

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

January 16, 2020

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: Rodney A. Shaffer v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2019-3011645

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**

RODNEY A. SHAFFER

V.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2019-3011645

NOTICE TO PLEAD

TO: Rodney A. Shaffer

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 Steven K. Haas
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Office of Administrative Law Judge
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

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

Date: January 16, 2020



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

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RODNEY A. SHAFFER

V.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2019-3011645

**MOTION OF METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY TO DISMISS COMPLAINT OF
RODNEY A. SHAFFER 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 Rodney A. Shaffer (“Complainant”) for his failure to comply with Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Steven K. Haas’s Orders, or respond to discovery propounded by Met-Ed. In support thereof, the Company avers as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. On July 18, 2019, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) regarding 53 Indian Fields Trail, Lower Burrell, Pennsylvania 15068 (“Service Location”) which was electronically served on the Company on July 19, 2019.

2. On August 8, 2019, the Company filed its Answer and New Matter denying the material allegations in the Formal Complaint. On that same day, the Company also filed Preliminary Objections to the Formal Complaint.

3. On August 21, 2019, a Motion Judge Assignment Notice was issued assigning this matter to ALJ Haas for disposition.

4. On September 11, 2019, ALJ Haas issued an Interim Order, which denied the Company's Preliminary Objections.

5. On October 4, 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.

6. On October 22, 2019, a Call-In Telephone Pre-Hearing Conference Notice was issued which scheduled a call-in telephonic hearing for December 3, 2019. The Notice also stated: **"[a]t the above date and time, you must call into the conference. If you fail to do so, your case will be dismissed. You will not be called by the Administrative Law Judge."**

7. On October 23, 2019, ALJ Haas issued a Prehearing Order which ordered the parties to dial in for the prehearing conference pursuant to the Call-In Telephone Pre-Hearing Conference Notice and stated that "failure of a party to participate in the prehearing conference shall constitute a waiver of all objections to the agreements reached, and any orders or rulings issued with respect thereto."

8. Due to a lack of response to the Discovery Requests, on November 20, 2019, the Company filed a Motion to Compel.

9. On December 3, 2019, the prehearing conference was convened as scheduled. Counsel for the Company participated in the conference. Complainant did not participate in the Prehearing Conference and, therefore, the Prehearing Conference proceeded until concluded without the Complainant in attendance.

10. On December 4, 2019, ALJ Haas issued an Order Granting Motion to Compel which directed the Complainant to provide responses to the Company's Discovery Requests no later than December 20, 2019, or face sanctions, including possible dismissal of his formal complaint.

11. On December 6, 2019, the Company provided notification of its witness availability in accordance with the ALJ Haas's directive at the prehearing conference.

12. On December 10, 2019, ALJ Haas issued a Scheduling Order which directed the parties to provide, in writing, a list of potential fact and expert witnesses no later than December 20, 2019, directed the Complainant, again, to provide his responses to the Company's Discovery Requests no later than December 20, 2019, directed expert testimony, if any, to be submitted no later than January 24, 2020, directed any rebuttal testimony, if any, to be submitted no later than February 21, 2020, and directed the evidentiary hearing be held on March 17, 2020.

13. Also on December 10, 2019, a Hearing Notice was issued which scheduled an initial in-person hearing for March 17, 2020.

14. On December 20, 2019, the Company provided notification of its anticipated expert and factual witnesses in accordance with the Scheduling Order. No such notification was provided by the Complainant.

15. The Company is not aware of communication from the Complainant regarding his absence at the Prehearing Conference and at no point did the Complainant contact the Company regarding the Formal Complaint.

16. 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. The Complainant offered no objections or responses to the Discovery Requests.

17. To date, the Complainant has ignored ALJ Haas's Scheduling Order requiring the exchange expert and factual witness information by December 20, 2019, as no witness information has been received from the Complainant as of the filing of this Motion.

18. The Company now files this Motion to dismiss the Formal Complaint of the Complainant due to his failure to abide by the Interim Orders of ALJ Haas, for his failure to appear at the Initial Telephonic Prehearing Conference and prosecute the Formal Complaint, failure to exchange expert and factual witness information, and for his failure to even acknowledge receipt of the Company's Discovery Requests.

II. MOTION TO DISMISS

19. 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).

20. 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).

21. 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.

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. The Initial Call-In Telephonic Prehearing Conference Notice issued on October 22, 2019, specifically stated: "[a]t the above date and time, you must call into the hearing. If you fail to do so, your case will be dismissed. You will not be called by the Administrative Law Judge."


26. The Complainant has failed to provide any responses to the Company's Discovery Requests, failed to provide notification of any potential witnesses in contradiction to the Scheduling Order issued by ALJ Haas, and failed to appear at Initial Telephonic Prehearing Conference as directed by the Initial Call-In Prehearing Telephonic Hearing Notice and the Prehearing Order.

27. 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 Rodney A. Shaffer.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 16, 2020



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)

October 4, 2019

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Rodney A. Shaffer
3 Shull Farm Road
Erwinna, PA 18920

Re: Rodney A. Shaffer v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Docket No. C-2019-3011645

Dear Mr. Shaffer:

Enclosed please find the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (Set I) to . Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 and 5.349, *et seq.*, your answers are due within twenty days of service of this letter (October 14, 2019). In addition, any objections are due within ten days of service of this letter (October 24, 2019). This document has been served as indicated within the Certificate of Service.

In addition to this material, I have enclosed a proposed protected agreement for your consideration. Please review this at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out. If you have no questions, please sign and sent it back to me.

Very truly yours,

Tori L. Giesler

Enclosures

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

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 Rodney A. Shaffer 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-2019-3011645.

H. As used herein, the terms “service location,” “property,” or “home” refer to your service address of 3 Shull Farm Road, Erwinna, Pennsylvania 18920.

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 RODNEY A. SHAFFER, 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. 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.
8. In your complaint, you state: “Act 129 is unconstitutional since the consumer has no option to opt-out.” 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?
 - d. What legal support do you rely on in support of your position that Act 129 is unconstitutional because it does not provide customers with an option to opt-out of smart meter installation?
9. Is it your position that you would like to opt out completely from smart meter installation?
10. In your letter dated August 15, 2019 replying to the Company’s Preliminary Objections, you state: “My constitutional rights afforded me the right to deny this device as I look to alternate source of electricity as its been documented to cause

tinnitus and other deleterious health issues.” Please provide the following information related to this statement:

- a. What legal support do you rely on in support of your position that you have a constitutional right to deny the installation of a smart meter?
 - b. What documents do you rely on in support of your statement that smart meters cause “tinnitus and other deleterious health issues?”
 - c. Do you intend to rely on these documents at the time of the hearing in this proceeding?
 - d. Please describe in detail the information that you have to support your statement that smart meters cause “tinnitus and other deleterious health issues.”
11. To your knowledge, has a smart meter been installed by the Company at your property?
 12. Please describe in detail how you believe a smart meter operates.
 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 RODNEY A. SHAFFER, 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. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that smart meters would create safety issues for you or members of your household.
24. 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.
25. Please provide copies of all documentation supporting your position that your household may opt out of smart meter installation.

26. 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.
27. Please provide a copy of all proposed exhibits you intend to submit for the hearing in this proceeding.
28. Please provide copies of all documentation you are relying upon in support of your positions in this proceeding.
29. Please provide copies of all documentation that you referenced, referred to, or otherwise relied on when preparing your responses to these interrogatories and requests for production of documents.

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RODNEY A. SHAFFER :
 :
 v. : **Docket No. C-2019-3011645**
 :
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY :

STIPULATED PROTECTIVE AGREEMENT

This Agreement, is between and among Rodney A. Shaffer (“Shaffer”); Metropolitan Edison Company (“Met-Ed”), by and through Met-Ed’s attorneys Lauren M. Lepkoski, Esquire, Tori L. Giesler, Esquire; and Met-Ed’s expert(s) and any and all other experts whom Met-Ed may hire or whom Met-Ed may consult within regards to the above-captioned proceeding (“Proceeding”). This Agreement establishes procedures for the protection of certain confidential information involved in the Proceeding.

Intending to be legally bound, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. That the information subject to this Stipulated Protective Agreement is all correspondence, documents, data, personal health information, studies, and other materials to be furnished by Shaffer’s medical providers pursuant to Met-Ed’s interrogatories to Shaffer as to her health conditions, and which Shaffer’s medical providers may provide to Met-Ed pursuant to a release signed by Shaffer. Such materials will be referred to below as “Confidential Information.” When a statement or exhibit is identified for the record, the portions thereof that constitute Confidential Information shall be so designated for the record.

2. All Confidential Information shall only be made available to Met-Ed subject to the terms of this Stipulated Protective Agreement. Counsel for Met-Ed shall use or disclose the

Confidential Information only for purposes of preparing or presenting evidence, cross examination or argument in the Proceeding. Met-Ed may afford access to Confidential Information made available by Shaffer's experts and health care providers (1) only to Met-Ed's experts, and (2) only subject to the terms of this Stipulated Protective Agreement.

3. Before Met-Ed discloses any Confidential Information to anyone, (1) Met-Ed shall secure written assurance from each of such potential person to whom disclosure may be made that he or she will maintain the confidentiality of the Confidential Information and not disclose the Confidential Information further except in preparation for the above mentioned Proceeding; (2) Met-Ed shall provide Shaffer with a list of Met-Ed experts to whom Met-Ed intends to disclose the Confidential Information; and (3) signatures of such experts, that they agree to the terms of this Agreement, shall be furnished to Shaffer before Met-Ed discloses any Confidential Information to any Met-Ed expert.

4. Met-Ed shall use its best efforts to safeguard the Confidential Information and not disclose any Confidential Information except as provided herein. Met-Ed agrees to give Shaffer written notice within five days of Met-Ed's discovery of any unintentional disclosure of the Confidential Information and Met-Ed shall cooperate with Shaffer to rectify to the extent possible, any damage to Shaffer for unintentional disclosure of Confidential Information.

5. Shaffer retains the right to challenge the adequacy of Met-Ed's written assurances that Confidential Information will not be jeopardized. No other persons may have access to the Confidential Information except as authorized by order of the Commission or of the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

6. Prior to making Confidential Information available to an expert, Met-Ed shall deliver a copy of this Stipulated Protective Agreement to such expert and shall receive a

written acknowledgment from the expert in the form attached as Appendix A to this Stipulated Protective Agreement or similar acknowledgment consistent with the terms of this Stipulated Protective Agreement. Shaffer shall be notified promptly of the identity of all persons provided access to Confidential Information pursuant to this paragraph and paragraph 3 above and shall be provided with a copy of each acknowledgment signed by each expert.

7. Met-Ed acknowledges that all health information it receives from Shaffer's healthcare providers pursuant to Met-Ed's interrogatory requests is Confidential Information and Met-Ed shall immediately stamp each page of such documents "Confidential" and shall keep all Confidential Information segregated from its general litigation files in a secure location.

8. Met-Ed will consider and treat the Confidential Information as within the exemptions from disclosure provided in the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Act as set forth at 65 P.S. § 67.708(b). To the extent Confidential Information is provided electronically or by mail, or other electronic means, Met-Ed and its experts will send such information encrypted, and will use such electronic files only for this Proceeding, will not copy the files onto any hard drive and will not make any additional copies.

9. Any public reference to Confidential Information by Met-Ed or its experts shall be to the title or exhibit reference in sufficient detail to permit persons with access to the Confidential Information to understand fully the reference, but not more. The Confidential Information shall remain a part of the record, to the extent admitted, for all purposes of administrative or judicial review but shall remain in a segregated location and shall be prominently marked "CONFIDENTIAL."

10. That part of any record of this Proceeding containing Confidential Information, including but not limited to all exhibits, writings, direct testimony, cross examination, argument, and responses to discovery, and including reference thereto as mentioned in paragraph 6 above, shall be sealed for all purposes, including administrative and judicial review, unless such Confidential Information is released from the restrictions of this Stipulated Protective Agreement, either through the agreement of the parties to this Stipulated Protective Agreement or pursuant to an order of an Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

11. Shaffer shall retain the right to question or challenge the admissibility of Confidential Information; to refuse to produce or object to the production of Confidential Information on any proper ground; and to seek additional measures of protection of Confidential Information beyond those provided in this Stipulated Protective Agreement.

12. That within thirty (30) days after a Commission decision is entered in the Proceedings, or in the event of appeals, within thirty (30) days after appeals are finally decided, Met-Ed and Met-Ed's experts, upon request, shall either destroy or return to Shaffer all copies of all documents and other materials not entered into the record, including notes, electronic or e-mailed files, which contain any Confidential Information. In the event that Met-Ed elects to destroy all copies of documents and other materials containing Confidential Information instead of returning the copies of documents and other materials containing Confidential information to Shaffer, Met-Ed shall immediately certify in writing to Shaffer that all the Confidential Information has been destroyed.

Agreed:

Rodney A. Shaffer

Date

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

Lauren M. Lepkoski // CLW
Lauren M. Lepkoski, Esquire

10/4/19
Date

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

Tori L. Glesler // CLW
Tori L. Glesler, Esquire

10/4/19
Date

APPENDIX A

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

RODNEY A. SHAFFER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2019-3011645

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE AGREEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The undersigned is Lawyer for Metropolitan Edison Company, in the Proceeding as defined in the Stipulated Protective Agreement. The undersigned has read and understands the Stipulated Protective Agreement agreed to in the Proceeding, which Stipulated Protective Agreement deals with the treatment of Confidential Information. The undersigned agrees to be bound by, and comply with, the terms and conditions of said Stipulated Protective Agreement.

Lauren M. Lepkosta, Esq.
NAME

2800 Pottsville Pike

Reading, PA 19605
ADDRESS

FirstEnergy Service Company
EMPLOYER

DATE: 10/4/19

APPENDIX A

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

RODNEY A. SHAFFER :
 :
 v. : Docket No. C-2019-3011645
 :
 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY :

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE AGREEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The undersigned is Lawyer for Metropolitan Edison Company, in the Proceeding as defined in the Stipulated Protective Agreement. The undersigned has read and understands the Stipulated Protective Agreement agreed to in the Proceeding, which Stipulated Protective Agreement deals with the treatment of Confidential Information. The undersigned agrees to be bound by, and comply with, the terms and conditions of said Stipulated Protective Agreement.

Toni J. Gueshaker
NAME

2800 Pottsville Pike

Reading, PA 19605
ADDRESS

FirstEnergy Service Company
EMPLOYER

DATE: 10/4/19

APPENDIX A

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

RODNEY A. SHAFFER

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2019-3011645

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE AGREEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The undersigned is _____, in the Proceeding as defined in the Stipulated Protective Agreement. The undersigned has read and understands the Stipulated Protective Agreement agreed to in the Proceeding, which Stipulated Protective Agreement deals with the treatment of Confidential Information. The undersigned agrees to be bound by, and comply with, the terms and conditions of said Stipulated Protective Agreement.

NAME

ADDRESS

EMPLOYER

DATE: _____

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RODNEY A. SHAFFER :
 :
 v. : **Docket No. C-2019-3011645**
 :
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY :


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 Rodney A. Shaffer upon the individual 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:

Rodney A. Shaffer
3 Shull Farm Road
Erwinna, PA 18920

Dated: October 4, 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**

RODNEY A. SHAFFER	:	
	:	
V.	:	Docket No. C-2019-3011645
	:	
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:

Rodney A. Shaffer
3 Shull Farm Road
Erwinna, PA 18920
contactrodsbrain@yahoo.com

Administrative Law Judge Steven K. Haas
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Office of Administrative Law Judge
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
sthaas@pa.gov

Dated: January 16, 2020



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