

12-15-12

Jack Bleiman  
111 Fellowship Rd.  
Moorestown, N.J. 08057

RECEIVED  
2012 DEC 18 PM 11:20  
PA P.U.C.  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

EXCEPTIONS OF Jack Bleiman v. Peco Energy f-2012-2284038

Concerning the entry into the basement by Peco employees. The meters are in the basement of the property. The tenant had no legal access to the basement and therefore did not have the right to allow anyone into the basement without my permission. On P.24 the ALJ refers to Right of Access." The Company's identified employees shall have access to the premises of the customer at all reasonable times for the purpose of reading meters, and for installing, testing, inspecting, repairing, removing or changing any or all equipment belonging to the Company." The basement was not 'the premises of the customer'. As i stated above she had no legal access to the basement. Therefore Peco had no right to enter the basement without my knowledge and consent. Just on this fact alone the case should be dismissed.

The ALJ states on P.24 1. "the party filing the Complaint bears the burden of proving that he/she is entitled to relief from the Commission. 2. Burden of Proof means a duty to establish one's case by a preponderance of the evidence, which requires that the evidence be more convincing by "even the smallest of degree", than the evidence presented by the other side. The ALJ then states on P.25 4. 'The Complainant has sustained his burden of proof, in part, regarding incorrect billed charges. There is also the letter sent to me by Peco which stated 'the portion of that balance attributable to the foreign wiring will be transferred into your name" On P.23 the ALJ states " I find the above Peco letters additional reason to fine the Company. The ALJ says that the incorrect billing and the letters were negligence on Peco's part. Enough so as to fine Peco \$3680.00. So the PUC gets \$3680.00. Yet it was I that was harmed by Peco's negligence. So why therefore am i not entitled to relief from the commission.

There are many aspects of this case that are very disturbing. If the tenant was doing what she was supposed to do, pay the bill every month, then there would have been no balance to transfer so according to Peco/Puc i would only have been responsible for what...the amount attributable to foreign wiring, but by not paying her bills [doing the wrong thing], the tenant benefit! The PUC is acting highly irresponsibly taking this position. It lends itself to illegal actions and abuse by tenants. As in this case where the unit was cleared of having foreign wiring by Peco P.6 11. "in May 2011, Peco and the Complainant's maintenance man met at the service address and agreed that there was no longer foreign wiring." So how is it Peco found foreign wiring again in Feb. 2012. And again the tenant had run up a high balance because she wasn't paying the Peco monthly bill and then immediately moved out after Peco found the 2nd case of foreign wiring. So was Peco negligent in clearing it the first time or ?

c.c. PA Office of Consumer Advocate

*Jack Bleiman*

f.232

JACK BLEIMAN  
111 FELLOWSHIP ROAD  
MOORESTOWN NJ 08057

RECEIVED

2012 DEC 18 PM 11:20

PA P.O.C.  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

SOUTH JERSEY NJ 080

17 DEC 2012 PM 1 L



Secretary  
Pa POC  
P.O. Box 3265  
Hamburg Pa 17105-3265