

From:  
Craig Ellis Jamison  
2643 S. Marshall St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19148-4611  
(215) 468-4966  
CJamGullCottage@aol.com

September 13, 2016

To:  
Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, Second Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**RE: Craig Ellis Jamison v. PECO Energy Company**  
**PUC Docket No: C-2016-2552858**

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission is recent information and / or exhibits Craig Ellis Jamison wishes to add to the original file "Response / objection to PECO Energy Company's request to dismiss the Complaint" – said file submitted by Mr. Jamison on July 15, 2014 .

I have enclosed a Certificate of Service showing that a copy of this document was served on the interested parties.

Thank You for your time and attention,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Craig Ellis Jamison". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Craig Ellis Jamison

From:

Craig Ellis Jamison  
2643 S. Marshall St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19148-4611  
(215) 468-4966  
CJamGullCottage@aol.com

September 13, 2016

To:

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, Second Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**RE: Craig Ellis Jamison v. PECO Energy Company**  
**PUC Docket No: C-2016-2552858**

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

I request to add recent information / exhibits to the designated docket alleging that parties of PECO Energy are **continuing** to deliberately misrepresent data in an effort to "trip" its automated system into shutting off service to the Complainant's residence in spite of / in defiance of clear knowledge that a formal PUC complaint is currently extant, and with clear knowledge that both parties currently await an initial hearing set for the date of Thurs. October, 20, 2016.

While awaiting said initial hearing the Complainant has complied with PUC / PECO instructions in paying current monthly usage bill debits. But, when the initial hearing date was altered by the PUC (from Sept. 27, 2016 to October 20, 2016), the Complainant then received a shut-off notice to which no one he's spoken to at PECO Energy is a) willing to take responsibility for issuing, and b) seems to have knowledge as to why it exists in the first place. In addition, each follow up phone call (made by the Complainant in an attempt to establish the origin / reason for the existence of the aforementioned shut-off notice) has met with a different answer, as well as a wildly fluctuating / varying "total due", "total deferred" balances.

Records pertaining to this claim are attached. And additional records (including audio recorded material between Complainant and PECO) are available upon request.

## CHRONOLOGY:

### \*notes\*

- 1) Complainant's attorney willing to request / obtain PECO's phone records to corroborate
- 2) Complainant willing to supply recordings of phone conversations with PECO to corroborate
- 3) Complainant willing to supply bank / check / mail – bill and all records to corroborate

- One week before the monthly bill due date of 8/16/16, the Complainant mailed PECO a check (dated 8/16/16) for \$409.63 – an amount exceeding the monthly usage bill of \$179.00. The reasoning for exceeding the amount was to begin trying to “get ahead”.
- In a PECO letter dated 8/16/16 (but received on August 30<sup>th</sup>??), PECO informed Complainant that they would not accept check payment, and that Complainant should make payment via cash through an authorized payment agent, or via certified funds (cashiers check, money order). The Complainant made a cash payment on 9/2/16 – this amount equal to the \$179.00 monthly usage due, but not exceeding the previous \$409.93.
- Upon making said cash payment, Complainant phoned PECO with payment receipt number and payment “Reference Number” to confirm payment.
- In a PECO letter dated 8/31 (and received on 9/3) Complainant received a “Past Due” notice which stated “If you have paid your bill in the last few days, thank you”. All seemed well until ...
- On 9/7 Complainant received a “Ten Day Shut Off Notice” (date prepared 9/2/16)
- On 9/9 Complainant received a “courtesy” phone call from PECO Revenue Management officer Quincy Lee – who appeared to have no knowledge as to the reason for the shut-off notice until checking his files / account history / records. According to Mr. Lee there were three outstanding balances – the breakdown of which he was unable to explain. At first he explained that the entire balance was due. Then he claimed \$10,000 was due, and that \$1,614.16 was deferred in light of the upcoming initial hearing. Then he claimed only \$351.33 was deferred. In other words, he didn't seem to know what was going on.

Mr. Lee did however provide Complainant with his direct phone number (215-841-6077). He also explained that as the Revenue Management officer handling the situation, he would extend the shut off notice date from Fri. 9/16/16 to Mon. 9/19/16 in order to allow Complainant and / or his legal counsel time to confer then collect / collate any additional data / material which Complainant and / or his counsel wished to submit to Mr. Lee

- Complainant conferred with his attorney, then on 9/12 phoned Mr. Lee to inquire as to how and where Complainant and / or attorney should submit material to Mr. Lee. Complainant left two messages.

In an attempt to obtain an email or mailing address for Mr. Lee, Complainant on that same day of 9/12 spoke with three different PECO representatives (the first named "Bernard"; the third named "Consuela Reese") – the first two of whom attempted to forward the call to Revenue Management. The first two attempts resulted in Complainant's call being disconnected. And finally Ms. Reese explained that no PECO representative can forward a call to Revenue Management, which begs the question, "Then why did the first two representatives not know this?". At any rate ...

- Mr. Quincy Lee returned Complainant's call on 9/13. But (contradicting his statement of four days prior) he then claimed to NOT be in charge of "handling the situation" – and therefore sending a mailed or emailed document to him would be in vain. He then informed Complainant to send any complaints, documentation, etc. to PECO's legal department. One interesting (and baffling) note in all of this ...
- Each time complainant spoke with a PECO representative (or even was auto-prompted), at no time was there any notification or acknowledgement as to the existence of any official shut-off notice and / or attendant service shut-off date. The closest thing to it was an auto-prompt recorded "courtesy" message informing Complainant to "pay bill by the due date to avoid any collection activity".
- This would seem to indicate that somewhere there is another outstanding "phantom bill charge" not unlike the \$20.00 charge back in June 2016 (see original evidentiary material – exs. "1a" and "1b") which no one at PECO could explain / determine the origin of, which auto-triggered the issuance of a shut-off notice.
- As Mr. Lee (and subsequent PECO representatives over the last week) have been unable or unwilling to explain the origin of the "new" (or until now hidden) charge(s), Complainant and his counsel are requesting a detailed and accurate accounting of what PECO is presently counting as "due", "deferred", etc. Also ...
- As Complainant has (outside of each month's current usage due bill) received no prior notification of any other outstanding balance - "phantom" or otherwise, Complainant is requesting an accounting of how PECO feels any outstanding (and hitherto non-mentioned) balance concurs / is in accordance with earlier, and plainly stated, PUC guidelines regarding extant disputed balances awaiting the docket hearing.

#### **IN CONCLUSION:**

Complainant alleges that, upon decision by the PUC to push back the date of the initial hearing by one month, PECO and / or it's individual agent-representatives once again attempted to "trip" it's system into issuing an automated shut-off notice. Complainant alleges that, by deliberately obscuring and / or altering (at various credit department levels), it's changeable record of "deferred" vs. "non-deferred" amounts, PECO and / or it's individual agent-representatives sought "plausible deniability" in that each rep could claim no personal knowledge or responsibility for what the auto-system "initiated".

Complainant alleges that this is the third such action by PECO (see Complainant's earlier evidentiary submissions - dated July 15, 2016). And that such activity is, at best, of questionable professional ethics; and, at worst, a blatant violation of the FTC's Fair Debt Collection Practices Act wherein "*The misrepresentation by the collector about themselves or the debt are actionable ... **regardless of intent***".

**WHEREFORE**, the Complainant requests that PECO abide by PUC stipulations, ... even when, outside of the control or influence of Complainant, the PUC alters the date of the hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Craig Ellis Jamison". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and address.

Craig Ellis Jamison  
2643 S. Marshall St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19148-4611  
(215) 468-4966

**BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**CRAIG ELLIS JAMISON (Complainant)**

**v.**

**PECO ENERGY ENERGY COMPANY (Respondent)**

**Docket No. C-2026-2552858**

---

**VERIFICATION**

I, the Complainant, Craig Ellis Jamison, hereby declare that the facts set forth in the foregoing are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I make this verification subject to the penalties of 18. C.S. § 4904 pertaining to false statements to authorities.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Craig Ellis Jamison". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Craig Ellis Jamison

Date: September 13, 2016

**BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**CRAIG ELLIS JAMISON (Complainant)**

**v.**

**PECO ENERGY ENERGY COMPANY (Respondent)**

**Docket No. C-2026-2552858**

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the Complainant, Craig Ellis Jamison, hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of this, the Complainant's addition of recent information / exhibits to the designated docket, by both mailing and emailing a copy (mail version properly addressed and postage prepaid) to:

Shawane L. Lee  
Counsel for PECO Energy Company  
Legal Department  
2301 Market Street / s23-1  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September 13, 2016

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Craig Ellis Jamison". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C" and "J".

Craig Ellis Jamison