

BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

STEVE ATUAHENE ;  
Complainant

v. ; C-2012-2299868

RECEIVED  
2013 FEB 12 AM 8:27  
PA PUC  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

RECEIVED

PECO ENERGY COMPANY  
Defendant ;

NOV 19 2012

Public Utility Commission  
Philadelphia Office  
Administrative Law Judge

COMPLAINANTS OBJECTIONS TO PECO  
LATE-FILED EXHIBITS 11-14

Complainant Pro Se, STEVE ATUAHENE, objections to Peco late-filed Exhibits 11-14 include but not limited to the following:

I. PROCEDURAL

PECO's late-filed Exhibits prejudice complainants cause in that said filings denied him the opportunity to ~~do~~ do due diligence through the use of experts to review said document. Complainant wanted the trial to be postponed to allow such ~~is~~ needed discovery under the relevant rules. However, PECO refused to agree and the case went ahead. Thus to allow PECO at this late hour to file said document without complainant timely and needed opportunity to use required experts to examine such documents at the late hour of trial and adjudication of this case clearly violate both

procedural and substantive due process of the law. The Exhibits therefore should not be allowed.

## II. SUBSTANTIVE

First the documents submitted are ~~retracted~~ too technical for average consumer to be able to understand their purpose. This removes the needed fairness in this adjudication. They should have been available earlier in the proceeding for complainant to have hired experts to review its authenticity and utility. This PECO failed to do. PECO should not be allowed to benefit from such manipulations.

Secondly, a careful analysis of the documents relating to high bill allegation supports complainant's position. The document, EXHIBIT 13, which purportedly is Account Activity Statement from 9/2009 to present in ~~the~~ summary reveals the following usage in kwh:

PERIOD		KWH
YEAR 2009	→ YEAR 2010	1538
YEAR 2010	→ YEAR 2011	549
YEAR 2011	→ YEAR 2012 SEPT.	44

### EXHIBIT A

Here, the trend seems unusual for the drops. It either demonstrates extreme high usage change or some sort of manipulation. Either way PECO has to explain that or the Commission has to give complainant the opportunity to probe into this by way of discovery or deposition.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reason complainant prays the Commission will find in his favor.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

SA  
STEVE ATUAFER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, STEVE ATUAHENE, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing motion/petition and accompanying papers, was served on the below listed addresses by first-class United States mail, postage pre-paid on 11-16-12 (date).

Name: Shawane Lee Esq  
Address: Exelon Business Services Co  
Address: 2301 Market Street, 523-1  
P.O. Box 8699  
City, State, zip: PHILA PA 19101-8699

Name: Hon Evando Vero  
Address: Office of Administrative Law Judge  
Address: 801 Market Street, Ste 4063  
City, State, zip: Phila PA 19107

Dated: 11-16-12

By: S.A.

RECEIVED  
2013 FEB 12 AM 8:27  
PA PUC  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**NO SCANNED IMAGES ARE  
AVAILABLE**

**COMPLETE ATTACHMENTS  
AND/OR EXHIBIT(S)  
MAY BE VIEWED IN THE  
COMMISSION'S  
FILE ROOM**