

To: Secretary
PA. P.U.C.
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA. 17105-3265

From: Robert Kocher
1108 S. Prospect st
Nanticoke, Pa. 18634-3807
570-735-1736

Re: Kocher vs. Pa. American Water
Docket # C-2011-2254375

Dear Sir/Mam,

Good Day. It was ordered by your office for the two parties in this complaint to try resolving this complaint between each other if possible to prevent the need for a hearing. Well as I believe I acted in good faith the atty for Pa. American water I believedid not. The Atty. did try to resolve the complaint not by means of discussion but by means of intimidation. From day one the Atty. said he would take my concerns and complaints to the utility and in GOOD FAITH try to resolve my concerns. But each and every time we spoke or communicated he only spoke about getting me a grant. He never mentioned anything further about my complaint. As you will see he was only interested in closing this complaint and had no interest in helping me or other customers that would benefit from one or more of my requests. Several times that we spoke he said that I was eligible for a grant if I would make two fifty dollar payments within thirty days and I told him that if unable to make the two fifty dollar payments I would make one \$100.00 payment within the thirty days. I told him that when I applied for a grant that it was denied due to the fact of my income being too high. He checked and said that my income was not too high and that I was eligible for a grant to help pay some of my past due balance. He told me that he would submit an application for the grant for me to help me out, yet every time I spoke to him he still had not submitted the application. Weeks have gone by and on April 26th had called and got very upset that I still was asking questions about the shut-off notices the company sends and at that point revealed the game he was playing. In order for me to get a grant for my bill that I am supposed to be eligible based on need and income, I would have to resolve my complaint with the water company.

Kocher vs. Pa. American Water
Docket # C-2011-2254375

So as of that day he screamed at me that he would no longer communicate on the phone with me and if I wanted the grant I have five days to agree with the email he sent me or he was going to report me to the ALJ and request a hearing. It is interesting however to see Atty Gruin edited the email conversation between us as to remove comments mad by him to me. After of our last conversation I have no desire to speak to him about this and called to request a hearing on April 26, 2012 but I did not have the docket number and the PUC employee could not locate my complaint in the system, this is the reason for my letter. Please schedule a hearing for this matter. Thank you for your time and unfortunately this could not be resolved when there is no Good faith attempt made. Enclosed are the e-mails sent to and from Atty. Gruin as I have stated it is obvious that from the very beginning he was only interested in making me go away, he at no point was intent on resolving any issue I had raised. Why would you edit your comments from the emails you sent? Most often it is because you don't want them read. When two parties are in disagreement it is essential to have a neutral non-biased third party to look at the evidence, compare the two explanations of the events and come to a well informed decision about what is the more likely scenario. It isn't always what we want the outcome to be but you can always tell who is has not acted in good faith. Once again I contacted Pa. American water customer service and they notified me again that they do NOT apply for grants to Dollar Energy for customers and that I MUST call them directly to make application for any grants. I can't wait to hear Atty Gruins answers under oath.

Thank You for your time and consideration,

Robert w. Kocher