

September 29, 2011

Munro v. PECO
Docket No. C-2010-2214718


Judge Eranda Vero:

Out of the blue, and after 6 mos. since first hearing, PECO called this week saying they would be out to check my meter. No evidence they have been here yet.

Unless this report is completed before the hearing on Monday, we will not have the info. needed to discuss the huge bill in January 2011 and other months.

It is a hardship for me to come to center city. Unless the meter report is completed I am requesting a postponement of Monday's hearing.

Please let me know. Thank you.



James Munro

CC: PUC

RECEIVED
2011 DEC 15 PM 12:24
P.A. PUC
SECRETARY'S BUREAU



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
801 MARKET STREET, SUITE 4063
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107
(215) 560-2105

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

September 15, 2011

James Munro
21 Algonquin Court
Wayne, PA 19087

Re: James Munro v. PECO Energy Company
Docket No. C-2010-2214718

RECEIVED
2011 DEC 15 PM 12:24
PA PUC
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Dear Mr. Munro:

On September 14, 2011, I received via fax your letter dated September 13, 2011. In your letter you confirm that you have notice of the further hearing scheduled in the above-captioned case for October 3, 2011.

The further hearing was scheduled for the limited purpose of collecting evidence regarding your high billing dispute concerning the period December 2010 – January 2011, when you claim you had left your residence due to back surgery and recovery period.

As you may recall, this claim was not part of your original complaint filed December 7, 2010, nor of your letter dated January 11, 2011 amending the original complaint. Instead, it was included as “New Matter” to your response to PECO’s New Matter.

While the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure provide for the filing of a response to New Matter, they do not recognize as pleading New Matter raised in response to New Matter. In addition, your “New Matter” raises legal and factual issues that are separate and distinct from the issues raised in your original and amended Complaint.

Usually, such documents are stricken from the record of the case, and the proponent of the document is asked to file a new complaint. However, in order to facilitate the resolution of all your claims, and with PECO’s consent, I agreed to consider your high billing dispute for the period December 2010 – January 2011 in a further hearing.

To reiterate, the further hearing scheduled for October 3, 2011 concerns your high billing dispute for the period December 2010 – January 2011. You should prepare for the hearing accordingly.

Sincerely,



Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

Enclosures

cc: Service List w/enc.

RECEIVED

2011 DEC 15 PM 12:24

PA FUD
SECRETARY'S BUREAU