

Tori L. Giesler, Esq.
(610) 921-6658
(330) 315-9263 (Fax)

February 14, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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


Re: Evelyn D. Dreher v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2018-3005217

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the Motion to Compel of Metropolitan Edison 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,


Tori L. Giesler

Enclosures

c: As Per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EVELYN D. DREHER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3005217

NOTICE TO PLEAD

TO: Evelyn D. Dreher

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.102(b), you are hereby notified that, if you do not file a written response denying or correcting the enclosed Motion to Compel of Metropolitan Edison Company within **five (5) days** from the service of the Notice, the facts set forth by Metropolitan Edison 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 Metropolitan Edison 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: February 14, 2019



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

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EVELYN D. DREHER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3005217

**MOTION OF METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO
INTERROGATORIES AND DOCUMENT REQUESTS**

TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

Metropolitan Edison Company (“Met-Ed” 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 Evelyn Dreher (“Complainant”) to provide full and complete responses to interrogatories and document requests issued by the Company on January 25, 2019. In support thereof, the Company avers as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. On or about October 1, 2018, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) regarding 31 Crown Point Drive, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania (“Service Location”) under Account No. 100018757631 (“Account”) which was electronically served on the Company on October 9, 2018.

2. On October 29, 2018, 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 or about November 13, 2018, the Complainant filed a Reply to Objection.

4. On or about November 19, 2018, Complainant filed an additional Responsive Pleading.

5. On November 29, 2018, Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Jeffrey A. Watson was assigned as the Presiding Officer in the above-captioned proceeding.

6. On December 20, 2018, ALJ Watson issued an Interim Order, which denied the Company’s Preliminary Objections.

7. On December 20, 2018, an Interim Order Establishing Initial Litigation Schedule was issued.

8. On January 25, 2019, 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.

9. On February 2, 2019, the Complainant served objections to the Company’s Discovery Requests that relate to “personal medical information,” claiming that this information is privileged and not relevant to the proceeding. Additionally, Complainant served objections to the Company’s Discovery Requests that relate to her educational and employment background claiming that such information is not relevant to her Complaint.

10. A full copy of the Company’s Discovery Requests is attached as Exhibit A.

11. A full copy of the Complainant’s Objections to the Company’s Discovery Requests is attached as Exhibit B.

II. MOTION TO COMPEL

A. The Company’s Requested Information Is Directly Relevant To The Specific Allegations Made By The Complainant And Is Discoverable Under The Commission’s Regulations.

12. Discoverable matter under the Commission's regulations is matter that is relevant and unprivileged. 66 Pa.C.S. § 333(d). The standard for permissible discovery is set forth in the Commission's regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c) as follows:

§ 5.321. Scope.

(c) *Scope.* Subject to this subchapter, a party may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of another party, including the existence, description, nature, content, custody, condition and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of a discoverable matter. It is not ground 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.

15. There are limitations on discovery. Those limitations are set forth in the Commission's regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a) - (c) as follows:

§ 5.361. Limitation of scope of discovery and deposition.

(a) Discovery or deposition is not permitted which:

(1) Is sought in bad faith.

(2) Would cause unreasonable annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, burden or expense to the deponent, a person or party.

(3) Relates to matter which is privileged.

(4) Would require the making of an unreasonable investigation by the deponent, a party or witness.

(b) In rate proceedings, discovery is not limited under subsection (a) solely because the discovery request requires the compilation of data or information which the answering party does not maintain in the format requested, in the normal course of business, or because the discovery request requires that the answering party make a special study or analysis, if the study or analysis cannot reasonably be conducted by the party making the request.

(c) If the information requested has been previously provided, the answering party shall specify the location of the information.

13. 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.

14. The information sought here by the Company is relatively simple and straightforward. As addressed in paragraphs 15 through 19, below, the requests are directly relevant and material to the issues raised by the Complainant in her responsive pleadings.

15. In her objections, the Complainant argues that the medical information requested in the Company’s Discovery Requests are not relevant and are privileged. The Company submits, however, that in both her Complaint and Response to Objection, the Complainant has specifically raised health-related concerns with Smart Meters as grounds for allowing her to opt-out from the installation of a smart meter. For example, the Complaint stated, “I have several concerns about smart meters and the radiation they emit: health issues.” In her Response to Objection, the Complainant stated, “I have not requested a smart meter for health and safety reasons,” and noted that her son and his wife, “were getting headaches and were unable to sleep at night” due to the installation of a smart meter.

16. The Company’s Discovery Requests seek medical information that, importantly, is tied only to health issues and records relevant to smart meter installation raised by the Complainant. For example, in Interrogatory 2, the Company seeks medical information only if the Complainant affirmatively claims that the installation of a smart meter would cause or contribute to an adverse health condition.

17. In addition, the Complainant has not explained how the information requested may or may not be privileged. Having raised specific health-related concerns, 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 contained in the Formal Complaint as well as the Response to Objection.¹

18. Regarding her second objection, the Complainant claims that the Company's questions (Interrogatories 26 and 27) regarding her educational background and employment history are not relevant. The Company submits, however, that these questions are directly relevant and material to the issues raised by the Complainant in both her Formal Complaint as well as her Response to Objection. Throughout her Complaint and responsive pleading, the Complainant provides substantial attachments and citations to materials that allegedly support her position. The Complainant provides numerous interpretations of these materials and makes a wide array of conclusory assertions. For example, the Complaint states, "The WHO classified pulsed radio frequency radiation as a group 2 carcinogen. The same happened in the past with DDT, asbestos and tobacco – now we all know that these are carcinogens." By way of further example, the Complainant's Response to Objection states, "Smart meters are not clean, they are not green and because radiation is unseen and the cumulative effects of pulsed radiation are only beginning to be realized, I believe that Met-Ed should give its customers the option to keep their analogue meters if they choose to." The Complainant's Answer and Response to Objection contain numerous examples of such conclusions and allegations.

¹ The ALJ's Interim Order Establishing Initial Litigation Schedule states that a Protective Order can be issued if necessary "to ensure that adequate procedural safeguards are put in place to make certain that sensitive information is not improperly disclosed to the public." Interim Order at 5.

19. The Complainant's educational background and employment history are directly relevant to her qualifications to make the assertions contained in Formal Complaint and Response to Objection. Discovery provides the Company with the opportunity to assess the credibility of these claims and the requested information is clearly relevant to that purpose.

B. The Complainant Must Comply With Commission Regulations.

20. 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.

21. 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.


22. 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.

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

WHEREFORE, Metropolitan Edison 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 do 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 Evelyn Dreher.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 14, 2019



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 Metropolitan Edison Company



2800 Pottsville Pike
PO Box 16001
Reading, PA 19612-6001

Tori L. Giesler, Esq.
(610) 921-6658
(330) 315-9263 (Fax)

January 29, 2019

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL


Evelyn D. Dreher
31 Crown Point Drive
East Stroudsburg, PA 18302

Re: Evelyn D. Dreher v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2018-3005217

Dear Ms. Dreher:

Enclosed please find the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to Evelyn D. Dreher. Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 and 5.349, *et seq.*, your answers are due within twenty days of service of this letter (February 18, 2019). In addition, any objections are due within ten days of service of this letter (February 8, 2019). This document has been served as indicated within the Certificate of Service.

Very truly yours,


Tori L. Giesler

Enclosures

c: As Per Certificate of Service
The Honorable Jeffrey A. Watson, Public Utility Commission (Cover Letter and Certificate)
Rosemary Chiavetta, Esq., Public Utility Commission (Cover Letter and Certificate)

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EVELYN D. DREHER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3005217


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents of Metropolitan Edison Company to Evelyn D. Dreher upon the individuals 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:

Evelyn D. Dreher
31 Crown Point Drive
East Stroudsburg, PA 18302

Dated: January 29, 2019



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

Counsel for Metropolitan Edison

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EVELYN D. DREHER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3005217

**INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS OF
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO EVELYN D. DREHER, SET I**

Metropolitan Edison Company hereby propounds these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to Evelyn D. Dreher (the "Complainant"). Telephone or other contact concerning availability and timing of formal responses is encouraged. The answer to each interrogatory should be started on a new page. The answers should restate the question asked and indicate the person(s) supplying the information.

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.342, you must send your answers to me within 20 days (February 18, 2019) and objections within 10 days (February 8, 2019). Your answers and objections should not be filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. You should only file the cover letter and certificate of service, with the Commission's Secretary Rosemary Chiavetta and send a copy to Administrative Law Judge Jeffrey A. Watson. If you have any objection to any of the interrogatories or the request for documents, please identify the interrogatory or request and state your objection in full as to why you should not have to answer/produce it. Any objection not raised within the 10-day period provided for by 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(c) will be deemed waived and you will not be permitted to raise the objection at a later time.

Dated: January 29, 2019

INSTRUCTIONS

- A. In answering these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, please furnish all information available to you, including any such information possessed by others that you can obtain, and not merely such information known of your own personal knowledge. If you cannot answer the Interrogatories and Requests in full after exercising due diligence to secure the information to do so, so state and answer to the extent possible.
- B. Other than for the reasons identified herein, you must provide an answer to all Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents. If the answer to the question is “none” or “unknown,” such statement must be written in the answer. If you consider the question to be inapplicable, “N/A” must be written in the answer. If an answer is omitted because of a claim of privilege, the basis of privilege is to be stated.
- C. If the answer to any of the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents is that you lack knowledge of some or all of the requested information, describe all efforts made by you to obtain the information necessary to answer that Interrogatory or Request.
- D. These Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents are to be deemed continuing in nature, and you shall promptly supply, by way of supplemental response, any additional responsive information that may become known to you or anyone acting on your behalf after your answers have been prepared or served.
- E. As used herein, the terms “Complainant” and “you” refer to Evelyn D. Dreher and her attorneys, agents, or representatives.
- F. As used herein, the terms “Company” or “Respondent” refer to Metropolitan Edison Company, and any agent, agency, or affiliate thereof.

G. As used herein, the term “proceeding” refers to the instant complaint proceeding at the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission at Docket No. C-2018-3005217.

H. As used herein, the terms “service location,” “property,” or “home” refer to your service address of 31 Crown Point Drive, East Stroudsburg, PA 18302.

I. As used herein, the term “household” refers to you and all other individuals who reside at the service location.

J. As used herein, the terms “document” or “documentation” includes any written, printed, typed, recorded, or graphic matter, whether produced or reproduced or stored on paper, cards, tapes, film, electronic facsimile, computer storage devices or any other devices or media, including, but not limited to papers; books; letters; photographs; objects; tangible things; correspondence; e-mails; websites; webpages; telegrams; cables; telex messages; memoranda; medical records; notes; notations; records; work papers; transcripts; minutes; reports and recordings of telephone or other conversations, or of interviews, or of conferences, or of other meetings; affidavits; statements; opinions; proposals; reports; surveys; plans; studies; analyses; audits; evaluations; contracts; agreements; journals; statistical records; invoices; receipts; desk calendars; appointment books; diaries; lists; tabulations; summaries; sound recordings; computer printouts; data processing input and output; microfilms; all records kept by electronic, photographic, or mechanical means; and things similar to any of the foregoing, however denominated. When one or more of the foregoing documents is requested or referred to, the request or reference shall include, but is not limited to, the original and each and every copy and draft thereof having writings, notations, corrections, or markings unique to such copy or draft.

K. As used herein, all other words are to be given their ordinary and usual meanings, according to a current edition of Webster’s Dictionary.

**INTERROGATORIES OF METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO EVELYN D.
DREHER, SET I**

1. Are you claiming that the installation of a smart meter at your property would cause or contribute to an adverse health condition for any member of your household?
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, please provide the following information for each household member whose health you claim will be affected:
 - a. Name;
 - b. Age;
 - c. The specific health condition that you believe would be caused by or contributed to as a result of the smart meter being installed;
 - d. Whether the household member is already experiencing the specific health condition and, if so, the date on which the condition was first experienced and the date on which the condition was first diagnosed by a medical doctor;
 - e. Whether the household member has experienced the specific health condition within the last four years;
 - f. Any medication prescribed to the household member; and
 - g. Whether the household member has visited a medical professional for the specific health condition, and if so, the name, address, and phone number of the medical professional and the date of the visit(s) to the medical professional.

7. If the answer to question 5 is yes, please provide the following information regarding your position that the installation of a smart meter would create safety concerns:
 - a. Please identify each document you rely on in support of the position.
 - b. Do you intend to rely on these documents at the time of the hearing in this proceeding?
 - c. Please describe in detail all information you have to support this position.
 - d. Do you have any relevant educational or work background that qualifies you to assert this position?
 - e. If yes, please identify the relevant educational or work background that qualifies you to assert this position.
8. Are there any cordless phones used in your home?
 - a. For each cordless phone in your home, please provide the name of the phone manufacturer and the model.
9. Do you use a cellular phone?
 - a. If yes, please provide the names of the cell phone manufacturer and model (for example, Apple i-Phone 7S).
 - b. Does anyone else in your home use a cellular phone?
 - c. How many cellular phones are in use at your home?

- d. For each cellular phone used by a member of your household, please provide the name of the cell phone manufacturer and the phone model.

10. Is there satellite television at your home?
 - a. If yes, please provide the name of the satellite television provider (for example, Direct TV).

 - b. If yes, where is your satellite disk located?

11. Is there a laptop computer at the service location?
 - a. If yes, where is it located?

12. Do you have a wifi network in your home?
 - a. If so, where is your wifi router located?

13. In your complaint, you state that under the law, “smart meters are to be installed upon request of the customer.” Please provide the following information related to this statement:
 - a. Is it your position that a customer has the right to request a smart meter not be installed at her service location?

 - b. Is it your position that a customer must request smart meter installation?

 - c. Is it your position that Act 129 of 2008 does not require the utility to install smart meters throughout its service territory?

14. Is it your position that you would like to opt out completely from smart meter installation?
15. Do you believe the installation of a smart meter at your property would violate the privacy or security of a member of your household?
16. If your answer to question 15 is yes, please specifically describe each of your concerns regarding your household's privacy or security after the installation of a smart meter.
17. If your answer to question 15 is yes, please provide the following information regarding your position that the installation of a smart meter would violate your household's privacy or security:
 - a. Please identify each document you rely on in support of the position.
 - b. Do you intend to rely on these documents at the time of the hearing in this proceeding?
 - c. Please describe in detail all information you have to support this position.
 - d. Do you have any relevant educational or work background that qualifies you to assert this position?
 - e. Is yes, please identify the relevant educational or work background that qualifies you to assert this position.
18. To your knowledge, has a smart meter been installed by the Company at your property?

19. Please describe in detail how you believe a smart meter operates.
20. In your complaint, you compare smart meters with DDT, asbestos and tobacco. Specifically, you state, “The WHO classified pulsed radio frequency radiation as a group 2 carcinogen. The same happened in the past with DDT, asbestos and tobacco – now we all know that these are carcinogens.” Please provide the following information related to this statement:
 - a. What documents do you rely on in support of this statement?
 - b. Do you intend to rely on these documents at the time of the hearing in this proceeding?
 - c. Please describe in detail the information you have to support this statement.
 - d. Is it your position that smart meters present the same risk as DDT, asbestos, and/or tobacco?
21. Please list the specific issues you intend to raise at the hearing in this proceeding.
22. Please identify the legal support, including specific citations, for each issue identified in question 21.
23. Please list the factual support for each issue identified in question 21.
24. Please provide the following information for all witnesses you intend to call to testify at the hearing in this proceeding.
 - a. Provide the full name of the witness.

- b. Provide the address and telephone number of the witness.
 - c. Provide the title or position held by the witness.
 - d. Provide the educational background of the witness.
 - e. Provide the employment background of the witness.
 - f. Provide the scope of the testimony for the witness.
25. Would any witness identified in question 24 be offered as an expert?
- a. If yes, provide the curriculum vitae of the witness and a summary of the testimony the expert witness is expected to provide.
26. Please describe in detail your educational background.
- a. Please list any relevant certificates, trainings, or degrees that you obtained.
 - b. Please provide a description of the certificate, training, or degree.
 - c. Please provide the date that any certificate, training, or degree was obtained.
 - d. Please provide the name and address of the institution which provided the certificate, training, or degree.
27. Please describe in detail your employment history.
- a. Please provide your employer name and address.
 - b. Please provide the title of your position.

- c. Please provide the dates of your employment.

 - d. Please provide the duties performed in your position.
-

**REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS METROPOLITAN EDISON
COMPANY TO EVELYN D. DREHER, SET I**

28. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that the installation of a smart meter at your home would cause or contribute to an adverse health condition in any member of your household.
29. Please provide copies of all documentation associated with visits by members of your household to a medical professional related to the health conditions identified in question 2, including but not limited to any and all medical records, medical visit reports, and notes and letters from medical doctors or other health care professionals.
30. Please provide copies of all documentation you intend to refer to at the hearing in this proceeding related to smart meters and/or radio frequency fields and health.
31. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that smart meters would create safety issues for you or members of your household.
32. Please provide copies of all documentation you intend to refer to at the hearing in this proceeding related to the safety concerns of smart meters.
33. For each cellular telephone used by a member of your household, please provide a complete copy of the bills you received from your cellular telephone provider for the past 12 months.

34. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that smart meters would violate the privacy or security of your household.
35. Please provide copies of all documentation you intend to refer to at the hearing in this proceeding supporting your position that smart meters would violate the privacy or security of your household.
36. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that your household may opt out of smart meter installation.
37. Please provide copies of all documentation you intend to refer to at the hearing in this proceeding supporting your position that a household may opt out of smart meter installation.
38. Please provide a copy of all proposed exhibits you intend to submit for the hearing in this proceeding.
39. Please provide copies of all documentation you are relying upon in support of your positions in this proceeding.

Laurie M. Lepkoski
Tori L. Geisler
First Energy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
PO Box 16001
Reading PA 19612-6001

Docket # C-2018-3005217

Evelyn D. Dreher v. Metropolitan Edison Company

In response to Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, please note that although your paper is dated 1/25/2019, I did not receive it until 1/29/2019 and therefore you did not give me enough time to prepare my objections. I work and I have had very little time to read through your papers and prepare a response. It will be postdated 2/4/2019.

Objections:


1. Please note that I object to your request for personal medical information, including physicians name, address and phone number. This is privileged information and is irrelevant to the case.

I have stated in previous information I've sent that according to documents, reports and peer reviews I have reviewed, that my household could very well suffer from the effects of pulsed microwave radiation coming into my home 24/7 when we do not have the ability to control it or turn it off. I will enclose copies of new evidence from the scientific community regarding dangers to our health from pulsed microwave radiation.

2. I object to your questioning my educational or work background. I don't see how this is relevant to the fact that Met Ed wants to install a radiation emitting smart meter on my home against my will. My employment history has nothing to do with this nor does my educational background.

I will comply with the rest of the information you are seeking but again, I do not think that these two requests are relevant.

Dated February 2, 2019



Evelyn D. Dreher
31 Crown Point Drive
East Stroudsburg PA 18302
570-242-4395

RECEIVED
FEB 07 2019
LEGAL DEPT.

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EVELYN D. DREHER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3005217

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the Motion to Compel of Metropolitan Edison Company upon the individuals 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:

Evelyn D. Dreher
31 Crown Point Drive
East Stroudsburg, PA 18302

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

Dated: February 13, 2019


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

Counsel for Metropolitan Edison Company