

Legal Department
2301 Market Street / S23-1
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

Direct Dial: 215-841-6841
Fax: 215-568-3389

April 21, 2016

VIA EMAIL & FACSIMILE - (215) 560-3133

Administrative Law Judge Angela T. Jones
Pa. Public Utility Commission
801 Market Street, Suite 4063
Philadelphia, PA 19107

**Re: Objection to Continuance Request and Telephonic Hearing
Jermaine Walker v. PECO Energy Company
PUC Docket No. C-2015-2472503**

Dear Judge Jones:

Kindly recall that this matter is scheduled for an in person hearing before Your Honor on Wednesday, May 4, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. I am in receipt of the Complainant's correspondence, dated April 14, 2016, requesting a continuance of the hearing. In his correspondence, the Complainant states that he will be out of town the date of the hearing. The Complainant additionally requests a telephonic hearing if the hearing is rescheduled.

PECO Energy objects to Complainant's continuance request. As stated in the Prehearing Order in this matter, requests for a continuance are only granted "in rare situations where good cause exists." (Prehearing Order, citing 52 Pa. Code § 1.15). Complainant has not established "good cause" for his continuance request. The Complainant has been aware of this hearing since March 28, 2016, when the PUC sent out the hearing notice. He has not demonstrated why it is necessary to continue the hearing because he will be "out of town" on the hearing date. Second, this is the fourth scheduled hearing. The first hearing was continued because the Complainant said that he had secured legal counsel who was reviewing his case. No attorney ever entered an appearance. The second two hearings were continued because the Complainant was incarcerated; and therefore, unavailable to attend the hearing. The last hearing was cancelled after the Complainant entered into a settlement agreement with PECO and then subsequently objected to the Certificate of Satisfaction filed. Because of the number of continuances, PECO objects to any additional continuances of this matter.

Additionally, PECO objects to a telephonic hearing. First, the Complainant has not specified why he requires a telephonic hearing. The Complainant, a young man, does not allege he has a physical disability preventing him from attending the in-person hearing. Further, because of the history of this litigation and substantial balance associated with the service address at issue, there is a credibility issue regarding who is actually prosecuting this denial of service complaint - Jermaine Walker or his mother - ratepayer Sherry Dixon who has a \$15,464.65 balance with PECO. Based on this, Mr. Walker should appear in person to prosecute his complaint.

Page 2 of 2
April 21, 2016

I thank Your Honor for your kind attention to this matter. Should Your Honor require additional information, I can be contacted directly at (215) 841-6841.

Very truly yours,



Shawane L. Lee
Assistant General Counsel, Exelon BSC
Encl.

cc: Jermaine Walker