companies with full disclosure of their per connection cost and establish a fixed margin of what percentage profit they make out of every connection, such an approach would need a careful implementation because they will likely find ways of artificially inflating the apparent cost per connection. Local laws protecting monopoly position of Internet providers need to be watched and prevented.

Thanks.

---

**Ticket: # 725874 - Comcast Data Cap Charges**

**Date:** 12/27/2015 6:15:36 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Shreveport, Louisiana 71105

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast Xfinity has recently started charging customers in my hometown of Shreveport, La who use their internet service a fee if they go over a set limit of 300GB per month. My complaint is not that Comcast is doing this, as a company, they have the right to charge for their services.

My complaint is that I, as the consumer, have no way of seeing how they determine my streaming amount. They offer us a streaming meter on the website, but they do not show us details. I'd like to get detailed descriptions about where I am using my data. Do things like Netflix or Amazon Prime count against your data caps more than say non-streaming Internet usage or mobile apps? I am concerned that these questions have not been answered in a way that satisfies me. I want more transparency in their data tracking and a way to dispute their claims.

I am also concerned about the timing of these overage charges. I feel that it is bad business to start charging customers for streaming movies and TV (which is essentially what they are doing) right before they roll out their own streaming service, which won't affect your data allotment. That just doesn't seem right to me as a consumer. We have very limited choices in our area for reliable, high-speed Internet access. Comcast assuredly knows this. I think that Comcast is taking advantage of a lack of competition in the marketplace. By competition I mean service providers who offer comparable Internet speeds and service.

---

**Ticket: # 727127 - 300 GB Data Cap complaint/ Lack of transparency of behalf of the provider**

**Date:** 12/28/2015 4:40:03 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Shreveport, Louisiana 71105

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I received a popup message on my laptop on 12/27/2015 from Comcast stating that I had used 90% of my 300 GB monthly data allowance. Comcast has claimed that only 8% of their customer base would be affected by their new policy. Despite these claims I had been informed by three friends in the previous two days that they received the same message. I had also spent seven of the previous 9 days either traveling or out of the country and an entire other day in Dallas. I live by myself and find it difficult to believe that I had reached 90% of my data cap while only spending 18 days in the city in which I reside – especially based on Comcast's previous statements.

While I do not subscribe to their cable services, I do stream. Regularly on weekends but I never even turn on any streaming devices prior to 7 PM on week days. Even then – I'll only watch an hour or two of TV if any at all.

This doesn't seem to me like an outrageous use of data that would place my in the "percent," especially seeing as how it's almost 2016.

My main issue resides in Comcast's lack of transparency and inability to keep proper and accurate records. After speaking with a customer service representative, he told me that he could not provide me any sort of itemized break down on either a daily or weekly basis that would confirm my usage. While his suggestion of "monitor[ing] it on the Website" is decent enough, it really puts an unnecessary burden on the consumer and still places no real accountability with the provider because there is no way to accurately check their information. As far as Comcast's record keeping, I worked there for more than three years and I am overwhelmingly familiar with the company's business practices as well as their inability to properly monitor outages and working nodes – much less usage on a more micro level. As the Comcast Business representative in the Shreveport area, I can provide a list of dozens of names and businesses where internal systems showed modems online, but the reality did not support the system's claims as I was often onsite attempting to fix the issues.

Not even getting into how the 300 GB limit is designed to discourage competition (including, but not limited to online streaming services, online gaming devices such as XBOX ONE and PS4, online surveillance), Comcast's own third-party analysis company, NetForecast, reported in June that Comcast's own meters do not accurately count data. [http://www.netforecast.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/NFR5120\\_Fourth\\_Comcast\\_Meter\\_Accuracy\\_Validation\\_Report.pdf](http://www.netforecast.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/NFR5120_Fourth_Comcast_Meter_Accuracy_Validation_Report.pdf)

Attached are copies of my flight itinerary and passport to show that, if any usage from my account registered during those dates, Comcast's measurements are clearly inaccurate and a very large flag should be raised. I would also like to state that no one other than myself knows the password to my wifi as of this writing. I also respectfully request that the so –called "data caps" be removed until



Comcast – or any other company using these limits – can prove that their measurement systems are accurate, consistent, and do not inhibit competition.

Thank you for your time.

Kind regards,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 338503 - TWC Subscriber Agreement Violates Net Neutrality**

**Date:** 6/12/2015 9:40:55 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Columbus, Ohio 43204

**Company Complaining About:** Time Warner

---

## **Description**

The following is part of the Time Warner Subscriber Agreement that is now in violation of Net Neutrality rules; specifically, the "and the priority we give to our business subscribers' data traffic" on the throughput clause. I have received no notification of a change to this agreement.

(c) Throughput Rates. We do not guarantee that you will obtain the Maximum Throughput Rate for the level of HSD Service to which you subscribe at any given time or on a continuous basis. The Throughput Rate you experience at any time will be affected by a number of factors, including the nature of the Internet and its protocols, our facilities, the bandwidth we devote to carriage of protocol and network information, the condition and configuration of our Equipment or Customer-Owned Equipment at your location, whether you use an in-home wi-fi network (which can significantly limit the Throughput Rate obtained by devices attached to it), our use of Network Management Tools, data volume and congestion on our network and the Internet, the time of day you are using the HSD Service, the performance of the website servers you try to access, and the priority we give to our business subscribers' data traffic and specialized services we deliver using our Equipment as described in our Network Management Disclosures.

Source: [http://help.twcable.com/twc\\_sub\\_agreement.html](http://help.twcable.com/twc_sub_agreement.html)

---

**Ticket: # 339406 - Comcast's hidden policy on data usage limits**

**Date:** 6/13/2015 5:56:53 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Atlanta, Georgia 30307

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

A friend mentioned that he had "gone over" on his data allowance with Comcast. I immediately asked, "what allowance"? I explained to him that my plan does not have data usage limitations. I went to Comcast's website to verify, and on their sales page, it does not clearly state the data limitations. You have to go to the hidden "fine print" information to find this policy. It appears nowhere on my monthly bill, and it was never explained to me each time I negotiated my contracts since the policy was implemented (November 2013).

I did not realize that this policy applied to me until I asked a customer service rep. That's when they told me my limit. After I followed up with a question about the policy, they immediately gave me the number for their "Customer Security Assurance Team". I explained to them that I had never been notified of this policy, and that it does not explain this policy anywhere on my monthly bill, or list, as a line item, my monthly allowance and my bill-month's usage. With these limitations, I would expect my Comcast bill to look a lot like my Verizon cell phone bill. When I mentioned that I was never notified, the rep mentioned that "calls went out" to notify customers and "voicemails were left". Comcast never put this at the top of their customer's bills in their "News" section where they normally list policy changes. Many of us proceeded without any knowledge of these limitations.

My concern is that Comcast is not following the FCC's net-neutrality rules as they relate to transparency and clear disclosures of policies that could potentially cost the customer additional monthly fees. The rep told me that I would be notified with a "courtesy call" when I have reached 90% of my usage.

I expect Comcast to list this information as a line item on every customer's bills, and to properly notify customers of policy changes of this sort. Otherwise, it feels like fraud.

The image I provided shows their sales page where it does not state the usage limitations. With cell phone plans, this is all consumers care about.

---

[Ticket: # 345901 - AT&T Data Throttling](#)

**Date:** 6/17/2015 2:21:18 PM

**City/State/Zip:** West New York, New Jersey 07093

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

My husband and I have an unlimited data plan from AT&T. Today, I received a text message (file attached) that my data has reached 75% of 5GB and my data speed would be reduced once I exceed that number. This throttling violates the Open Internet Transparency Rule. In addition, AT&T is combining our usage. It's not even per person.

---

**Ticket: # 347618 - ATT Not Allowing me to tether cell phone**

**Date:** 6/17/2015 10:48:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

Hi, I have a unlimited data plan with ATT. The terms of service specifically, "WIRELESS CUSTOMER AGREEMENT ("Agreement"), per

<http://www.att.com/legal/terms.wirelessCustomerAgreement.html#whatAreVoiceDataPlanReq>, section 6.1 paragraph 3 states, "AT&T data plans are designed for use with only one of the following distinct Device types: (1) Smartphones, (2) basic and Quick Messaging phones, (3) tablets, (4) LaptopConnect cards, (5) stand-alone Mobile Hotspot devices, and (6) Home Bases. A data plan designated for one type of device may not be used with another type of device. For example, a data plan designated for use with a basic phone or a Smartphone may not be used with a LaptopConnect card, tablet, or stand-alone Mobile Hotspot device, by tethering devices together, by SIM card transfer, or any other means. A data tethering plan, however, may be purchased for an additional fee to enable tethering on a compatible device. An Activation Fee may apply for each data line." The above restriction is in violation of the Clear, Bright-Line Rules regarding No Blocking. As noted in FCC 15-24, II.A.1.15, "A person engaged in the provision of broadband Internet access service, insofar as such person is so engaged, shall not block lawful content, applications, services, or nonharmful devices, subject to reasonable network management.", the ISP (ATT) shall not block applications and services. A application on my phone can tether and that service is common and allowed for home internet service; however, the mobile broadband plan I have does not allow tethering - which seeks to block a service and application, that my phone can do for free based on the plan they sold me (unlimited). Therefore, I believe that ATT seeks to block a standard industry practice (enabling a router on my mobile device - application and service). Their terms of service in 6.1 above prevent tethering even though the Open Internet Order FCC 15-24 prevents such practice. Yes a ISP may partake in "reasonable network management" as per FCC 15-24; however, "consumers must be protected, for example from mobile commercial practices masquerading as "reasonable network management."" This is such practice, a network management practice with the sole financial and non-technical desire "that effectively force them to switch to price plans with less generous data allowances." (FCC 15-24 II.4.33) What the ISP is trying to do is block a application and service that is easily able to turn on and entice me to drop my unlimited data plan in order to get a more costly option, that once done, will move me from the unlimited data plan. ATT is trying to make my service (unlimited) as painfully slow (i.e. throttling in violation of 2010 Transparency Rule) and blocking access to tethering applications and services not for a legitimate technical network management purpose but for a business purpose. Please ensure that the unlimited data plan that I've paid \$4,320 for since 2009 (\$30mo x 12mo x 6 years x 2 phones) can be used at its full capacity and not have tethering applications and the service provided by a tethering app on my phone, seen as prevented for a business purpose and not network management and thus violate the No Blocking Rule. Best, (b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 348304 - Unfair Throttling**

**Date:** 6/18/2015 11:04:45 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Summerville, South Carolina 29483

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

**Description**

I received the attached message from AT&T stating that had used "75% of my 5GB network management threshold" and that I would "experience reduced data speeds." This is clearly a rebranding of the previous policy and not in response to network management practices.

I believe that I am, as in the past, being targeted for punitive or unfair throttling based, not on network conditions, but on data use alone.

All of this is despite my clearly labeled "Unlimited" tier of service for which I pay a premium. On the AT&T website (screenshot also attached) it shows I'm using "3.75GB of Unlimited" (of which it would be impossible to use 75%).

I believe AT&T's practices, in the absence of any transparency and through the use of arbitrary pre-set limits, are in direct opposition to the Open Internet and damaging to neutral usage of Internet services.

---

**Ticket: # 356424 - Comcast fails openness requirement****Date:** 6/22/2015 4:17:53 PM**City/State/Zip:** Aurora, Colorado 80016**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast offers speed tiers. They do not guarantee rates, and they cannot state any expectation of when the given speed may or may not be attainable. In essence, they never have to deliver the stated speed, under any circumstances. Additionally, speeds may exceed the tier for brief periods. Therefore there is no real meaning to the tier and no explanation of this to the consumer other than the phrase 'Actual speeds vary and are not guaranteed. '. How can they charge more for a tier when it doesn't guarantee more speed? There is nothing showing that the 250Mbps speed is even attainable, in reality, at any time. There is nothing proving that a 250Mbps tier has any actual different rates than a 50Mbps tier. They do not disclose the upload speed at all on their web site, only the download speed, and the upload speed is very very low (10Mbps or less up vs. 250Mbps down). Therefore they are not disclosing critical information to the consumer on their website. In addition, their detailed agreement discriminates against forms of legal traffic such as running a game server, personal file server, etc. This is against the provision against blocking legal traffic. Lastly, they require business customers to use their rented equipment for internet access. This may or may not be against the rules, but it seems clear that the same thing should apply to this that applies to cable boxes, i.e. Why do I have to pay them to rent their equipment instead of using my own?

Attached is a PDF of their website as of the date of this complaint. Note the lack of any detail or disclosure of upload speeds. The only phrase disclosing speed when you click on the pricing and other info link is what was stated above i.e. actual speeds are not guaranteed and may vary.

Note: I'm not blind to the fact that Comcast cant control the speed of the internet as a whole or of other web servers, but if order a 250Mbps tier, I expect to \*routinely\* see 250Mbps speeds from bandwidth testing sites, etc. I am aware that during peak periods I may not always see 250Mbps, and I believe it is fair to allow that with adequate disclosure, but if I cannot attain that speed at any time other than 3AM on a Monday, and they dont explain what % of time it can be expected, then that is false advertising and a violation of the clarity and disclosure provision. Likewise, how am I to make an informed choice when they do not tell me the upload speeds are a tiny fraction of the download speeds and likewise not guaranteed.

---

**Ticket: # 372399 - data cap**

**Date:** 6/29/2015 2:06:05 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Mt Pleasant, South Carolina 29466

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I recently found out that I have a data cap on my internet usage. Had I know this I would have never signed up for comcast. U verse wasn't an option for us and this is why we decided to make the switch and quite frankly we only did b/c our kids were complaining about how slow the internet service was. We have a had nothing but one problem after another with comcast trend. It's just very very sad to me that none of this was disclosed to us when we talk to a costumer service rep. If comcast truly cares about their customers they would make a full disclosure about the data usage and it's cap and what that all means to the customer. This way the consumer has all the facts and is not caught off guard and learns after the fact. Very Very unhappy!



---

**Ticket: # 392723 - No tethering AND throttling on my AT&T Unlimited data**

**Date:** 7/9/2015 2:06:07 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Midland, Virginia 22728-1714

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

I have had AT&T's Unlimited Data for iPhone plan (\$30/mo/line) for 4 lines since 2008. I am still unable to enable tether, or Personal Hotspot in iOS parlance, despite net neutrality guidelines. I have also been threatened with throttled speed as recently as today, July 9, 2015, if I exceed 5GB/mo towards my "unlimited" plan cap.

I find these restrictions onerous and contrary to the letter and spirit of network neutrality and the consumer is unable to determine the subjective "network congestion" requirements to determine if AT&T is indeed applying this measure evenly or punitively.

I implore the FCC and FTC to investigate this matter with their full authority on behalf of all AT&T Unlimited Data for iPhone plan holders and ensure that AT&T upholds network neutrality and transparency.

---

**Ticket: # 427038 - Data Cap**

**Date:** 7/26/2015 2:46:38 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Oakland, Tennessee 38060

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

### **Description**

I have recently found out, through my own research, that I am in a one of comcast's "test markets" with a limit of 300gb of data per month. I was not informed of this when signed up for comcast service. I find this misleading that they impose a limit to without disclosure upfront.

---

**Ticket: # 432408 - Comcast Abuses Customer AGAIN****Date:** 7/28/2015 7:26:53 PM**City/State/Zip:** Atlanta, Georgia 30324**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast has yet again abused its customer. I am sick and tired of the companies misinformation and lack of providing customers complete and clear disclosure. I've had it with this company and their willingness to fail in communicating to its customer. I am a current Comcast customer, I have been since may of 2014 when I moved into my home. I recently (within the last month) called them to change my internet plan to a faster plan because I had just purchased the Amazon fire stick and now stream on demand tv. At that time I was told that all I needed to do it add the blast service to my account. I did that. Not within 2 weeks of doing that I start getting calls saying that I was "about to go over my data use". First of all, I was never even told there was a data limit. Secondly, upon calling Comcast after adding this blast feature I then called their tech support department because my internet was lagging still. After thirty minutes "troubleshooting" the service to no avail they scheduled for a tech to come take a look. At no time during this conversation was I, to the best of my knowledge, told that I would be charged \$70 for a "service charge". The man literally came into my home and ran speed test with the computer plugged in two different methods. After this I begin getting calls from Comcast stating that I was about to go over my data. Again, I'd never even heard there was a limit. I then called Comcast and was told that it was a glitch in the system and that the lady couldn't even see the data that I had used. After the 2nd call regarding data I then called back tonight to find out that they say I've used over the 300GB that they all. Mind you that this limit is only set in 2 Georgia cities (Atlanta, Savannah, and Augusta) I feel like I've been taken advantage of and that there is not anyone that is able to help me!! FCC PLEASE HELP!!!!

---

**Ticket: # 434572 - Data Cap Transparency****Date:** 7/29/2015 4:30:36 PM**City/State/Zip:** Nashville, Tennessee 37206**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast in Nashville has been running a "trial" with a data cap in Nashville for \*over 2 years now\* and it's been affecting my ability to use the service. I pay an outrageous amount of money for the internet-only tier and now I have to make a decision monthly on whether to stream a certain amount of content or pay for overages. This cap is unreasonable in 2015 at 300gb per month and frankly shouldn't be there to begin with. The "trial" is arbitrarily in my area, then expanded into other cities, and has no end date. As customer, I had no choice to participate and Comcast doesn't do this in the rest of their markets. They even blatantly admit this in the help section of their website. They completely lack any transparency in this program. I want to opt-out and have a data cap-free internet plan, but they tell me to sign up to a enterprise-grade account. There's no recourse Comcast on this issue.

---

**Ticket: # 450842 - Straighttalk Wireless blocking certain internet traffic, no transparency**

**Date:** 8/5/2015 5:44:11 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Westlake Village, California 91361

**Company Complaining About:** Straight Talk

---

**Description**

StraightTalk wireless ("Straighttalk") is a leading broadband telecommunications service provider, specifically a Mobile Virtual Network Operator operating on the ATT Wireless 2G, 3G, and 4G networks that is engaged in Blocking LAWFUL services on the Internet and provides no transparency regarding its limitations of service or intent to block traffic. Specifically: the company prevents the use of Virtual Private Networking (VPN) necessary for accessing most secure corporate web sites, services, and email services.

As a mobile network operator, Straighttalk is subject to the Open Internet rules which specifies:

1) No blocking: broadband providers will not be able to block access to legal content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices.

2) Transparency: A person engaged in the provision of broadband Internet access service shall publicly disclose accurate information regarding the network management practices, performance, and commercial terms of its broadband Internet access services sufficient for consumers to make informed choices regarding use of such services and for content, application, service, and device providers to develop, market, and maintain Internet offerings.

Straighttalk's Terms of Service are located here:

<https://www.straighttalk.com/wps/portal/home/h/legal/terms-and-conditions>

The terms of service do not state any limitations on Virtual Private Networking which is a well-known, legal, and non-harmful service of almost every corporation in the United States for its employees and trusted partners.

The evidence provided below was collected on July 26, 2015. The first text block is from an internet web service with public address xxx.xxx.xxx.xxx (digits removed for protection) that is attempting to RESPOND to a service request from a Straighttalk wireless phone properly configured per their instructions, with public address (b) (6) which is within Straighttalk's domain:

-----evidence of service blocking by Straighttalk-----

Jul 26 07:44:50 router.lan syslog: 15[NET] sending packet: from xxx.xxx.xxx.xxx[500] to

(b) (6) [500] (312 bytes)

Jul 26 07:45:00 router.lan syslog: 12[NET] received packet: from (b) (6) [500] to xxx.xxx.xxx.xxx[500] (400 bytes)

Jul 26 07:45:00 router.lan syslog: 12[ENC] parsed IKE\_SA\_INIT request 0 [ SA KE No N(NATD\_S\_IP) N(NATD\_D\_IP) ]

Jul 26 07:45:00 router.lan syslog: 12[IKE] received retransmit of request with ID 0, retransmitting response

-----end of Service blocking evidence -----

The last line indicates that the phone NEVER received the response to service, and the last message is repeated over and over as the web service attempts to respond to the request by the mobile phone, and the mobile phone, not having received the response, continues to re-transmit the same request.

By comparison, a successful transaction using the exact same phone from another wireless network (Wifi) looks like this:

-----example of successful service transaction -----

```
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[NET] received packet: from (b) (6) [500] to
xxx.xxx.xxx.xxx[500] (400 bytes)
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[ENC] parsed IKE_SA_INIT request 0 [ SA KE No N(NATD_S_IP)
N(NATD_D_IP) ]
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[IKE] (b) (6) is initiating an IKE_SA
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[IKE] (b) (6) is initiating an IKE_SA
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[IKE] remote host is behind NAT
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[IKE] sending cert request for "C=DE, O=xxx, CN=xxxx"
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[ENC] generating IKE_SA_INIT response 0 [ SA KE No N(NATD_S_IP)
N(NATD_D_IP) CERTREQ N(MULT_AUTH) ]
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 07[NET] sending packet: from xxx.xxx.xxx.xxx[500] to
(b) (6) 4[500] (337 bytes)
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 09[NET] received packet: from (b) (6) [4500] to
xxx.xxx.xxx.xxx[4500] (1372 bytes)
Jul 29 06:13:57 router.lan : 09[ENC] parsed IKE_AUTH request 1 [ IDi CERT CERTREQ AUTH
CPRQ(ADDR MASK DNS DNS NBNS NBNS VER) N(INIT_CONTACT) N(ESP_TFC_PAD_N)
N(NON_FIRST_FRAG) SA TSi TSr ]
```

-----end of successful transaction -----

The above clearly shows that the same phone has received the response from the server and has processed it successfully.

This proves that Straighttalk wireless is BLOCKING this type of traffic on its networks.

I have attempted to contact the company repeatedly since July 26, 2015 to request clarification on their terms of service, and I have not received a response. Clearly Straighttalk is not only blocking service, but is not willing to provide any information regarding its blocking policies.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 453724 - Comcast Cable Internet Data Cap****Date:** 8/6/2015 8:24:23 PM**City/State/Zip:** Calhoun, Georgia 30701**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast has instituted unreasonably low data caps in specifically targeted markets. This is unfair not only because it's being implemented only for some customers but because the cap is far too low to watch Netflix for any reasonable amount of time. I paid for the service and shouldn't have to worry about actually using the service that I paid for lest I be charge \$10 for 50GB which is a tiny amount for a high price. I have now used two of three courtesy overages and when I tried to talk to someone to get information on the usage I was disconnected twice. Comcast provides no actual proof of the data usage so the consumer is left to take their word that they have used that much data. That is a complete lack of transparency and an unfair business practice by a virtual monopoly in my area. I want an explanation from Comcast and proof that I actually used the data.

---

**Ticket: # 463544 - Clearwire and Sprint unfair business practice**

**Date:** 8/12/2015 12:36:40 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Davis, California 95618

**Company Complaining About:** Clearwire (i.e. Sprint)

---

## **Description**

After 5 years of service clearwire (now Sprint) is shutting down their mobile broadband access. Sprint/CLEAR are giving no options and no other carrier is offering equivalent service. All the plans have very low data caps and high monthly charges. Wireless broadband is included in the open internet transparency rule that mandates equal access for all. This violates that mandate. This is an unlawful business practice to restrict our access to the airwaves.



---

**Ticket: # 474109 - Blocking of Lawful Services**

**Date:** 8/17/2015 9:54:00 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Temperance, Michigan 48182

**Company Complaining About:** Buckeye Cablesystem

---

**Description**

•Blocking: Broadband providers may not block access to lawful content, applications, services or non-harmful devices.

"SMTP traffic (mail clients): E-mail traffic (SMTP) directly from its Buckeye Express customers using dynamically-assigned IP addresses is allowed only through Buckeye's e-mail platform. This prevents SPAMMERS from exploiting these computers as a relay for illicit e-mail traffic. While these customers may receive e-mail into a client (i.e. Outlook Express) via POP3, they may not send outbound mail through another server."

From page 4 of

"[http://www.buckeyecablesystem.com/downloads/BEX\\_docs/InternetAccessServiceDisclosures.pdf](http://www.buckeyecablesystem.com/downloads/BEX_docs/InternetAccessServiceDisclosures.pdf)".

A service provider cannot block lawful services under the pretense that they may be used illegally.

---

**Ticket: # 482194 - ATT UVerse continues to throttle internet speeds for certain content.**

**Date:** 8/21/2015 11:13:59 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Raleigh, North Carolina 27612

**Company Complaining About:** AT&T

---

## **Description**

Please reference previous case 345728.

AT&T Uverse is throttling users' broadband connections. Call it traffic shaping, "filtering" (as an AT&T rep used) or anything else it is throttling. I can find numerous complaints of others experience the same problem. This is a clear violation of the recent ISP transparency regulations.

I previously filed a complaint with the FCC for this issue and the FCC simply forwarded the complaint to AT&T. AT&T made no attempt to resolve issue, they simply denied the practice, and the FCC closed the complaint. One representative with UVerse even admitted that my issues were related to "filtering" by AT&T servers. ISPs will continue these deceptive practices until an entity such as the FCC steps up to do something about it.

I don't know why I am bothering to file another complaint with the FCC, as I was extremely disappointed with the process last time but these sorts of unchecked practices by what is essentially a utility company bother me a great deal.

If you simply plan to forward my complaint to AT&T, don't bother. I can do that myself, and they will simply deny what is occurring without any plausible explanation to the contrary. Again, please do not forward this to AT&T, it will not accomplish anything. What do I need to do to draw attention to this problem?

---

**Ticket: # 493299 - Comcast Data Cap**

**Date:** 8/27/2015 2:17:09 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Atlanta, Georgia 30315

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I just received notification that my household will be billed for going over a 300GB cap on our monthly internet data usage. This in itself is in direct violation of Net Neutrality rules, which prohibit ISPs from blocking access to lawful content.

The manner in which Comcast applies its data monitoring is also completely opaque--I have no idea how accurate is Comcast's data monitoring, as the company has shared zero information with me, the consumer. For example, my Comcast data "meter" shows that we are over 300GB for the month of August, but our billing cycle ended on August 14th--I don't understand how Comcast's illegal cap could be applied with any kind of "fairness" or "logic" if it is applied to straddle two different billing cycles. This lack of transparency is also in direct violation of Net Neutrality rules.

Furthermore, a cap of 300GB is ridiculous for today's Internet consumer, and, if enforced, would severely curtail my ability to fully use the Internet as the utility it is (for example, in the five minutes since I received my warning regarding our data cap, my Comcast "meter" shows that I am now 2GB beyond 300GB; extrapolating by using this 0.4GB/minute rate as an average would yield 300GB of data in just 12.5 hours. While this may be an inaccurate average, this cap clearly prevents my family from using the data-heavy areas of the internet, which is ALSO in violation of Net Neutrality rules that make it unlawful for ISPs to target certain types of content and its delivery to consumers.

I am asking the FCC to enforce the rules and guidelines it establishes to protect the rights of the consumer.

---

**Ticket: # 498075 - Comcast data cap**

**Date:** 8/29/2015 1:12:10 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Nashville, Tennessee 37205

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Comcast has decided to issue a data cap of 300 GB in our market. Scattered usage of media devices last month has been enough to put us over this limit with three overage fees. This is ridiculous, we don't even constantly use the Internet. Comcast offers no option to see how you used your data, and simply states that you used a certain amount and must be billed for it. There is no transparency for seeing how. Internet usage is always evolving, and these data caps restrict even basic function and usage, and is designed to force you to pay more for regular usage. Multiple calls to Comcast have produced laughably horrible experiences, with no offers of a higher cap level and reps simply stating "this is the policy, that is all". I should not have to limit my WiFi usage when paying for Internet, as other markets do not have this limit and pay the same rates as I do with Comcast. We were never told of this when purchasing service either. I have the option to switch to another provider, but many in other "data capped" markets do not have fair competition. Something must be done about this shameful business practice.

---

**Ticket: # 508130 - Comcast Data Capping in Atlanta**

**Date:** 9/3/2015 11:02:07 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Atlanta, Georgia 30315

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

I just received notification that my household will be billed for going over a 300GB cap on our monthly internet data usage. This in itself is in direct violation of Net Neutrality rules, which prohibit ISPs from blocking access to lawful content.

The manner in which Comcast applies its data monitoring is also completely opaque--I have no idea how accurate is Comcast's data monitoring, as the company has shared zero information with me, the consumer. For example, my Comcast data "meter" shows that we are over 300GB for the month of August, but our billing cycle ended on August 14th--I don't understand how Comcast's illegal cap could be applied with any kind of "fairness" or "logic" if it is applied to straddle two different billing cycles. This lack of transparency is also in direct violation of Net Neutrality rules.

Furthermore, a cap of 300GB is ridiculous for today's Internet consumer, and, if enforced, would severely curtail my ability to fully use the Internet as the utility it is (for example, in the five minutes since I received my warning regarding our data cap, my Comcast "meter" shows that I am now 2GB beyond 300GB; extrapolating by using this 0.4GB/minute rate as an average would yield 300GB of data in just 12.5 hours. While this may be an inaccurate average, this cap clearly prevents my family from using the data-heavy areas of the internet, which is ALSO in violation of Net Neutrality rules that make it unlawful for ISPs to target certain types of content and its delivery to consumers.

I am asking the FCC to enforce the rules and guidelines it establishes to protect the rights of the consumer.

---

**Ticket: # 533842 - Comcast Data Usage Cap "Trial"****Date:** 9/16/2015 10:35:06 PM**City/State/Zip:** Collierville, Tennessee 38017**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

I recently "cut the cord" on my AT&T Uverse cable TV and switched to Comcast for my internet service provider. There are NO other choices in my area. I NEED a typical amount of data available for a family of 4 that streams Netflix, Hulu, Amazon Prime and SlingTV to replace my cable TV. I was NEVER informed of any data caps upon signing with Comcast and was issued an alert on my computer screen tonight that I have used upwards of 90% of my 300GB allowed. This is absolute trickery and should be illegal. How is this a trial if it has been occurring for upwards of 2 years (I found out tonight) and how can this be legal to impose this cap WITHOUT any disclosure to the consumer? I am furious about this and will be monitoring my usage closely for any \$10 per extra 50 GB and will demand a refund if imposed. How many customers does Comcast intend to squeeze \$10 per extra 50GB out of? The profit has to be in the many millions of dollars. This is a clear anti-trust law violation and a shady way for the cable companies to strongarm their cable cord cutters into paying them these ridiculous fees ANYWAY. It's a second slap in the face after you realize we have slower internet than North Korea. Please enforce your previous statement, FCC, to investigate these Data Usage Cap "Trials" to expose them for what they are: THIEVERY.

---

**Ticket: # 549758 - Xfinitywifi**

**Date:** 9/24/2015 3:24:44 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Boca Raton, Florida 33486

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Xfinity automatically enables their xfinity hotspot on your modem which in turns adds it as the number one default for wireless connection on your computer. It appears users are not able to disable it themselves. They have provided extremely cumbersome instructions that don't actually work. The problem is that it automatically defaults as a network connection and it is unsecure. Users are not even able to change the property settings to not have it automatically connect. This is wrong on so many levels it isn't even possible to list all the potential issues with this. This practice obviously exposes unknown users for hackers to obtain confidential and private information. As a regulatory compliance auditor, I am constantly reviewing my connections when I travel to ensure the xfinitywifi connection didn't automatically take over. I'm seriously baffled on why this is allowed at all without proper disclosure. I believe attwifi has the same level of intrusion. I had to actually contact them to have the hotspot removed from my modem. We'll see if it works. No confidence here.

---

**Ticket: # 568076 - Cox Cable Data Caps****Date:** 10/3/2015 5:27:44 PM**City/State/Zip:** Fairfax, Virginia 22031**Company Complaining About:** Cox

---

**Description**

I am a customer of Cox Cable for residential broadband, and I am also a government contractor for multiple agencies. My job is to maintain the up-time, efficiency, and SPEED of certain government agencies server's and applications that the government relies on. As an IT professional, I find it simply disgusting that broadband providers are able to get away with charging higher prices for residential packages that offer such low speeds, and most importantly, showing your data usage & data cap on a monthly basis (which there was no mention of when signing up). Now out of full disclosure, Cox has been one of the best cable companies I've dealt with in regards to their prices, availability, customer support, and packages offered, however I am still paying too much for my plan (which is the second fastest available), but logging in to their web site to check my account, I noticed that my plan apparently has a data cap, and it's only 700GB per month. While this might not be an issue for some people, the fact is that it is such a low number for a "premium" package plan. For someone like me who uses the internet frequently for both working from home (on-call) and for relaxation, that "data cap" is extremely low especially considering the cost. When I login to my Cox account on their web site, I can look at my total monthly usage and between my girlfriend and I, we regularly exceed their data cap every month. With the availability of services such as Netflix and higher quality HD media becoming an alternative to cable TV service, the caps they suggest are absurd. It's especially frustrating knowing that they are able to charge such a large amount of money per month for internet mediocre internet speeds when compared globally, but also knowing the technology exists to drastically increase the available bandwidth (speed) that their plans can provide with very little effort on their end. My chief complaint is in regards to the data cap trials they are running in Cleveland, OH. Luckily for me, it doesn't apply to me (yet) in northern Virginia or else I would be using another ISP and when compared to the world average, the US broadband market seriously falls behind. I was surprised when logging into my account to pay my bill to be notified by a popup that I had exceeded my monthly "data cap" for every single month. Again, luckily for me, Cox does not currently charge me for the extra usage, but just the notification leaves the impression that they are intending to roll that out at some point. I purchased the premium internet package because I knew that I would require the download speed and the plan said UNLIMITED data. What worries me is that they will eventually announce the data caps go into place in my area and then I'd be charged a ridiculous amount of money if I go over their 700g data cap, if they implement it. What's the point in paying for higher available bandwidth? It would result in me reaching my data cap faster and I assume would result in me being charged a ton of money. I know I'm not the only one who feels this way. I'm very glad the so-called "net neutrality" bill was passed, because I would rather give more control to the government than to private corporations who see streaming sites like Netflix as a threat to their TV businesses. I would ask the FCC to mandate that ISP's cannot mandate data caps on customers. As of today, the 3rd of October, I have already used 86% of my "monthly" cap, just from streaming movies, music, and from working the past few days quite a bit which required me to download a few hundred gigabytes of large data sets. After that, I would ask the FCC to do all it can do to stop ISP's from limiting the speeds they offer to customers, or lower the cost so it's not so expensive when they have plenty of upstream bandwidth available to support it, especially with the prices they charge. Again, to give credit where credit is due, Cox has cheaper plans than other



regional rivals such as Comcast, but the fact of the matter is the same and even Cox shouldn't be able to impose data caps on customers expecting higher speeds.

As far as Cox Cable goes, I hope those "trials" in Cleveland soon come to an end and the data usage warnings disappear from my Cox account page, and nothing is heard of proposed data caps again, otherwise a negative precedence will be set where only the customers suffer and only the big ISP's benefit. Comcast already has a terrible name among customers, and hopefully Cox doesn't become the next Comcast.

I've attached a screenshot from their website showing my "data usage". Note that I have 23 days left in the current billing/data cycle and I'm already at 86% usage. You can also see my overage for every month prior which is indicated in the yellow bars.

Thank you.

(b) (6)

---

**Ticket: # 580271 - data cap**

**Date:** 10/9/2015 9:52:58 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Temperance, Michigan 48182

**Company Complaining About:** Buckeye Cablesystem

---

## **Description**

As the FCC has voted to regulate broadband Internet services as a public utility, it needs to require ISP's to itemize bills or show valid proof of billed data usage. I am increasingly frustrated with the fact that my ISP (as well as my cellular data provider) can claim that I have increased usage of data, month after month, without showing me proof of said usage. I am asked at increasing frequency to pay more and more of my hard earned money for something that I cannot track on my own. The FCC has done an extremely poor job of protecting US consumers from predatory practices of ISP's by requiring checks and balances in their billing systems. Both myself and my husband are self-employed, work from home and require Internet access to conduct business. Our access to open internet is critical to the survival of both of our businesses and our ability to contribute to this country's economy. Why is it that I can at any time walk outside of my house and monitor my own electricity usage but if I ask for proof of data usage, I am told that I cannot be given access to that information to protect my own privacy? It seems to me that this practice only serves to protect the interests of ISP's who are not being monitored for honesty and transparency. In my area, Buckeye CableSystems is one of three ISP's available and by far holds the majority of customers. If I were to switch ISP's I would have to suffer inferior Internet speeds with no resolution to my current issue as neither of the competing companies provide some sort usage monitoring. This issue is left for the FCC to resolve not only for myself, but for all consumers.

---

**Ticket: # 598319 - No sweetheart, you can't watch Sesame Street we're over our data cap.**

**Date:** 10/18/2015 3:32:33 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Miami, Florida 33155

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Nearly 10 months after signing up for Comcast's Xfinity Internet service, I was notified yesterday that Comcast has unilaterally decided to impose a data cap on my home Internet usage.

Sadly, I first learned of this via an uninvited popup in my web browser advising that further usage would result in overage charges. A quick and costly Google search revealed that Comcast has decided to use Miami as a "test market" for capped data plans.

I can't decide what part of this is most disturbing, perhaps it is that there are actual human beings at Comcast, so interested in the bottom line, that they conjured up, and approved, committing this atrocity against fellow United States citizens. If there were ever a scheme designed to circumvent the strong net neutrality rules implemented by this Commission, this is it!

### **Real-world Consequences:**

- 1) Having to consider cost of broadband every time my daughter wants to watch her shows;
- 2) Having to consider the cost of submitting this complaint, because the reality is I am paying overages for it;
- 3) Reverting to purchasing hard copies of DVDs, video games, music etc as it is no longer an affordable option to download/stream digital copies--this should set the U.S. back a few years.
- 4) I have no choice but to continue to financially support this nonsense, there is no other high speed broadband option in my area.
- 5) I will be reducing the speed of my internet from 50-25(or whatever is the lowest) to offset the cost of overages; no point in paying for it if I cant use it;
- 6) Will be canceling one, or more, of the subscription-based streaming services that provide me with amazing products and services.

### **Complaint:**

Comcast has violated the REPORT AND ORDER ON REMAND, DECLARATORY RULING, AND ORDER In the Matter of Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet, which implements "Strong Rules That Protect Consumers from Past and Future Tactics that Threaten the Open Internet" by imposing data caps on home Internet usage. This practice is clearly designed to "unreasonably interfere or unreasonably disadvantage consumers or edge providers" , and places Comcast in the position of "gatekeeper". As a gatekeeper, Comcast is able to "extract unfair tolls" and will likely "reduce the rate of innovation at the edge".

I charge that Comcast has violated the Rules in the following ways:

Unreasonable Interference or Unreasonable Disadvantage :

With its implementation of data caps, Comcast is unreasonably interfering or disadvantaging end users' ability to select, access, and use broadband Internet access service or the lawful Internet content, applications, services, or devices of their choice; and,

Transparency:

Comcast, by continuing to advertise and sell its services as unlimited, or without notifying current and prospective customers of its data cap policies, has failed to meet its burden of Enhanced Transparency by not disclosing accurate information regarding the network management practices, performance, and commercial terms of its broadband Internet access services sufficient for consumers to make informed choices regarding use of such services and for content, application, service, and device providers to develop, market, and maintain Internet offerings.

Thank you.

---

**Ticket: # 625954 - Comcast Unfair Data Caps**

**Date:** 11/1/2015 3:37:03 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Cutler Bay, Florida 33189

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Hello,

I recently purchased a new home in South Miami and since there was no other option, I was forced to subscribe to Comcast internet. I have found out that I am in one of the geographical areas where Comcast is trying the 300GB data cap. Comcast refuses to let me know (via website, mail, or email, or any other method) what my usage details are. The lack of transparency are alarming. Comcast also considers data used via its xfiniti network NOT counting to the data cap, yet any other internet streaming DOES count toward data caps. This violates net neutrality, as Comcast is trying to force me to use only its slow, inefficient, own xfinity network. The U.S. is a market which prides itself on encouraging competition for innovation. The current internet provider situation in South Miami does nothing but hinder competition, innovation, and the ability of my neighbor's and I to keep up with the world in terms of development and innovation. Shame on Comcast and on the political entities who are limiting fair access to internet.

---

**Ticket: # 631334 - 300Gb Data Cap Being Instituted 12/01/2015**

**Date:** 11/3/2015 6:06:21 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Bryant, Arkansas 72022

**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

## **Description**

Today (11/03/2015) I received email notification from Comcast that my internet service, provided via Comcast, will soon (12/01/2015) be subject to the arbitrary, and what I believe to be anti-competition, 300Gb data cap.

Based on Comcast's usage meter, my family of four, has used almost all of what would be allowed under such a data cap each of the past three months (290, 250, and 271 respectively). While I would have not incurred additional charges any of these three months, the placing of a data cap limits my family's ability to utilize our service as we have been and should be allowed. We are not "cord cutters," we rely on a paid DirectTV service for the majority of our TV needs, though we also stream movies through Netflix and Amazon video services. This data cap seems to be punitive to customers that do rely on streaming services, which means my family no longer has that option.

Comcast has stated that I can elect to remove this data cap for only \$35 extra a month, which I believe is indicative of their true motives.

The FCC should investigate this practice of establishing these data caps based on their arbitrary nature, the ease that most modern households can use an excess of 300GB, and that data usage is going to continue to increase for most households.

For full disclosure, I do have an option to switch to ATT Uverse, which I now may seriously consider.

---

**Ticket: # 639879 - Clearwire/Sprint**

**Date:** 11/6/2015 1:24:26 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Aurora, Colorado 80017

**Company Complaining About:** Sprint

---

## **Description**

Sprint is clearly violating broadband internet transparency laws . They bought out clearwire and slowly have demolished it to its closure tomorrow afternoon. No clear comparable option is being offered because there isn't one and Sprint knows this well enough that they are leaving thousands without accessible internet access with its only option being buying into the monopoly that they are being allowed to create.

---

**Ticket: # 644438 - corporate malfeasance. put them out of business NOW and into jail!  
they are stealing from the customers ON PURPOSE**

**Date:** 11/8/2015 5:39:06 PM

**City/State/Zip:** Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464

**Company Complaining About:** Boost Mobile

---

## **Description**

SEND IMMEDIATE REPLY TO ME NOT BoostMobile/Sprint. They ARE criminals! AND lie and cheat like a used car salesman in a plaid suit.

NEED YOUR IMMEDIATE ASSISTANCE. Corporation stealing from and taking advantage of consumers. This is a form letter below sent to Sprint/Boost/etc. NO ONE DOING ANYTHING ABOUT THIS PROBLEM! Have contacted the FCC, FTC, US Atty General DOJ, PA Atty General, etc and ALL are corporate lackeys or bribes etc. Have evidence in letter below. NEED YOUR IMMEDIATE HELP!

Sunday April 12, 2015/November 16, 2015 Monday

(b) (6)

Pottstown PA 19464

(b) (6)

CANNOT PAY MORE, ON FIXED INCOME!

RE: STOP THE DATA THROTTLING, IMMEDIATELY!

As of this date, throttling issue problem still NOT fixed by them. ONLY excuses no REAL solutions to correct the problem made by them not consumer. UNLIMITED MEANS UNLIMITED NOT OTHER! NO exceptions NO excuses NO compromises! DEMAND RESTITUTION FOR THEIR MALFEASANCE! DON'T PASS this to others or another department! PERSONALLY take care of this issue yourself. THANKS! Corporate Policy NOT law! DON'T BE A CORPORATE LACKEY! YOUR JOB IS TO THE CONSUMER ONLY NOT THE CORPORATIONS!!!!

Regarding BOOSTMOBILE Worldwide a subsidiary of Sprint and SPRINT itself, and, Phone # (b) (6) had phone an HYDRO then Android since yr2011. Made by Kyocera. PRE-PAID CELL PHONE without contract. This IS a 3G phone. Everything updated through phone through System Update by this consumer regularly. Phone service ALWAYS paid ON-TIME on the first of each month at RadioShack in Pottstown PA for \$40.00/mos + tax. From Late yr2013 until now, phone service is \$40/mos + tax. Prior to that Shrinkage Plan was \$45 then \$50/mos + tax. \*PICK UP AND USE ONE OF THESE PHONES YOURSELF FOR APPROX. 6MOS OR SO TO SEE WHAT THE EVIDENCE LISTED BELOW AGAINST BOOSTMOBILE WHICH IS OWNED BY SPRINT truly is. You WILL see that we ARE CORRECT 100%! \* Company located in (CA) and Australia and Japan. CEO of Sprint used to be CEO of AT&T. Was replaced 2014. Current CEO/President used to be CEO of Marcelo Claure and now CEO of Sprint and ALSO on Board of Directors of his old company as well. ETHICS VIOLATIONS! See FTC vs AT&T "Data Throttling" Case NOT Cramming. Contacted FCC and FTC and NOTHING but excuses in 4-6mos+. On Shrinkage Plan where if customer/consumer pays regular payments without late payments and NO grace period past due date and in this case, \$50 to start monthly payments regular without missing payments or late then they drop to \$30-35/mos BUT the corporation LIED and it has NEVER gone below \$40/mos + taxes & 9-1-1 fee. These phones can be bought at RadioShack in Pottstown PA.



Phone cost yr2013 was \$50.00 and new phone bought yr2014 was \$80.00 PLUS monthly without late payments of \$40/mos. NEVER below these costs. The corporation changed their "policy" to avoid giving on-purpose the consumer a savings at a lower cost. Prices always rise due to corporation greed and criminal misconduct.

ALSO see box in stores with bait 'n switch FRAUD where corporation states on box that UNLIMITED talk, text, web/internet. Advertising on television and in magazines and in stores IS A LIE as NOTHING UNLIMITED with this phone or company ALWAYS catches that SURPRISES consumer and NEVER notifies consumer EVER written, verbal, etc. NOTHING ever stated about THROTTLING data back from 3G to 2.5G after 5-6 days which makes this phone USELESS! ACTUALLY, phone much slower than 2.5G from 3G after throttling as more likely at 2G or even 1.5G. Takes forever to load YouTube, etc. No asterisk or footnotes etc. NO arbitration because corporation does NOT want trials too expensive for greedy fraudulent corporation and so with arbitration PLUS they know they would lose all the time anyway during a trial, corporation decides and wins NOT consumer. SERVICE goes from 3rd each month to 3rd of next month. Loading data from internet takes what seems "forever" if it doesn't kick you out before this is loaded (Examples: Youtube keeps loading and loading and loading without ever running OR runs then stops and runs and stops ever 1-3seconds or so. BUT by the 8th or 9th or 10th or 11th of each month the service gets WORSE for the last 3wks of each month. USED to be around the 20th or 21st of each month now down to 9th or 10th or so over the past few years with nothing EVER told to consumer about changes or options or whatever before these throttling back of data done as they change their terms AT WILL without notify consumers EVER. Bill ALWAYS paid on the 1st of each month and due by the 2nd of each month. NEVER LATE or bill jumps without GRACE PERIOD (greedy bastard corporations as their ALWAYS MUST be grace period of at least 7days due to paychecks, US Mail, etc to get bill paid on-time) afterward to \$55.00/month without Shrinkage Plan. Booklet which comes with phone USELESS doesn't tell how to use the features. ALSO, when phone activated, this IS when contract signed NOT before and consumer NEVER told about this. CANNOT afford to pay more BECAUSE costs NOT the issue AS are ALL phones no matter what the price operate the same with same "Throttling BACK OF DATA." ALL phones the same as far as throttling goes regardless of costs. NO MORE TRICKS OR DECEPTIONS OR LOOPHOLES BY CORPORATIONS!!!! Each consumer MUST paid back in-full for all years that they were using corrupt corporation's services. Restitution + monies for time and hassle, etc. Civil and criminal suits against BoostMobile/SPRINT.

See attached. SEE EVIDENCE BELOW and from previous handwritten letters too.

\*\* MAIN concern is with BoostMobile/Sprint as they are the phone company with complaints against. Guilty of fraud, price gouging, price fixing, deception and bait 'n switch, off-shoring of profits and inversion, tax evasion with profits, conspiracy, collusion, RICO, etc. Many other consumers have had the same problems as we are having with Boost/Sprint! Corporate POLICY NOT LAW!!!!

LAWS THEY HAVE BROKEN (plus see AT&T versus FCC): RICO, collusion, conspiracy, Sprint profits offshoring/tax evasions, bait 'n switch explain: they seem to be pushing their "consumers" with older 2.5G and 3G phones products away from 3G and toward 4G, 5G, 10G phones and also toward newer more updated technologies and MORE EXPENSIVE phones UNAFFORDABLE except for the rich 1% so that they can make more money from their suckers "customers" by throttling and slow data speeds and awful customer services. They do this so that their suckers can get angry and go out and buy the more unaffordable and expensive newer technologies and phones that the consumer cannot afford unless they are rich 1% EVEN PRESIDENT OBAMA is for NET-NEUTRALITY so that ALL citizens and consumers get the same access and speed no matter what they pay contract phone

or pre-paid phone or not. THE CORPORATIONS ARE NOT DOING THIS and won't AND ONLY CARE ABOUT MONEY AS PER THEIR ACTIONS NOT WORDS. That is why they are throttling (i.e. STEALING!). ALSO this is IMMORAL and they are illegally doing this and breaking plenty of laws, ....

Contacted Sprint and/or they called us since about 3-6mos ago regarding BoostMobile and the throttling (i.e. stealing and lies to consumers, etc) and got nowhere as they ONLY care about money and the shareholders and profits. As per their actions. They ONLY offer "crumbs from the table" which is NOTHING!!!! Doesn't make it right or moral since 2013 when service got terrible and throttling began AND since 2011-2011 and throttling began. ONLY excuses to cover up their malfeasance. THEY ONLY WANT CONSUMERS TO PAY MORE, YET, GET SAME TERRIBLE DATA THROTTLE SERVICE = STEALING.

NEMO EST SUPRA LEGIS!

DO NOT let this dishonest greedy CUT BACK OR THROTTLE or whatever it's changed to now service ever again. Service and reception MUST NOT be hindered or obstructed. EVERYONE MUST get the same exact service no matter what type of phone or amount is paid. NO exceptions

---

**Ticket: # 645546 - Data Limits****Date:** 11/9/2015 1:54:03 PM**City/State/Zip:** Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130**Company Complaining About:** Comcast

---

**Description**

Comcast has a 300gb data limit, of which I was never informed of when I set up my service with them. That is a legal disclosure that should be addressed at time of setting up service. Instead, I am now getting overage charges for data that I was not aware of was limited. This is a blatant legal issue that should have been brought up at time of service being ordered. Other than next month offering an "unlimited data" option, that is \$35 more, where everywhere else is only \$30 more because of, "policy," I think is a blatant disregard and lack of care for their customers wellbeing, and more so just a want to get more money in their pockets. Data limits are preventing me from being able to use my internet for work and pleasure. As some one who works from home, a data limit on my internet is very hard to work with, and causes more problems than it should. I have never had a data limit before from any other provider other than Comcast.

---

**Ticket: # 692778 - T-Mobile's "Unlimited" Data Services are secretly Throttled @ 512GB**

**Date:** 12/5/2015 10:51:18 AM

**City/State/Zip:** Carnation, Washington 98014

**Company Complaining About:** T Mobile

---

**Description**

Dear Sirs,

I would like to file a formal complaint with the FCC regarding T-Mobile's Unlimited Data Services.

Upon reaching 512GB of data in a billing cycle T-Mobile is throttling customers back down from LTE speeds to GSM(Edge) connectivity only.

This is exactly what AT&T was recently fined \$100M by the FCC for doing to their customers.

I want the FCC to force T-Mobile to QUIT throttling customers or fine them exactly the same way that AT&T was fined for this same illegal behavior.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2015/06/17/att-just-got-hit-with-a-100-million-fine-after-slowing-down-its-unlimited-data/>

To quote Chairman Wheeler on this deceptive corporate transparency practice:

"By not properly disclosing the policy to consumers who thought they were getting "unlimited" data, the company violated the FCC's rules on corporate transparency, FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler said in a statement.

"Consumers deserve to get what they pay for," Wheeler said. "Broadband providers must be upfront and transparent about the services they provide. The FCC will not stand idly by while consumers are deceived by misleading marketing materials and insufficient disclosure."

Further, I believe that any attempt by cellular companies to either throttle or discriminate by type of data being sent from attached devices is a Network Neutrality Bright line Violation.

<https://www.fcc.gov/openinternet>

"February 26, 2015, the FCC's Open Internet rules"

Bright Line Rules:

- No Blocking: broadband providers may not block access to legal content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices.
- No Throttling: broadband providers may not impair or degrade lawful Internet traffic on the basis of content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices.

- No Paid Prioritization: broadband providers may not favor some lawful Internet traffic over other lawful traffic in exchange for consideration of any kind—in other words, no "fast lanes." This rule also bans ISPs from prioritizing content and services of their affiliates.

<http://money.cnn.com/2015/08/31/technology/tmobile-data-theives/>

John Legere, CEO of T-Mobile, has vowed to throttle unlimited customers whose overall data usage exceeds some undisclosed threshold. This is in direct conflict with the Open Internet rules both on throttling and on discrimination based on services.

"Legere said that some customers are using special software to skirt past T-Mobile's data limits. He said if they continue to abuse the network, they'll be kicked off T-Mobile's unlimited data plans."

~~~~~  
~~~~~

Upon requesting usual LTE data services after 512GB:

Code: 0X00060026 - NETWORK\_FAILURE

Details: This ESM cause is used by the network to indicate that the requested service was rejected due to an error situation in the network.

This error description can also be saved as a text file. That would enable you to send it to the customer supporter via email.

#### Result

##### Wireless Status

1	PLMN:	
2	Service Status:	Restricted services
3	Bandwidth(kHz):	10000
4	Cell ID:	399
5	Signal Strength:	3
6	RSRP(dBm):	-95
7	RSRQ(dB):	-7
8	Roam:	YES

Upon requesting any data service after 512GB: (throttled to EDGE)

#### Status

SIM card status	PIN disabled
Network mode	GSM (EDGE)
Connection status	Connected

