

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

June 21, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: Earl A. Houck v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2019-3007964

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

krak
Enclosures

c: As Per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EARL A. HOUCK	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2019-3007964
	:	
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	:	

NOTICE TO PLEAD

TO: Earl A. Houck

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 Emily DeVoe
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: June 21, 2019



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

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EARL A. HOUCK

:

:

v.

:

Docket No. C-2019-3007964

:

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:

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

TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

Metropolitan Edison Company (“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 Earl A. Houck (“Complainant”) to provide full and complete responses to interrogatories and document requests issued by the Company on May 7, 2019. In support thereof, the Company avers as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. On February 8, 2019, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) regarding 34 Sherman Road, Ottsville, Pennsylvania 18942 (“Service Location”) which was electronically served on the Company on February 19, 2019.

2. On March 11, 2019, 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 April 11, 2019, a Motion Judge Assignment Notice was issued where the parties were informed that Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Emily DeVoe was assigned to rule on the Company’s Preliminary Objections.

4. On April 12, 2019, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was issued which scheduled a telephonic hearing for May 21, 2019.

5. On April 16, 2019, ALJ DeVoe issued an Interim Order denying the Company's Preliminary Objections and an Interim Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference.

6. Also on April 16, 2019, a Corrected Notice was issued modified the telephonic hearing scheduled for May 21, 2019 to an initial call-in telephonic prehearing conference.

7. On April 17, 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. ALJ DeVoe issued a witness notification deadline of May 17, 2019 and a discovery deadline of July 12, 2019.

8. On May 7, 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. A full copy of the Company's Discovery Requests is attached as Exhibit A.

9. On May 15, 2019, in accordance with the Interim Order Establishing a Litigation Schedule, the Company provided notice and summaries of testimony for its factual and expert witnesses.

10. On May 21, 2019, the call-in telephonic pre-hearing conference was held. Both the Complainant and counsel for the Company appeared. The Complainant indicated that he would not be presenting any witnesses other than himself. Further, the parties discussed the Company's Discovery Responses and how to request an extension if needed.

11. The Complainant did not file any objection to the Discovery Requests. On May 30, 2019, he provided partial responses. Specifically, 1, 2(a)-(e), 3-12 and 15 have been answered. However, 2(f)-(i), 13, 14, and 16-20 were all answered with “n/a” or “unknown” in response to questions that the Complainant most certainly has, or should have, the answers to.

II. MOTION TO COMPEL

12. 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).

13. 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).

14. 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.

15. The Complainant’s allegations within his formal complaint included the following:

“I don’t want it [smart meter] due to E.M.I./Electromagnetic Interference, Radiofrequency EMF, both of which have major health concerns. My 87 year old Mother-in Law who has heart conditions and pacemaker lives at my residence.

Both of these effect her conditions. I am also concerned about the health hazards they impose on my family as well. [sic]

Formal Complaint, ¶ 4.

16. The information sought here by the Company is relatively simple and straightforward. It is directly relevant and material to the issues specifically raised by the Complainant in his Formal Complaint and cited above. 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.

17. If the Complainant needed more time to answer the Company's Discovery Requests, he could have contacted the Company to request an extension. Further, he did not even attempt to object to the questions if he found them to be objectionable.

18. Instead, the Complainant claimed the answers to various answers were "unknown", where the answers should be known. For instance:

- a. In response to 2(f) and (g), seeking information related to whether his household member had visited a doctor or was on medication, he claimed to not know;
- b. In response to 21, seeking copies of all documentation associated with visits to a medical professional related to question 2, he again claimed to not know; and
- c. In response to 22, seeking copies of information he may refer to at hearing, he claimed to not know (despite responding to questions 4 and 12 with vague references to various documents that the Company cannot independently find, and noting that he intends to rely on these documents at hearing).

19. It is simply disingenuous to claim that the Complainant would not have, or be in a position to produce, answers to each of these questions. Moreover, each of these questions are

directly related to the specific allegations raised in his complaint, and therefore are indisputably appropriate for the Company to request through discovery in this proceeding.

20. Similarly, in other instances he simply responded “n/a” [not applicable] to questions such as the following:

- a. Question 2(h) and (i), inquiring as to whether a medical doctor has made a determination as to the installation of a smart meter causing or worsening health conditions, and any other health conditions that has been or is expected to be experienced;
- b. Question 16(a)-(f) and 17, related to any witnesses he intends to call at hearing;
- c. Question 18(a)-(d) related to his own educational background;
- d. Question 19(a)-(d) related to his own employment history; and
- e. Questions 20 and 24-26 requesting copies of all documents referenced in responses, supporting his positions, or upon which he intends to rely at hearing.

21. Each of these questions are directly related to the specific allegations raised in his complaint, and therefore are indisputably appropriate for the Company to request through discovery in this proceeding. Therefore, his claim that they are “n/a” or not applicable is simply untrue.

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. As a result of the Complainant's failure to provide complete responses 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.

25. 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.

26. In the event the Complainant is directed by the Commission to respond to the Company's Discovery Requests, but fails to, 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 does not comply with the Order directed by the Commission and fails to fully respond to the Company's Discovery Requests, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss in its entirety the Complaint of Earl A. Houck.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 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)

April 24, 2019

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL


Earl A. Houck
34 Sherman Road
Ottsville, PA 18942

Re: Earl A. Houck v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2019-3007964

Dear Mr. Houck:

Enclosed please find the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to Earl A. Houck. Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 and 5.349, *et seq.*, your answers are due within twenty days of service of this letter (May 14, 2019). In addition, any objections are due within ten days of service of this letter (May 6, 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 Watson, Public Utility Commission (Cover Letter and Certificate of Service)
Rosemary Chiavetta, Esq., Public Utility Commission (Cover Letter and Certificate of Service)

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EARL A. HOUCK

:
:
:
:
:
:

v.

Docket No. C-2019-3007964

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

**INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS OF
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO EARL A. HOUCK, SET I**

Metropolitan Edison Company hereby propounds these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to Earl A. Houck (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 (May 14, 2019) and objections within 10 days (May 6, 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: April 24, 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 Earl A. Houck and his 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-2019-3007964.

H. As used herein, the terms “service location,” “property,” or “home” refer to your service address of 34 Sherman Road, Ottsville, Pennsylvania 18942.

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 EARL A.
HOUCK, 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.

- 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.
7. 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?
8. Is there a laptop computer at the service location?
- a. If yes, where is it located?
9. Do you have a wifi network in your home?
- a. If so, where is your wifi router located?
10. To your knowledge, has a smart meter been installed by the Company at your
property?
11. Please describe in detail how you believe a smart meter operates.

12. In your complaint, you state that you do not want a smart meter installed at your property because of the “E.M.I./Electro magnetic Interference, Radiofrequency EMF, both of which have major health concerns.” 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.
13. Please list the specific issues you intend to raise at the hearing in this proceeding.
14. Please identify the legal support, including specific citations, for each issue identified in question 13.
15. Please list the factual support for each issue identified in question 13.
16. 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.
-
17. Would any witness identified in question 16 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.
18. 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.
19. 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 OF METROPOLITAN EDISON
COMPANY TO EARL A. HOUCK, SET I**

20. 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.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. 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.
24. Please provide a copy of all proposed exhibits you intend to submit for the hearing in this proceeding.
25. Please provide copies of all documentation you are relying upon in support of your positions in this proceeding.

26. Please provide copies of all documentation you referenced, referred to, or otherwise relied on in preparing your responses to these discovery requests.
-

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EARL A. HOUCK

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2019-3007964


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 Earl A. Houck 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:

Earl A. Houck
34 Sherman Road
Ottsville, PA 18942

Dated: April 24, 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

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

EARL A. HOUCK

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2019-3007964

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 electronic and First Class Mail, postage prepaid, as follows:

Earl A. Houck
34 Sherman Road
Ottsville, PA 18942
andyhfish@icloud.com

Administrative Law Judge Emily DeVoe
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Piatt Place, Suite 220
301 5th Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
edevoe@pa.gov

Dated: June 21, 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