

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Andrew Perrong	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket # C-2020-3019899
	:	
Frontier Utilities Northeast, LLC	:	

**ANSWER TO RESPONDENT FRONTIER UTILITIES NORTHEAST, LLC’S  
NEW MATTER**

Complainant ANDREW PERRONG hereby replies to the New Matter of FRONTIER UTILITIES NORTHEAST, LLC (hereinafter “Respondent”) as follows:

1. Denied. This averment attempts to characterize the formal complaint, which speaks for itself, and any attempt to characterize its contents is therefore denied. By way of further answer, Mr. Perrong is bringing this action to challenge Respondent’s violations of the Commission’s Regulations, which arise out of a number of illegal telephone calls which Respondent, its agents, and/or affiliates placed to Complainant. Any other averments to the contrary are denied.

2. Denied. This averment attempts to characterize the formal complaint, which speaks for itself, and any attempt to characterize its contents is therefore denied. By way of further answer, the Complaint actually alleges that Respondent actually violated the Commission’s Regulations, specifically 52 Pa. Code § 111.10(a)(2), 52 Pa. Code § 111.10(a)(3), 52 Pa. Code § 111.10(b), and 52 Pa. Code § 111.12(d). Any other averments to the contrary are denied.

3. Denied. This averment attempts to characterize the formal complaint, which speaks for itself, and any attempt to characterize its contents is therefore denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment

incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied.

4. Denied. Along with this response, Complainant is filing Preliminary Objections seeking to strike this paragraph for the inclusion of scandalous or impertinent matter. In the alternative, Complainant expressly denies this paragraph.

5. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied.

6. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied.

7. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied. By way of further answer, Complainant avers that he is seeking relief only for violations of Respondent's violations of the Commission's Regulations, over which the Commission does exercise jurisdiction.

8. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is

required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied. By way of further answer, Complainant avers that he is seeking relief only for violations of Respondent's violations of the Commission's Regulations, over which the Commission does exercise jurisdiction.

9. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied. By way of further answer, Complainant avers that he is seeking relief only for violations of Respondent's violations of the Commission's Regulations, over which the Commission does exercise jurisdiction.

10. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied. By way of further answer, Complainant avers that he is seeking relief only for violations of Respondent's violations of the Commission's Regulations, over which the Commission does exercise jurisdiction.

11. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that

this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied. By way of further answer, Complainant avers that he is seeking relief only for violations of Respondent's violations of the Commission's Regulations, over which the Commission does exercise jurisdiction.

12. Denied. This averment is a conclusion of law to which no responsive pleading is required. Moreover, this averment incorporates by reference arguments made in Respondent's Preliminary Objections, and Complainant incorporates his responses thereto. To the extent that this averment contains an averment that is not a conclusion of law, that averment is denied. By way of further answer, Complainant avers that he is seeking relief only for violations of Respondent's violations of the Commission's Regulations, over which the Commission does exercise jurisdiction.

### **CONCLUSION**

Complainant prays that the Commission issue a civil penalty against Respondent for violating 52 Pa. Code § 111.10(a)(2), 52 Pa. Code § 111.10(a)(3), 52 Pa. Code § 111.10(b), and 52 Pa. Code § 111.12(d), issue a preliminary injunction enjoining Respondent from violating the same in the future, and revoke Respondent's license for violating the same, as well as any other relief that the Commission deems meet and just.

Dated: **August 9, 2020**

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/

Andrew Perrong  
*Complainant Pro-Se*  
1657 The Fairway #131  
Jenkintown, PA 19046  
Phone: 215-791-6957  
Facsimile: 888-329-0305  
andyperrong@gmail.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.54, I hereby certify that I served a copy of the foregoing via

E-Mail and First Class Mail, to:

Deanne O'Dell, Esquire  
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC  
213 Market Street, 8th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
dodell@eckertseamans.com

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
PO Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Office of Administrative Law Judge  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
2nd Floor, L-M West  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
bobbwillia@pa.gov

I also certify that I e-filed the foregoing with the Commission via their web portal.

Dated: **August 9, 2020**

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/

Andrew Perrong  
*Complainant Pro-Se*  
1657 The Fairway #131  
Jenkintown, PA 19046  
Phone: 215-791-6957  
Facsimile: 888-329-0305  
andyperrong@gmail.com