

RECEIVED
2014 MAY -7 PM 12:48
PA PUC
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

ALAN HAULMAN C/O AJH PIZZA, INC., Complainant :
: :
: :
vs. : **NO. C-2014-2415273**
: :
BLUE PILOT ENERGY, LLC, :
Respondent :

REPLY TO NEW MATTER OF BLUE PILOT ENERGY, LLC

AND NOW COMES the Complainant, Alan Haulman C/O AJH Pizza, Inc., through his attorneys, Dethlefs-Pykosh Law Group, LLC, and respectfully replies to the New Matter of Blue Pilot Energy, LLC, as follows:

1. Complainant's Formal Complaint is incorporated herein by reference.
2. Respondent's first affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.
3. Respondent's second affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.
4. Respondent's third affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.
5. Respondent's fourth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no

responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

6. Respondent's fifth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

7. Respondent's sixth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

8. Respondent's seventh affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

9. Respondent's eighth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

10. Respondent's ninth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

11. Respondent's tenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

12. Respondent's eleventh affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

13. Respondent's twelfth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

14. Respondent's thirteenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no

responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

15. Respondent's fourteenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

16. Respondent's fifteenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

17. Respondent's sixteenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

18. Respondent's seventeenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

19. Respondent's eighteenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

20. Respondent's nineteenth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

21. Respondent's twentieth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

22. Respondent's twenty-first affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

23. Respondent's twenty-second affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which

no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

24. Respondent's twenty-third affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.


25. Respondent's twenty-fourth affirmative defense is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required and is therefore deemed denied.

WHEREFORE, the Complainant, Alan Haulman C/O AJH Pizza, Inc., respectfully requests judgment in his favor and against Respondent with costs, attorney's fees, and any other relief the Court deems just.

Date:

5/7/17

Respectfully submitted,



Darrell C. Dethlefs, Esq.
Dethlefs-Pykosh Law Group, LLC
2132 Market St, Camp Hill, PA 17011
(717) 975-9446
ddethlefs@aol.com
Supreme Court ID No. 58805

RECEIVED
2017 MAY -7 PM 12:49
PA PUC
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Certificate of Service

I, Katherine L. McDonald, Esq., the undersigned, hereby certify that on 5/7/14, a true and correct copy of the Reply to New Matter of Blue Pilot Energy, LLC, was served on the following by United States Postal Service First-Class Mail:

Nazario J. Jureidini, Esq.
In-House Counsel
250 Pilot Road, Suite #300
Las Vegas, NV 89113

Date: 5/7/14

BY:


Katherine L. McDonald, Esq.
Dethlefs-Pykosh Law Group, LLC
2132 Market St, Camp Hill, PA 17011
(717) 975-9446
kmcdonald@dplglaw.com
Supreme Court ID No. 313633

RECEIVED
2014 MAY -7 PM 12:49
PA PUC
SECRETARY'S BUREAU