

March 6, 2013

Joseph Glod
57 Devon Rd.
Paoli, Pa. 19301

Rosemary Chiavetta/Judge Vero
Secretary/Administrative Law Judge
Pa. Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, Pa. 17105-3265

Re: Exceptions of Joseph Glod –Complainant to Initial Decision/Findings of Fact

Dear Judge Vero,

Upon further review of the Initial Decision (Findings of Fact), I will attempt to clarify my argument to the best of my ability. I would also like to thank you for your time and efforts they are much appreciated. I would like to point out the first issue on **Page 3 Number 6 under the Finding of Facts heading of the Initial Decision.**

1)The balance from service address **4241 Valley Rd**, clearly states \$0 in PECO **Exhibit 10**. When I applied for service at **501 Edmonds Ave**. there was no mention of denial of service due to an outstanding balance. When I received my first bill that is when I noticed the balance. After a couple of months of billing, I had noticed my current charges were very high. My living space was anywhere between 400-500 square feet. If you refer to Peco **Exhibit 11** you will also see that my balance was \$0 for **501 Edmonds Ave**. and electric charges were twice the amount of the gas. This is definitely not normal for the size of living space. I was out working all day and could not understand. So this is where my wiring argument came about.

The second issue on **Page 4 Numbers 8&9 under the Finding of Facts heading of the Initial Decision.**

1) Referring to line 8, I filed a complaint (**Exhibit 14**) with the Commission on **10/29/04** and didn't get an answer until **02/22/05**. I filed this complaint because I was not getting any cooperation from PECO and I also expressed my concern with my high billing issues. These concerns are not mentioned in this Inbound Closing Report. I do not see any documents (**paper/recorded calls**) of these complaints from PECO and the COMMISSION anywhere within these documents and am requesting that they be provided. Also, why did it take four months to render a decision on an EGW STRAIGHT PAR/BUDGET? I believe the PUC was investigating my complaints. It could not have been just a standard payment arrangement waiting for four months for an approval.

The third issue on **Page 4 Number 12 under the Findings of Facts of the Initial Decision.**

1) Referring to line 12, **Exhibit 2** does not support this fact. It supports the application for service at 1100 W Chester Pike. Also when I first applied for service at 221 W. Lancaster Ave, I was not presented with a denial of service due to an outstanding balance. I was made aware of it after my first bill arrived. So, clearly this was an attempt to carry over an old balance that showed \$0 dollars per **Exhibit 11** from **501 Edmonds Ave.**

In closing, it is clear that PECO and the PUC are not carrying out their responsibilities and duties to the consumer. I am very confident that I covered the wiring issue back in 2004 with both companies. I find it offensive that it is being said that I never mentioned it. Also, up to the current date neither company could not provide to me the original forms that I had to fill out and submit. Nor has there been an attempt to retrieve recorded calls.

Second, I have asked for all the bills from **201 Kingston Rd.**, **4241 Valley Rd.**, **501 Edmonds Ave.** and **221 Lancaster Ave.** and have not received one. I am having a hard time accepting some miscellaneous print out presented as billing detail.

Third, I would like to know why I was able to acquire service at **501 Edmonds Ave.** and **221 W Lancaster Ave.** without getting denied and informed of an outstanding balance. This once again proves my point of carrying around old balances and sneaking them onto new bills.

Fourth, after reviewing everything I believe that the PUC should have offered me a payment plan to acquire service at **1100 W Chester Pike** and not let me get forced into a PECO agreement knowing that I needed to get service.

Fifth, if you subtract the \$1194.26 (**4241 Valley Rd**) balance from the \$1885.86(**501 Edmonds Ave**) balance you will get \$691.60. Then if you subtract \$1885.86 from \$2129.48(**221 W Lancaster Ave**) you will get \$243.62. Then add \$691.60 plus \$243.62 and you get a \$935.22 balance. I paid \$1008.70 through the agreement that PECO terminated and made no longer valid. You can't terminate an agreement and ask to uphold it. There is nothing in writing that says if you close an account because you no longer need current service that a payment agreement for an aged debt will no longer be valid. Basically, my debt is 100% paid.

I am asking the Commission with all due respect to close this case and relieve me of any outstanding balance due to the lack of more detailed information that PECO has been unable to present for their argument. Thank you for your time and have a nice day.

Respectfully yours,

Joseph Glod