

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

RECEIVED

2012 JUL 31 AM 10:04

PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Tyrian D. Granberry

VS.

F-2012-23/3139

Peco Energy Company

RECEIVED
2012 AUG 10 AM 9:48
PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Plaintiff's Response

- 1) Plaintiff Notice on numerous bills that there was excessive amount's on the billing statement's.
- 2) Plaintiff state's the amount being used was not the amount's being charged.
- 3) Plaintiff filed a dispute with the Public Utility Commission.
- 4) Soon after plaintiff was being advised to put in a request for a decrease.

5) Plaintiff put in such request for number of occupant's, amount of budget and usage.

6) Plaintiff was now being informed to be put on a special program.

7) Plaintiff received a letter following a phone consultation about the program.

8) Plaintiff followed the agreement's to the program.

9) Plaintiff reports that the electricity was shut off due to default of agreement.

10) Plaintiff repeatedly states the non-fault to the said agreement.

11) Plaintiff states that it was said to a number of person's including, Customer Service Rep,

10) Supervisor, Public Utility Commissioner's Agent and Peco's Corporate office, THAT there had to be a mistake.

RECEIVED

AUG 10 2012

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

12) Plaintiff states that the letter was misworded which led to a default.

13) Plaintiff states being on a budget bill in the amount of \$86. a month, in which Plaintiff was disputing due to Family Income vs. Usage

14) Plaintiff states how being put on a special program results in a higher budget than original amount

15) Plaintiff was inconvenienced and without electricity due to a matter that could have been handled appropriately

16) Plaintiff suffered emotionally, DAMAGES, STRESS AND INCONVENIENCE. SERIOUS
8/14/12
Tyron D. Gearberry
7/23/12

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

RECEIVED

AUG 10 2012

Tyrion D Gearberry

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

VS.

F. 2012-23/3139

Peco Energy Company

In Conclusion

Plaintiff states that payment's was made monthly in the the amount's requested by Defendant less the amount that was not clear in the payment letter. Plaintiff asserts how is it that being on a special program result in the amount being higher than the original agreement that was being disputed due to family income and usage. Plaintiff make payment a new charges plus \$16.67 as indicated in agreement

Letter. 8/20/12
Tyrion D Gearberry
8/5/12

Tyrion D. Gearberry
8/5/12

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

Tyrian D. Greenberry

VS.

F-2012-23/3/39

Peco Energy Company

Verification

I, Tyrian D. Greenberry hereby Acknowledge the
Facts set forth here within to be the truth by the
best of my knowledge.

RECEIVED

AUG 10 2012

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Tyrian D. Greenberry

[Signature]
7/23/12

SECRETARY

[Signature]
8/8/12

PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

2012 JUL 31 AM 10:04

RECEIVED

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

RECEIVED

AUG 10 2012

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Tyler D. Granberry

VS.

F. 2012-2313139

Peco Energy Company

Certificate of Service

I, Tyler D. Granberry hereby certify this day
A copy of Plaintiff's Answer to motion by mailing
A copy to the above defendant's At:

separately
Tyler D. Granberry
Peco Energy Company
2301 Market Street, 5-23-1
PO Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

~~RECEIVED
2012 JUL 31 AM 10: 04
PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU~~

CC: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Tyrian B Greenberg
1203 W 7th St
Harrisburg, PA, 17103

RECEIVED

2012 AUG 10 AM 9:48

PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

20

USA FIRST CLASS FOREVER



THIS MAIL HAS BEEN PROCESSED
BY THE POSTAGE DUE SECTION
AT HARRISBURG, PA 17107

17120009399

