



Utility Regulation and Competition Office

Case # C1 – 2026

Entity involved: Gas Station (Little Cayman)

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The customer reported that fuel prices fluctuate in Grand Cayman but appear to remain unchanged in Little Cayman. The customer also raised concerns that fuel was being sold in U.S. gallons rather than imperial gallons. The customer was advised that, because fuel shipments to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman are less frequent than shipments to Grand Cayman, fuel prices on the Sister Islands generally do not fluctuate as often. The customer was further informed that the Office had calibrated the fuel pump in Little Cayman and confirmed that the fuel-dispensing equipment is dispensing fuel in imperial gallons, as required under the Dangerous Substances Regulations.

Case # C2 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 12 January 2026

Summary

The customer reported that the telephone lines at their location are not functioning properly and that the system intermittently freezes during use. The business entity has advised that it will conduct checks on the relevant lines and consult with its information technology department, as it was not previously aware of the reported issue.

Case # C3 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The complainant advised that they were issued with an incorrect bill in respect of their iPhone services and requested accurate receipts and billing records from the service provider. The Office subsequently engaged with Flow in relation to the matter, following which the duplicate charges were identified and removed from the complainant's account.

Case # C4 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had completed the required documentation to close their account and returned Flow's equipment; however, they continued to be billed incorrectly despite Flow's indication that the error would be corrected. URCO subsequently contacted Flow regarding the matter, following which the issue was resolved.

Case # C5 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 30 January 2026

Summary

The customer advised that two telephones were purchased from a private business and that a Flow SIM card was subsequently inserted; however, the devices did not function as expected. This Office made several attempts to contact the customer but was unable to establish communication. Based on

the information available, it was determined that the devices were restricted from accepting a Flow SIM card and Flow would need to look at the phone.

Case # C6 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 15 January 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had notified Flow of their intention to cancel the account but did not receive a response. Flow subsequently indicated that the customer's request had been sent to a closed mailbox and confirmed that it would now take the necessary action to address the matter. Despite several follow-up attempts by the Office; the customer did not respond to confirm whether the matter had been resolved.

Case # C8 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 28 January 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they had been without service for several days and expressed the view that the service provider should have issued a public notice regarding the outage. The customer also requested a credit in respect of the service interruption. The customer was advised that there is currently no legislative provision requiring compensation in such circumstances; however, the Office intends to undertake a consultation to consider this issue further.

Case # C10 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 23 February 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had inadvertently failed to pay their telephone bill, following which their service was disconnected after four days. The customer further stated that, when attempting to make payment online, they received a notification indicating that the account had been temporarily suspended due to late payment. The customer was advised that a formal complaint should first be submitted to Flow before the Office could intervene in the matter.

Case # C11 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 6 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported experiencing intermittent service issues. However, the Office was unable to determine whether the matter related to Wi-Fi connectivity or internet service. The Office contacted the customer to arrange a meeting in order to obtain a clearer understanding of the issues raised. As the customer did not respond, the matter was subsequently closed.

Case # C14 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 2 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported experiencing frequent interruptions to their internet signal. Digicel attended the customer's residence and conducted various tests, which did not identify any faults on Digicel's network. Digicel advised the customer to connect their smartphone to the home internet Wi-Fi modem, particularly as the customer had indicated that the connection performed well when using high bandwidth applications such as TikTok, Instagram, and Facebook.