

Subject: Regulation AA

Date: Jul 31, 2008

Proposal: Regulation AA - Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices

Document ID: R-1314

Document

Version: 1

Release
Date: 05/02/2008

Name: Muki W Fairchild

Affiliation:

Category of
Affiliation:

Address:

City: Durham

State: NC

Country: UNITED STATES

Zip: 27707

PostalCode: 27707

Comments:

I strongly support Regulation AA. Here's is a copy of a letter I wrote to all 3 of my congressional representatives with an update: My husband, a 75 year old retired physician has had a longstanding account with Citibank with an excellent record. Recently he inadvertently sent in a check for \$4,233.15 that was received on 5/30/08, which was \$200 short - his error. He expected a finance charge, but not the one that was levied on 6/13/08 totaling \$117.45 or 59% of the amount that he had neglected to pay. He called the company and spoke with a customer service representative who, after looking at his payment record and the many years that he has used his credit card, agreed to waive the charge this one time. Several days later, a letter came telling him that "After a further review, we have determined that your account is not eligible for a credit of the finance charges." I made the next call to the customer service number on 6/30/08 and this time I talked with a very nice woman who assured me the charge would be taken off and so far, it has been. At my request, she sent me a letter showing me how the charges are computed. As you probably know from others, the reason the finance charge was so high, is because it was computed on the entire

balance of the month, not on the \$200 my husband still owed. In other words, we were charged interest on money THAT WAS ALREADY PAID. How this can be legal, is beyond us. And despite the fact that my husband has an MD and I also have a graduate degree, I defy anyone to understand the rather convoluted language of the form letter that we were sent explaining how the finance charges are accumulated and that are, no doubt in the information in the small print, that we get every year. We sincerely hope that Congress will, on their already crowded agenda, tackle the credit card industry. Although we can afford the \$117. finance charge, we know that it is much higher for many others and that they are the ones who can not and just get deeper in debt each month. Here's the addendum: the following month. The credit card bill, showed the adjustment for the \$117. AND it showed another finance charge for \$112. We were astonished. Why?? Another call to Citi card. Two representatives later, they agreed to remove the charge after saying that it was because the charge was levied on the balance for 2 months. This seemed absurd and was definitely NOT stated in the letter we had received explaining how finance charges are levied. Remember, the original "sin" that my husband had committed - the missing \$200, had long since been paid. Please, please, do something about what would be judged criminal activity, that is stealing, if one individual did this to another in the real world. Thank you for collecting our comments!
Muki W Fairchild, MSW and Charles R Keith, MD