

Direct Dial: 215.841.6841

August 16, 2016

VIA EMAIL

Jonathan Nase, Esquire
Deputy Director - Legal
Office of Special Assistants
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2016

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**Re: Sherry Dixon v. PECO Energy Company
PUC Docket No. C-2015-2513652**

Dear Mr. Nase:

Kindly recall that an Initial Decision was sent to the parties on June 30, 2016, for the above-referenced matter with exceptions due on or about July 20, 2016 and Reply Exceptions due August 1, 2016. The Commission issued a Final Order on August 4, 2016, marking this matter closed.

Please find enclosed a copy of Exceptions that were served on PECO Energy by the Complainant on August 15, 2016. I note that there is no legible date on the Exceptions. Additionally, the PUC docket does not reflect that these Exceptions have been docketed.

The cover letter accompanying the Initial Decision makes it clear that pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.533, Exceptions must be filed with the Commission within 20 days of the notice of the letter and mailed or hand-delivered to the opposing party within 20 days.

As the Complainant's Exceptions were not filed by July 20, 2016, and PECO was not served with the Exceptions until August 15, 2016, PECO objects to the Exceptions being docketed for consideration by the Commission.

PECO additionally objects to the Commission accepting the Exceptions as a Petition for Reconsideration of the Final Order, as this Complainant has been abusing the PUC process. Since July 20, 2011, Complainant has filed eighteen (18) informal and formal complaints with the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission.¹

¹ Complainant filed informal complaints with the Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) at case numbers: (1) 002861636 on July 20, 2011; (2) 002891181 on September 26, 2011, (3) 002988516 on June 28, 2012; (4) 003035014 on October 20, 2012; (5) 003035708 on October 22, 2012; (6) 003229643 on April 26, 2014, (7) 003290076 on September 26, 2014, (8) 003318578 on February 3, 2015; (9) 003395127 on October 21, 2015; (10) 003404210 on December 1, 2015; (11) 003443133 on May 24, 2016 and (12) 003455101 on June 30, 2016. All of

August 16, 2016


Page 2 of 2

All of the complaints are similar in that they involve disputes over payment of bills, billing, alleged meter inaccuracy, threatened interruption of service or inadequacy of service. In fact, the Complainant currently has a case open at docket number F-2016-2554895 and by filing PUC complaints, she has skillfully avoided paying her \$16,265.61 balance.

PECO objects to the Complainant's untimely exceptions and requests that the Commission deny the Complainant's filing and close the docket.

I thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,




Shawane L. Lee
Assistant General Counsel, PECO
Encl.

cc: Sherry Dixon (*via first class mail*)

the informal complaints raise billing concerns, threatened termination, allegations of meter inaccuracy or inadequacy of service.

Date
9/1/18



I Sherry Dixon, received a letter stating I had to file an exception. Because I did not agree with the decision that was made I do not know what happens in the first one I sent this. I will have to file an exception. In the papers I received it says that I could not prove, because to be discriminated against me and no prove was found that they did not discriminate against me most of what they said did not have prove either. I feel as if I was not a wrong, however and would like to file my exception. I will send each party a copy of this letter.

267-475-0343 ← Sherry Dixon