

Tori L. Giesler, Esq.
(610) 921-6203
(330) 315-9263 (Fax)

March 5, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: Ann H. Swartz v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2017-2626756

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the Motion to Dismiss 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

krak
Enclosures

c: As Per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

ANN H. SWARTZ

V.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2017-2626756

NOTICE TO PLEAD

TO: Ann H. Swartz

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 Dismiss 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 requiring no other proof. All pleadings, 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
Office of Administrative Law Judge
Piatt Place, Suite 220
301 5th Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

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

Date: March 5, 2019



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

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

ANN H. SWARTZ

V.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2017-2626756

**MOTION OF METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO DISMISS COMPLAINT OF
ANN H. SWARTZ FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ORDERS**

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 §§ 5.245, 5.371-5.372, hereby files this Motion to Dismiss the complaint of Ann H. Swartz (“Complainant”) for her failure to comply with Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Jeffrey A. Watson’s Orders or respond to discovery propounded by Met-Ed. In support thereof, the Company avers as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. On September 28, 2017, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) regarding 532 Fauth Lane, York, Pennsylvania 17406 (“Service Location”) which was electronically served on the Company on September 28, 2017.

2. On October 18, 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 October 30, 2017, the Complainant filed an Answer to Preliminary Objection.

4. On November 3, 2017, a Motion Judge Assignment Notice was issued where the parties were informed that ALJ Watson was assigned to rule on the Company's Preliminary Objections.

5. On November 7, 2017, the Complainant filed a Reply to the Company's Answer.

6. On November 21, 2017, ALJ Watson issued an Interim Order, which denied the Company's Preliminary Objections.

7. On December 6, 2017, an Interim Order Setting Resolution Conference was issued.

8. On December 21, 2017, a Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice was issued scheduling a hearing for April 10 and 11, 2018 before ALJ Jeffrey A. Watson.

9. On December 21, 2017, a Prehearing Order was issued by ALJ Watson which set forth the procedural schedule for the parties.

10. On December 28, 2017, 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 full copy of the Company's Discovery Requests is attached as Exhibit A.

11. On January 2, 2018, a Cancellation Notice was issued which cancelled the telephonic hearing scheduled for May 15, 2018.

12. On January 5, 2018, ALJ Watson issued an Interim Order Cancelling Hearing Scheduled for April 10-11, 2018 which stated, inter alia, that the prehearing order was issued in error as this matter was previously referred for mediation review and the mediation process had not yet been completed.

13. Counsel for the Company attempted to contact the Complainant pursuant to the Interim Order Setting Resolution Conference, but no return telephone calls have been received. As mediation efforts were unsuccessful and, by letter dated June 22, 2018, the Company reported to Mediator Cynthia Lehman that mediation efforts were unsuccessful and that the matter be moved onward for hearing.

14. On June 22, 2018, the Company also filed with the Commission a Motion to Compel Responses to Interrogatories and Document Requests.

15. By an undated letter received on July 5, 2018, the Complainant responded to the Company's Motion to Compel.

16. The Complainant did not file any objection to the Discovery Requests and did not provide any responses or the requested documents by the due date.

17. In addition, at no point did the Complainant contact the Company to discuss the Discovery Requests or to seek an extension of time to respond to the Discovery Requests.

18. On February 8, 2019, ALJ Watson issued an Interim Order which granted the Company's Motion to Compel and directed the Complainant to serve upon counsel for Respondent, full and complete responses to all of the Discovery Requests served upon Complainant by the Company and file a certificate of service with the Commission's Secretary not later than February 25, 2019.

19. Also on February 8, 2019, an Interim Order Establishing Initial Litigation Schedule was issued which set forth the schedule for discovery, the identification of witnesses, and filing of motions in this proceeding. Relevant to this Motion, ALJ Watson issued a witness notification deadline of April 8, 2019 and a discovery deadline of June 14, 2019.

20. On February 25, 2019, the Company received a packet of medical information and a list of references from the Complainant via first class mail. The packet had no explanation or cover letter.

21. If the information received on February 25, 2019, from the Complainant was intended to be construed as a response to certain of the Discovery Requests, the response provided was *incomplete* in contradiction to ALJ Watson's Interim Order entered February 8, 2019, which directed the Complainant to provide *full and complete* responses to *all* of the Discovery Requests.

22. At no point did the Complainant contact the Company to discuss the Discovery Requests.

23. The Company now files this Motion to dismiss the Formal Complaint of the Complainant due to her repeated failures to abide by the Interim Order of ALJ Watson.

II. MOTION TO DISMISS

24. 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).

25. 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).

26. 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.

27. 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. The Company is entitled to the requested information to enable it to fully investigate and defend against the Complainant’s allegations.

28. 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 and provides that the Commission or the presiding officer may, on motion, make an appropriate order if a party fails to appear, answer, file sufficient answers, file objections, make a designation or otherwise respond to discovery requests.

29. 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.

30. The Complainant has failed to provide complete responses to the Company’s Discovery Requests. The Complainant’s actions demonstrate a lack of cooperation and willingness to participate in this proceeding as required under the Commission’s regulations. As a result, the Formal Complaint in this proceeding should be dismissed in its entirety.

31. The Complainant’s actions demonstrate a consistent lack of cooperation and willingness to participate in this proceeding as required under the Commission’s regulations. As a result, the Formal Complaint in this proceeding should be dismissed in its entirety.

WHEREFORE, Metropolitan Edison Company respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss, with prejudice, the Complaint of Ann H. Swartz.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 5, 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
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, PA 19612-6001

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

610-929-3601

December 28, 2017

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Ann H. Swartz
532 Fauth Lane
York, Pennsylvania 17406

Re: Ann H. Swartz v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2017-2626756

Dear Mrs. Swartz:

Enclosed please find the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to Ann H. Swartz. Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 and 5.349, *et seq.*, your answers are due within twenty days of service of this letter (January 18, 2018). In addition, any objections are due within ten days of service of this letter (January 8, 2017). This document has been served as indicated within the Certificate of Service.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. M. Lepkoski".

Lauren M. Lepkoski

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**

ANN H. SWARTZ :
 v. :
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY : **Docket No. C-2017-2626756**
 :
 :
 :

**INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS OF
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO ANN H. SWARTZ, SET I**

Metropolitan Edison Company hereby propounds these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to Ann H. Swartz (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 (January 18, 2018) and objections within 10 days (January 8, 2018). 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: December 28, 2017

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 Ann H. Swartz 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-2017-2626756.

H. As used herein, the terms “service location,” “property,” or “home” refer to your service address of 532 Fauth Lane York, Pennsylvania 17406.

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 ANN H.
SWARTZ, SET I**

1. Do you believe the installation of a smart meter at your property would create safety concerns for a member of your household?
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, please specifically identify each of your safety concerns related to smart meters.
3. 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.
4. Do you believe the installation of a smart meter at your property would create or worsen health issues for a member of your household?
5. If the answer to question 4 is yes, please provide the following information for each household member:

- a. Name;
 - b. Age;
 - c. The specific health issues that you believe would be experienced after the smart meter is installed;
 - d. Whether the household member is already experiencing the specific health issues;
 - e. Whether the household member has experienced the specific health issues 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 issue, and if so, the name, address, and phone number of the medical professional and the date of the visit(s) to the medical professional.
 - h. Whether a medical professional has determined that the installation of a smart meter would create or worsen the specific health issue.
6. Please explain how the installation of a smart meter would create or worsen health issues for your household members. Be as specific as possible.
 7. Please provide the following information in support of your position that health issues at your household would be created or worsened by the installation of a smart meter.

- a. Please identify each document you rely on in support of your 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.
8. Would you consider yourself a medical professional?
- a. If yes, please identify your medical professional title, relevant educational experience, and relevant work experience.
9. To your knowledge, has a smart meter been installed by the Company at your property?
10. Please describe in detail how you believe a smart meter operates.
11. Please list the specific issues you intend to raise at the hearing in this proceeding.
12. Please identify the legal support, including specific citations, for each issue identified in question 11.

13. Please list the factual support for each issue identified in question 11.
14. 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 contact information 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.
15. Would any witness identified in question 14 be offered as an expert?
 - a. If yes, provide the curriculum vitae of the witness and state the scope of the testimony of the expert witness.
16. 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.

17. 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.
18. Do you believe the installation of a smart meter at your property would have an impact on radio frequency (“RF”) at your home?
19. If yes to question 18, please specifically identify all of the RF impacts associated with the installation of a smart meter.
20. Please provide the following information regarding your position related to the RF impact of a smart meter:
 - a. Please identify each document you rely on in support of this 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 relevant educational or work background that qualifies you to assert this position.
21. Are there any cordless phones used in your home?
- a. Do you use a cellular phone?
 - b. Does anyone in your home use a cellular phone?
 - c. How many cellular phones are in use at your home?
22. Is there a microwave oven at the service location?
- a. If yes, where is it located?
23. Is there satellite television at the service location?
- a. If yes, where is it located?
24. Is there a laptop computer at the service location?
- a. If yes, where is it located?
25. In your complaint, you state that “I’ve told them of legislation introduced to Pennsylvania law makers to protect citizens and allow the public to ‘Opt Out’ of Smart Meter Program.” 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 his 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?
26. Is it your position that you would like to opt out completely from smart meter installation?
27. In your responsive pleadings, you state that “I have not received any answers to my questions concerning meter safety from the manufacture, nor law makers. I am still waiting for a reply from the utility company, the p.u.c. and the manufacturer regarding the UL Seal of safety or independent tests deeming the meter safe for installation.” Please provide the following information related to this statement:
- a. What questions did you ask the utility company?
 - b. What date did you ask the questions?
 - c. What is the name of the individual in the Company that you ask the questions to?
 - d. What documents do you rely on in support of this statement?
 - e. Do you intend to rely on these documents at the time of the hearing in this proceeding?
 - f. Please describe in detail the information you have to support this statement.

**REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS OF METROPOLITAN EDISON
COMPANY TO ANN H. SWARTZ, SET I**

1. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that the health issues of your household would be created or worsened by the installation of a smart meter.
2. Please provide copies of all documentation associated with visits by members of your household to a medical professional related to the health issues identified in question 1.
3. Please provide copies of all documentation you intend to refer to at the hearing in this proceeding related to the impact of smart meters on a person's health.
4. Please provide a copy of all proposed exhibits you intend to submit for the hearing in this proceeding.
5. Please provide copies of all documentation you are relying upon in support of your positions in this proceeding.
6. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that smart meters would create safety issues for you or members of your household.
7. 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.
8. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position related to the RF impact of smart meters.

9. Please provide copies of all documentation you intend to refer to at the hearing in this proceeding related to the RF impact of smart meters.
10. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that your household may opt out of smart meter installation.
11. 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.

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

ANN H. SWARTZ

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2017-2626756

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 Ann H. Swartz 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:

Ann H. Swartz
532 Fauth Lane
York, Pennsylvania 17406

Dated: December 28, 2017



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

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

ANN H. SWARTZ	:	
	:	
V.	:	Docket No. C-2017-2626756
	:	
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	:	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the Motion to Dismiss 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:

Ann H. Swartz
532 Fauth Lane
York, PA 17406

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

Dated: March 5, 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