



PO Box 10189
Grand Cayman KY1-1002
Cayman Islands
Tel: (345) 946-4282
Fax: (345) 945-8284

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 and 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 premises in question was a business premises, and the customer was advised to report the matter internally.

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:

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.

Case # C15 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 10 March 2026

Summary

The customer reported that they were being charged an automatic daily roaming fee of \$10.00. Flow advised that, provided data roaming was not enabled on the customer's FLOW service, roaming data charges should not be incurred. The customer was further advised that, when travelling and using a separate travel eSIM selected for data services, any data usage should be billed to that eSIM rather than to the FLOW mobile service. The customer subsequently indicated that they were satisfied with the explanation provided and confirmed that the issue had not recurred.

Case # C17 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 9 April 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they were unable to place international calls to the United States. The customer was informed that, in accordance with the Office's complaints policy, complaints should first be submitted directly to the relevant service provider. The customer was further advised that, if the matter remains unresolved following the service provider's review, they may contact the Office for further assistance.

Case # C19 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 12 April 2026

Summary

The customer reported that their mobile internet service was experiencing frequent interruptions. A Digicel technician attended the property and conducted various tests. The results of the on-site assessment were normal, and the diagnostic logs did not identify any faults or issues on Digicel's network.

Case # C20 – 2026

Entity involved: defamatory statements

Date of Complaint: 14 April 2026

Summary

The customer reported that defamatory statements had allegedly been made against them. The customer was advised to report the matter to the Royal Cayman Islands Police Service.

Case # C21 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 14 April 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they had made several attempts to obtain a refund from Flow but had been unable to resolve the matter directly with the service provider. Following receipt of the complaint, the Office contacted Flow to seek clarification and facilitate a response regarding the outstanding refund request. Flow subsequently confirmed that the refund had been processed, and the customer was issued the refund on 21 April 2026.

Case # C22 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 15 April 2026

Summary

The customer reported being charged a late payment fee, a reconnection fee, and a service fee. Upon review of the customer's billing records, the Office determined that only the late payment fee was applied. The reconnection and service fees had been reversed by the service provider and were therefore not charged to the customer's account.

Case # C23 – 2026

Entity involved: Logic

Date of Complaint: 28 April 2026

Summary

The customer advised that their internet service had been unavailable for two days and that they had had trouble contacting the service provider. The Office provided the customer with the relevant contact details for Logic to report the issue. The customer subsequently confirmed that they were able to contact Logic and that the matter had been resolved.

Case # C24 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 1 May 2026

Summary

The customer advised that they were no longer able to access their voicemail service. Following intervention by the Office, the matter was raised with the service provider, which subsequently assisted the customer in resolving the issue. A representative of the service provider was able to guide the customer through the necessary steps to regain access to their voicemail functionality, resulting in the matter being satisfactorily addressed.

Case # C25 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 3 May 2026

Summary

The customer alleged that fuel prices at a retail gas station had increased by approximately 100% over a two-week period and expressed concern that the increase constituted price gouging. The Office reviewed the complaint and conducted an assessment of the relevant pricing information. Following its review, the Office advised the customer that the price increase was attributable to the higher landed cost of a new fuel shipment and was consistent with the wholesale price adjustment implemented by the importer.

Case # C26 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 1 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that a number of allegedly malicious and defamatory posts had been published about them on a social media platform. Upon review, the Office advised the customer that the matter fell outside its regulatory jurisdiction and was more appropriately addressed by the competent law enforcement authorities. Accordingly, the customer was directed to report the matter to the Police Service, which possesses the authority and investigative mandate to assess and pursue complaints relating to potential criminal conduct or unlawful online activity.

Case # C27 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 5 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that their internet service had been unavailable for a portion of the morning and expressed concern that they had not been notified by the service provider, Flow, of the service disruption. Upon inquiry by the Office, Flow confirmed that it was aware of the outage and had dispatched a technical team to investigate and rectify the issue. This information was subsequently

communicated to the customer. The customer was further advised that, in accordance with established complaint-handling procedures, service-related issues should first be reported directly to the service provider to allow an opportunity for resolution before the matter is escalated to the Office.

Case # C28 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 8 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that CUC had undertaken tree-trimming activities adjacent to their property and alleged that fallen tree branches came into contact with electrical lines servicing the residence, resulting in an interruption of electricity supply for approximately one week. Upon investigation, CUC advised that the service disruption was not attributable to its vegetation management activities but rather resulted from defective electrical components located within the customer's premises. The Office communicated the utility provider's explanation to the customer. The customer subsequently indicated that they did not accept CUC's assessment of the matter and advised that they intended to seek independent legal advice regarding the issues raised.

Case # C29 – 2026

Entity involved: Digicel

Date of Complaint: 3 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that, despite subscribing to Digicel's highest-tier postpaid plan, they were experiencing persistent issues with slow mobile data connectivity and call performance. The matter was referred to Digicel for investigation. In response, Digicel advised that it had conducted network testing in relation to the customer's device and service. The service provider reported that no faults or service deficiencies were identified during its assessment. Digicel further provided the results of testing conducted at various locations relevant to the customer's complaint, all of which indicated that network performance was operating within expected parameters and that no service-related issues were detected. The findings of the investigation were communicated to the customer. The customer, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the response provided and maintained concerns regarding the service provider's level of accountability in addressing the reported issues. The Office advised the customer of the outcome of the investigation and recorded their continued dissatisfaction with the provider's position.

Case # C30 & C31 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 10 May 2026

Summary

The customers expressed dissatisfaction with Flow's decision to discontinue its candw.ky email service. Upon receiving the complaint, the Office engaged with the service provider and requested that the deadline for the discontinuation of the email service be extended to provide affected customers with additional time to make alternative arrangements. Flow subsequently agreed to extend the applicable deadlines. The Office communicated the revised discontinuation dates to the customers and advised that the decision to discontinue the candw.ky email service constituted a business and operational matter within the service provider's discretion. As such, while the Office facilitated communication and sought additional transitional accommodations for affected customers, the ultimate decision regarding the continuation or cessation of the service remained within the provider's lawful business operations.

Case # C32 – 2026

Entity involved: CUC

Date of Complaint: 26 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported concerns regarding the relocation of a utility pole on their property by CUC and the trimming of trees that had previously provided shade to their residence. The customer further inquired as to why representatives of the Office were present at the site during the execution of the works alongside personnel from CUC. Upon review of the matter, the Office advised the customer that CUC, pursuant to the rights and obligations conferred under its licence and applicable regulatory framework, was authorized to relocate utility infrastructure where necessary to facilitate the provision of service to new and existing customers in a developing area. The Office explained that the works undertaken formed part of the utility's efforts to accommodate continued growth and expansion within the service area. The Office further clarified that its representatives were present at the location at the request of CUC in an oversight capacity to ensure that the utility's activities were being conducted in accordance with its regulatory obligations, licence conditions, and applicable standards. Following this explanation, the customer was advised of the Office's role and the basis upon which the utility works were being carried out.

Case # C33 – 2026

Entity involved: Flow

Date of Complaint: 22 May 2026

Summary

The customer reported that an electrical outage had occurred at their business premises and alleged that, as a result of the outage, their telephone line developed a fault. The customer further advised that, despite having reported the issue to the service provider, Flow, they had not received a timely response or resolution. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Office engaged with Flow and sought an update regarding the status of the reported fault. Following the Office's intervention, the service provider investigated the matter and subsequently undertook the necessary corrective actions to restore the affected telephone service. The customer was advised of the steps taken by the service provider, and the matter was ultimately resolved to the extent that service functionality was restored.