

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Larry Moyer	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2015-2511904
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

RE: Docket Number C-2015-2511904

Dear Public Utility Commission:

With apologies for the background information included here, I'm writing to express my sincere hope that the above case is moving toward decisive action by the Commission. The formal complaint in that case was filed on October 29, 2015, and remains open after nearly four years.

Multiple submissions on file in that case highlight some of the troubling delays and irregularities, some of which apparently resulted from inattention or misinformation. Four of these submissions were letters sent to the Commission between June 2, 2017, and October 25, 2017, during the time when ALJ Dennis J. Buckley was the presiding judge.

1. "letter of application and protest" – June 2, 2017
2. "letter re three new violations" – July 28, 2017
3. "letter re doc not visible on web" – October 11, 2017
4. "letter re public documents" – October 25, 2017

The first (three page) letter identified the Commission's departures from established procedures and asked the Commission for a specific response. That letter did not receive any reply.

A second letter ("letter re three new violations") was submitted with attachments and a July 31 cover letter to Secretary Chiavetta. It informed the Commission of

PPL's continuing violations. That letter, also, received no answer. The same letter was later cited by ALJ Judge Joel H. Cheskis, who linked it improperly with PPL's Motion for Summary Judgment.¹ In his order, ALJ Judge Cheskis said the letter "will be treated as [Moyer's] answer to PPL's motion".²

As the July 28 letter suggests, it was my hope that proceedings in the above complaint (C-2015-2511904) would "yield a satisfactory conclusion", and that further litigation would be unnecessary.

The third letter (with attachments) cited a document that was received by the Commission but was withheld from public view. That letter, too, did not receive any response.

In the absence of a response, I called the Commission regarding the withheld document and spoke with a supervisor, Melissa. As an additional step, I wrote a fourth letter, with attachments, citing the apparent "discrepancy" and seeking an official response from the Commission. Again, that letter received no answer.

Exceptions to the Initial Decision on Docket Number C-2015-2511904 were filed on May 16, 2018, and, to date, have not received any response. Please let me know the status of Docket Number C-2015-2511904 and indicate what further action by the Commission may be expected.

Respectfully yours,

Larry Moyer

¹ The letter regarding three new violations had no connection to the Motion for Summary Judgment, and made no mention of it. The date of the letter was also misidentified by Judge Cheskis as July 27.

² "Order re Summary Judgment", November 20, 2017 at 3