



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE  
REFER TO OUR FILE

April 18, 2005

F-01482857

Donald & Patty Taylor  
4909 Parkside Avenue  
Philadelphia Pa 19131

Donald & Patty Taylor  
v.  
Peco Energy Company

Dear Mr & Mrs. Taylor:

The Commission on April 11, 2005 received your Exceptions in the above referenced proceeding. This was not within 20 days of the mailing to you of the Initial Decision of the Administrative Law Judge, as prescribed in the cover letter transmitting that Initial Decision, and the Commission's Rule at 52 Pa. Code §5.533.

Accordingly, your Exceptions were not timely filed and will not be considered by the Commission.

Very truly yours,

James J. McNulty  
Secretary

nvl

cc: All Parties of Record  
Susan Hoffner, ALJ  
Law Bureau  
Office of Special Assistants  
Office of Trial Staff  
Chairman  
Commissioners

Exceptions PUC (BCS) PECO Energy Company Donald and Patty Taylor vs. Peco Energy Company

We do not agree with the initial decision of the Administrative Law Judge Herbert Smolen Donald and Patty Taylor vs. Peco Energy Co. case # F-01482857. Our property located at 4907 Parkside ave was vacant long before we moved in. Prior to us moving in a title search was conducted, which is normal for most home buyers. Therefore all utilities were paid and we started at zero balance. Peco insist that we owe back monies for electric that we should have been billed for, because a peco technician discovered an alleged tampered meter when installing an automated meter reader. During our court hearing on January 12, 2005 peco failed to present any evidence of meter tampering nor did the Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) who issued a decision in favor of peco. Based on their investigation meter tampering did exist. Our question is what evidence did (BCS) have to complete their investigation? Although it was indicated to us that the burden of proof was our responsibility, how is it possible to prove that we did not have a tampered meter? Peco admits that they had no idea when the meter could have been tampered with but they had the authority to back bill us for four years. We can only wonder how many other home owners or rate payers are faced with this same injustice as we.

DOCUMENT  
FOLDER

Donald Taylor

DOCKETED

JUN 14 2005

ORIGINAL

I am filing a petition for NUC PRO TUNC for filing late exceptions. We received a letter from Mr. James McNulty stating that our exceptions were not filed in a timely manner. However we received a certified letter on March.23, 2005. From our knowledge the 20 day time period should have started from the date of our receipt. We mailed our exceptions on April. 11, 2005 with U.S. Postal form 3817(certificate of mailing) which made it approximately (19) days from the 23<sup>rd</sup> of March.

Respectfully Submitted. Donald & Patty Taylor

Exceptions PUC (BCS) Donald and Patty Taylor VS Peco Energy Company. Case# F-01482857

RJP

DOCUMENT  
FOLDER

DOCKETED

JUN 14 2005

SECRET

JUN 14 2005

RECEIVED