

January 20th, 2015

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

RECEIVED

JAN 22 2015

RE: Jesus Campos v. PGW, Docket No.: C-2012-2328020

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

I, Jesus Campos, Complainant, certify that I have not entered into any verbal or written agreement with Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW) to settle the above-mentioned matter.

I submit this letter to the Public Utility Commission and provide the following responses in reference to a letter from PGW to my person, attached as Exhibit A

1. I received a call on January 12, 2015, from PGW Manager of Customer Review Unit, Tiffany Higgins, regarding this ongoing matter. I was provided with information regarding a possible settlement and informed Ms. Higgins that I would consider this option given that written information was provided for my review before making a decision.
2. I was informed that PGW did not agree with any wrongdoing, but would provide me with a 10% credit (\$202) for previously unbilled usage. However, in the initial decision by Honorable Angela T. Jones, PGW was ordered to reinstate a previous credit of \$781.01 to my account, which never happened. In addition, subsequent credits were automatically deducted for the purpose of this matter without my authorization and which Honorable Angela T. Jones instructed could be paid within a 4 year period given that a written agreement was in place. Currently, there is no such agreement and I could choose to pay in full prior to the 4 year period expiring after PUC final decision.
3. Furthermore, to date, I have not received any documentation from PGW requesting my written authorization to settle this matter.
4. On January 13, 2015, PGW issued a letter indicating that I am satisfied with the treatment of my account for gas service and that I no longer wish to pursue this matter. This is not a true statement and does not represent my wishes.

I object to Philadelphia Gas Work's letter dated January 13, 2015 in its totality and request that the Commission continues to process my appeal of its decision and conduct an exhaustive investigation in this matter. See copy of my request for an appeal to the Commission's decision attached as Exhibit B

Most respectfully,



Jesus Campos
2005 McKinley St.
Philadelphia, PA 19149

Cc: Wendy Vacca (Regular Mail)
Danielle Leva (Regular Mail)
Laureto Fariñas (Regular Mail)



PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS

800 West Montgomery Avenue • Philadelphia, PA 19122

Danielle Leva, Paralegal
Legal Department
Direct Dial: 215-684-6862
FAX: 215-684-6798
E-mail: danielle.leva@pgworks.com

January 13, 2015

Mr. Jesus Campos
2005 McKinley Street
Philadelphia, PA 19149

RE: Jesus Campos v. Philadelphia Gas Works, Docket No. C – 2012 – 2328020

Dear Mr. Campos:

Pursuant to the settlement conference between you and Tiffany Higgins, Manager of Customer Review Unit – PGW held on January 12, 2015, this letter confirms the terms of the settlement of the above-captioned matter.

In complete settlement of all issues in this matter, we have discussed your concerns with your account with PGW. The parties acknowledge and agree to the following:

1. This matter involves disputed balance of your account for gas service to 2005 McKinley Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (PGW Acct. No. 05-7219-4004).
2. In the interest of good customer relations, PGW will provide a credit of \$202 to the Complainant's account. This is 10% of the bill for previously unbilled usage.
3. You have indicated that you are satisfied with the treatment of your account for gas service, and you no longer wish to pursue the above captioned matter.

If you need any additional information, please contact me at my direct-dial number above. Thank you.

Sincerely,


Danielle Leva

RECEIVED

JAN 22 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

cc: Wendy Vacca (PGW Mail)



PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS

800 West Montgomery Avenue • Philadelphia, PA 19122

Laureto A. Farías, Senior Attorney
Legal Department
Direct Dial: 215-684-6982
FAX: 215-684-6798
E-mail: laureto.farinas@pgworks.com

January 13, 2015

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

RE: Jesus Campos v. PGW, Docket No. G-2012-2328020

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.24(b), the Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW) certifies that the above referenced Complaint has been satisfied. PGW and the Complainant have discussed the issues raised in the complaint and reached a settlement. With this discussion and settlement, the Complainant has indicated that he is satisfied with the resolution of the complaint.

Therefore, further commission action in this matter is no longer necessary.

By copy of this letter, I am notifying the Complainant of his right to object to any part of this settlement, in writing to the Public Utility Commission within ten (10) days of the date of this letter.

If you need any additional information about this matter, please contact me at my direct-dial number above. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Laureto Farinas, Esq.

cc: Jesus Campos (Regular Mail)
Wendy Vacca (PGW Mail)

June 25th 2013

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

RECEIVED

JAN 22 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU**RE: Jesus Campos v PGW, Docket No. C- 2012-2328020**

I, Jesus Campos, have reviewed and understand Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission decision. However, the decision does not actively seek to protect consumers and it fundamentally leaves those most vulnerable at the mercy of utility organizations. The following details show how the current utilized law happens at the expense of the consumer:

- I. I bought and activated utility services at the house located at 2005 McKinley St. Philadelphia, PA 19149 on or around June 2007. PGW service on 12/4/2009 as part of the "Part and Labor plan" to fix my heater inside the home. The technician corrected the problem but did not notice any other discrepancies. I signed documentation on the changes or adjustments he completed.
- II. Again, on 7/17/2012, PGW service my address under the "Part and Labor plan" to fix my air conditioner outside the home. The technician proceeded to inspect the air conditioner. In addition, without notification to consumer, technician proceeded to change the "meter" as per technician it was recording only ½ of the utilized units. The technician did not offer consumer the opportunity to review the previous meter reading or sign for the changes completed.
- III. On or about August 20, 2012, I received a bill for the amount of \$5,712.23 (- \$781.01 in credit) for a total of \$4,931.22
- IV. On August 22nd 2012, my girlfriend, Patricia Velasco, contacted PGW to request an explanation and resolve the issue. At the time, no explanation was provided other than the bill would be further reviewed as per a letter submitted sent on 8/24/2012. On 9/20/2012 PGW responded that PGW had made an adjustment to the bill which would be \$1,280.40 (-\$781.01 in credit already reduced to 0). PGW response was that the meter was wrong and only recording half of your actual usage since you established service. The adjustment was based on the change of rates.
- V. Up to this time 9/20/2012, I had not received explanation as to how the meter was recording half of actual usage and how that was determined. This prompted me to file a formal complain to PUC on 9/28/2012.
- VI. A hearing was schedule for 3/7/2013. On 3/7/2013 at about 7:30am I received a call from PGW attorney Laredo Faridas requesting to postpone the hearing. PGW attorney then followed up with a formal request to Honorable Judge Angela T. Jones stating

that the investigating officer had a family emergency. The request was granted and the hearing postponed to 3/11/2013.

- VII. On 3/11/2013 a new officer (witness Ms. Pereira) represented PGW not the original officer who conducted the investigation and who had the emergency situation. She explained that the "meter" was sent for inspection on 7/17/2012 and by 7/20/2012 PGW was notified that the "meter" was reading only 1/2 of the actual usage.

As a result the following questions are raised: how would the initial technician know the "meter" was only reading half of the usage? Furthermore, when contacted, on 8/23/2012 why PGW was unable to explain the bill? If PGW is a large enough firm, why does the consumer has to be burden with the time to reschedule a hearing date? If the burden is on the consumer, why does the consumer gets burden with further expenses and time? Or must the consumer pay an attorney? A burden on its own right. These are all burdens and legal matters which only serve utility organizations to come into a consumer's home and without notice make changes unknown to consumers to later burden the consumer with disproving such claims.

I request that the decision made on this case be further reviewed and the procedure in which utility companies conduct business include consumers rights and a transparent process, otherwise, vulnerable consumer will continue to suffer.

Most respectfully,



Jesus Campos
2005 McKinley St.
Philadelphia, PA 19149

EXTREMELY URGENT

Please Rush To Addressee



U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PHILADELPHIA, PA
19125
JAN 22, 15
AMOUNT

\$16.95
00019905-14

1007

Visit us at



EK355070392US



**PRIORITY
* MAIL *
EXPRESS™**

CUSTOMER USE ONLY

FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) _____ PHONE () _____

1111 1000 1234

PAYMENT BY ACCOUNT (if applicable)

DELIVERY OPTIONS (Customer Use Only)

SIGNATURE REQUIRED Note: The mailer must check the "Signature Required" box if the mailer: 1) Requires the addressee's signature; OR 2) Purchases additional insurance; OR 3) Purchases COD service; OR 4) Purchases Return Receipt service. If the box is not checked, the Postal Service will leave the item in the addressee's mail receptacle or other secure location without attempting to obtain the addressee's signature on delivery.

Delivery Options

No Saturday Delivery (delivered next business day)

Sunday/Holiday Delivery Required (additional fee, where available)

10:30 AM Delivery Required (additional fee, where available)

*Refer to USPS.com® or local Post Office™ for availability.

TO: (PLEASE PRINT) _____ PHONE () _____

1111 1000 1234

ZIP + 4® (U.S. ADDRESSES ONLY)

12345 67890

ORIGIN (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)

1-Day 2-Day Military DPO

PO ZIP Code 19125	Scheduled Delivery Date (MM/DD/YYYY) 1-23-15	Postage \$ 16.95
Date Accepted (MM/DD/YYYY) 1-22-15	Scheduled Delivery Time <input type="checkbox"/> 10:30 AM <input type="checkbox"/> 3:00 PM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 NOON	Insurance Fee \$
Time Accepted 2:31	10:30 AM Delivery Fee \$	Return Receipt Fee \$
Weight 3.2 lbs.	Sunday/Holiday Premium Fee \$	Live Annual Transportation Fee \$
	Acceptance Employee Initials PT/ST	Total Postage & Fees \$ 16.95

DELIVERY (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)

Delivery Attempt (MM/DD/YYYY)	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
Delivery Attempt (MM/DD/YYYY)	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature

ALL COPIES LEGIBLE

To: PUC

CMPC

External Carrier: EXPRESS

1/23/2015 9:45:06 AM