

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA  
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

---

IN RE: Application of Danach, LLC : Docket No. A-2013-239804

ANSWER OF  
EXECUTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, INC.  
d/b/a LUXURY SEDAN SERVICE  
TO PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS OF  
DANACH, LLC

Respondent, Executive Transportation Company, Inc., d/b/a Luxury Sedan Service (“Executive”), by and through its attorney, Michael S. Henry, Esquire, hereby responds to the Protest of Danach, LLC, as follows:

1. Admitted.
2. Admitted.
3. Admitted in part, denied in part. The averments in this paragraph are admitted, except for the date of filing, which was December 23, 2013, as reflected in the dockets.
4. Admitted.
5. Denied as stated. Respondent’s protest speaks for itself. To the extent the averments in this paragraph are inconsistent therewith, they are denied.
6. Denied. The averment in this paragraph contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required.

7. Denied as stated. Respondent's protest speaks for itself. To the extent the averments in this paragraph are inconsistent therewith, they are denied.

8. Denied as stated. Respondent's protest speaks for itself. To the extent the averments in this paragraph are inconsistent therewith, they are denied.

9. Denied. It is denied that Respondent's protest was untimely. On the contrary, the dockets indicate it was received by the Commission on December 23, 2013.

10. Denied. The averments in this paragraph contain conclusions of law to which no response is required. By way of further answer, the protest was timely.

11. Denied. The averments in this paragraph contain conclusions of law to which no response is required.

12. Denied. The averments in this paragraph contain conclusions of law to which no response is required. By way of further answer, the protest is sufficiently specific enough to put the applicant on notice of respondent's intent to put applicant to its burden of proof with regard to its financial and operation fitness and to present evidence at the time of hearing that its proposed service will be harmful to existing carriers, including respondent. By way of further answer, if the Commission concludes that the protest is not sufficiently specific, respondent respectfully requests the Commission to grant it leave to amend its protest pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.101(e).

13. Denied. The averment in this paragraph contains conclusions of law to which no response is required.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Executive Transportation Company, Inc., t/b/a Luxury Sedan Service, by and through its attorney, Michael S. Henry, Esquire,

respectfully requests that the Preliminary Objections of Movant, Danach, LLC, be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael S. Henry*

Michael S. Henry, Esquire  
Attorney for Respondent  
Executive Transportation Company  
d/b/a Luxury Sedan Service

BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

---

IN RE: Application of Danach, LLC : Docket No. A-2013-2391804

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, MICHAEL S. HENRY, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the Answer of Executive Transportation Company, Inc., d/b/a Luxury Sedan Service to the Preliminary Objections of Danach, LLC was sent to the following interested parties, via United States First Class Mail on January 22, 2014:

Rosemary Chiavatta Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

David Temple, Esquire  
Gallagher, Malloy, & Georges, P.C.  
1760 Market Street  
Suite 1100  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated: January 22, 2014

*Michael S. Henry*

---

Michael S. Henry