

Lauren M. Lepkoski, Esq.
(610) 921-6203
(330) 315-9263 (Fax)

April 26, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: James Wolfgang v. Pennsylvania Electric Company
Docket No. C-2017-2613989

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the Motion to Compel of Pennsylvania Electric Company with regard to the above-captioned matter. This document has been served on the Complainant as shown in the Certificate of Service.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,



Lauren M. Lepkoski

krak
Enclosures

c: As Per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

JAMES WOLFGANG

v.

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2017-2613989

NOTICE TO PLEAD

TO: James Wolfgang

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.371(b), you are hereby notified that, if you do not file a written response denying or correcting the enclosed Motion to Compel of Pennsylvania Electric Company within **five (5) days** from the service of the Notice, the facts set forth by Pennsylvania Electric Company in the Motion may be deemed to be true, thereby requirement no other proof. All pleading, such as a Reply to Motion, must be filed with the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, with a copy service to counsel for Pennsylvania Electric Company, and where applicable, the Administrative Law Judge presiding over the case.

File with:


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

With a copy to:

Administrative Law Judge Jeffrey A. Watson
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Piatt Place
Suite 220
301 5th Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Lauren M. Lepkoski
Tori L. Giesler
FirstEnergy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-6001

Date: April 26, 2018



Lauren M. Lepkoski, Esquire
Tori L. Giesler, Esquire

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| JAMES WOLFGANG | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | Docket No. C-2017-2613989 |
| | : | |
| PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY | : | |

**MOTION OF PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY TO COMPEL RESPONSES
TO INTERROGATORIES AND DOCUMENT REQUESTS**

TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

Pennsylvania Electric Company (“Penelec” or the “Company”) by and through its attorneys, Lauren M. Lepkoski and Tori L. Giesler, and pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.371-5.372, hereby files this Motion to compel James Wolfgang (“Complainant”) to provide full and complete responses to interrogatories and document requests issued by the Company on March 30, 2018. In support thereof, the Company avers as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. On or about July 6, 2017, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) regarding 10208 Dunn Avenue, Lake City, Pennsylvania 16423 (“Service Location”) under Account No. 100086970025 (“Account”) which was electronically served on the Company on July 13, 2017.

2. On August 2, 2017, the Company filed its Answer and New Matter denying the material allegations. On the same day, the Company also filed Preliminary Objections to the Formal Complaint.

3. On September 6, 2017, Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Jeffrey A. Watson was assigned as the Presiding Officer in the above-captioned proceeding.

4. On September 14, 2017, ALJ Watson issued an Interim Order, which denied the Company's Preliminary Objections.

5. On March 23, 2018, ALJ Watson issued an Prehearing Order Setting Initial Litigation Schedule.

6. On March 30, 2018, in accordance with 52 Pa. Code § 5.341, the Company forwarded to the Complainant interrogatories and document requests ("Discovery Requests") via first class mail. In its Discovery Requests, the Company sought information and documents related to the Complainant's allegations regarding the Company's smart meters. A complete copy of the Company's Discovery Requests is attached as Exhibit A.

7. Any objections to the Discovery Requests were due on or before April 9, 2018 and Responses to Discovery Requests were due on or before April 19, 2018.

8. The Complainant did not file any objection to the Discovery Requests and has not provided any responses or the requested documents by the due date. Accordingly, and prior to filing this Motion to Dismiss, counsel for the Company attempted to contact the Complainant via telephone inquiring about the Discovery Responses. To date, no response to the Discovery Requests or telephone call has been received from Complainant.

II. MOTION TO COMPEL

9. The Commission's regulations permit the discovery of "any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action." 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c).

10. Generally speaking, this Commission applies a standard of relevance which is less restrictive than that required by parties to present information into the evidentiary record. It is not grounds for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at hearing if the information

sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c).

11. Discovery may be obtained regarding any matter relevant to the subject matter. Relevant evidence is evidence that tends to make an act at issue more or less probable. Moreover, evidence is relevant if it advances the inquiry in some degree and, thus, has probative value. Although the law does not furnish an absolute test of relevancy, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court follows a two-part analysis for determining relevance. In *Commonwealth v. Stewart*, 461 Pa. 274, 336 A.2d 282 (1975), the Court held that “[i]t must be determined first if the inference sought to be raised by the evidence bears upon a matter at issue in this case and, second, whether the evidence renders the desired inference more probable than it would be without the evidence. *Id.* at 284.

12. The information sought here by the Company is relatively simple and straightforward. It is directly relevant and material to the issues raised by the Complainant in both her Formal Complaint as well as her responsive pleading. The Company is entitled to the requested information to enable it to fully investigate what information the Complainant relied on to make the specific and detailed allegations he did in his Formal Complaint. If the Complainant needed more time to answer the Company’s Discovery Requests, he could have contacted the Company to request an extension.

13. The Commission’s Regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 5.371 address the consequences of a participant’s failure to comply with the Commission’s discovery regulations. Section 5.371 provides that:

- (a) The Commission or the presiding officer may, on motion, make an appropriate order if one of the following occurs:
 - (1) A party fails to appear, answer, file sufficient answers, file objections, make a designation or otherwise respond to discovery requests, as required under this subchapter.

14. Further, 52 Pa. Code § 5.372 provides that the presiding officer may impose appropriate sanctions upon a party found to be found in violation of the obligations set forth in the Commission's Regulations.

15. As a result of the Complainant's failure to provide any response to the Company's Discovery Requests, which demonstrates his lack of cooperation and willingness to participate in this proceeding as required under the Commission's regulations, the Formal Complaint in this proceeding should be dismissed in its entirety.

16. The Company requests that the Complainant be directed to provide full and complete responses to the Discovery Requests to be received by the undersigned counsel for the Company within five business days after entry of an Order Granting the Motion to Compel.

17. In the event the Complainant are directed by the Commission, but fail to respond to the Company's Discovery Requests, the Company respectfully requests that the Complaint against the Company be dismissed in its entirety.

WHEREFORE, Pennsylvania Electric Company respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order compelling the Complainant to fully and completely respond to the Discovery Requests such that the responses are received by counsel for the Company no later than five business days after entry of an Order on the Motion to Compel. Further, in the event the

Complainant does not comply with the Order directed by the Commission and fails to respond to the Company's Discovery Requests, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss in its entirety the Complaint of James Wolfgang.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 26, 2018



Lauren M. Lepkoski
Attorney No. 94800
Tori L. Giesler
Attorney No. 207742
FirstEnergy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-6001
(610) 921-6203
(610) 921-6658
llepkoski@firstenergycorp.com
tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com

Counsel for Pennsylvania Electric Company

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

JAMES WOLFGANG

v.

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2017-2613989


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the Motion to Compel of Pennsylvania Electric Company upon the individual listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

Service by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, as follows:

James Wolfgang
10208 Dunn Avenue
Lake City, PA 16423

Dated: April 26, 2018



Lauren M. Lepkoski
Tori L. Giesler
FirstEnergy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-6001
(610) 921-6203
(610) 921-6658
llepkoski@firstenergycorp.com
tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com