



Emily M. Farah
Counsel, Regulatory

411 Seventh Avenue
Mail drop 15-7
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Tel: 412-393-6431
efarah@duqlight.com

March 11, 2019

Via Electronic Filing

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Keystone Bldg. 2nd Floor W
400 N. Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**RE: R. George Snyder v. Duquesne Light Company
Docket No. C-2018-3006776**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find Duquesne Light Company's Response to Complainant's Request to Withdraw Complaint. A copy of this document has been served upon Complainant in accordance with Commission regulations.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Emily M. Farah", is written over a faint, larger version of the signature.

Emily M. Farah
Counsel, Regulatory

Enclosure

cc: ALJ Long
R. George Snyder

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

R. GEORGE SNYDER,

Complainant,

v.

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY,

Respondent.

No: C-2018-3006776

**RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANT'S
REQUEST TO WITHDRAW COMPLAINT**

Filed on behalf of Respondent
Duquesne Light Company

Counsel of Record for this Party:

Emily M. Farah, Esquire
PA I.D. No. 322559
efarah@duqlight.com

411 Seventh Avenue, 15th Fl.
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

R. GEORGE SNYDER,	:	
	:	
Complainant,	:	
	:	
v.	:	No: C-2018-3006776
	:	
DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANT’S REQUEST TO WITHDRAW COMPLAINT

Respondent, Duquesne Light Company (“Duquesne Light”), submits this Response to Complainant’s Request to Withdraw Complaint:

1. On or about March 9, 2019 Complainant R. George Snyder (“Complainant”) mailed a letter (the “Letter”) to the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) assigned to the above-captioned matter stating that he no longer intended to pursue his Formal Complaint. A copy of the Letter is attached as **Exhibit A**.

2. In the Letter, Complainant stated, “it is the intention of the undersigned to drop this case[.]” See Exhibit A.

3. The Letter was signed by the Complainant. See Exhibit A.

4. Duquesne Light did not receive a copy of the Letter from Complainant; rather, Duquesne Light received a copy of the Letter from the ALJ’s office on or about March 11, 2019.

5. Commission regulations permit the withdrawal of pleadings in contested proceedings.¹
52 Pa. Code § 5.94.

¹ Duquesne Light does not believe that it is permitted to file a Certificate of Satisfaction at this time because Complainant sent the Letter to the ALJ and not Duquesne Light.

6. The Commission may dismiss any complaint without a hearing if a hearing is not necessary in the public interest. 66 Pa. C.S. § 703(b).

7. A hearing for the above-captioned matter is scheduled for Tuesday, April 2, 2019.

8. A hearing is not necessary in the public interest when the complainant does not wish to pursue the case. Bergal v. Phila. Gas Works, F-2014-2451331, 2015 WL 1291577, at *1 (Feb. 27, 2015) (Colwell, ALJ); Darden v. Phila. Gas Works, C-2015-2512966, 2016 WL 1301695, at *4 (Mar. 11, 2016) (Colwell, ALJ).

9. Duquesne Light has no objection to Complainant's decision to stop pursuing this case, as stated by Complainant in the Letter.

WHEREFORE, Duquesne Light Company respectfully requests that the Formal Complaint in this matter be dismissed with prejudice and that the docket for this proceeding be marked closed.

Respectfully submitted,

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY



Emily M. Farah, Esquire
PA I.D. No. 322559

411 Seventh Avenue, 15th Fl.
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 393-6431
Counsel for Duquesne Light Company



Rev. e. Mrs. R. George Snyder
437 Library Avenue
Carnegie, Pennsylvania * 15106
eddymerckx1@yahoo.com
(412) 443-6920/6828

9th March 2019

Mrs. Mary D. Long
Administrative Law Judge
Piatt Place, Suite #220
301 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania * 15222

Dear Mrs. Long,

Upon reviewing all correspondence received by the undersigned, I note paragraph 8, received 3rd March 2019, which states, in part, that the complainant not only “bears the burden of proof,” but “must show a preponderance of evidence that the Respondent has violated the Public Utility Code,” I regret that I suspect that I cannot provide “a preponderance of evidence.” It may not even be that my initial complaint against the Duquesne Light Company is covered by any regulations apart from company policy.

The Duquesne Light Company states that “I alleges” that we had unusually high electric bills. I did not “allege” to have “unusually high electric bills,” I did have “unusually high electric bills” and requested their meter be tested. I did not receive inconsistent information from DLC regarding their meter. I maintain the electric meter is not “my meter” but is owned by DLC exclusively and as such is their responsibility to maintain and to inspect upon request by their customers. If the electric meters are the property of the customer, as DLC implies in their correspondence when they state “your meter,” customers ought to have received a bill for the new meter and the old meter left on our property. We should not be required to pay a fee to have their property inspected.

Inasmuch as there is not a preponderance of evidence to produce, it is the intention of the undersigned to drop this case and to save the court and the undersigned the time and stress required.

Yours sincerely,


Rev. R. George Snyder

c: my files

