

Ms. Rosemary Chiavetta, Esquire Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
PO Box 3265

Harrisburg PA 17105-3265

Regarding Docket Number C-2021-3028346
Stanley and Eileen Krasinski versus Metropolitan Edison company Motion of Met-Ed for
Judgment on the Pleadings.

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Please be advised that the following is our Reply to Answer to Margaret A Morris, Esquire at
Reger Rizzo & Darnell LLP with regards to the motion of Metropolitan Edison company for
Judgment on the Pleadings

Sincerely,

Stanley and Eileen Krasinski

cc: The Hon. Mark A Hoyer
The Hon. John Coogan
Margaret Morris Esquire

**Reply to Answer Metropolitan Edison Company of the Amended Complaint
of Stanley and Eileen Krasinski Docket No. C-2021-3028346**

Metropolitan Edison through its Attorneys Reger Rizzo and Darnall LLP maintains that the complaint is against the wrong party and that Mid Atlantic Interstate Transmission owns the transmission poles and lines. We stand by our complaint

In reference to background submitted in the answer regarding Docket No. A-2015-248890-3 the PUC approved the joint application for the transfer of assets to Mid Atlantic Interstate Transmission (MAIT) from Metropolitan Edison Company (MetEd) Pennsylvania Power Company (Penelec). However, what is not stated is that MAIT was created by and is jointly owned by its operating companies, First Energy Transmission, MetEd, Penelec, and Jersey Central Power and Light (JCP&L), **all First Energy companies.** (*June 19, 2015 PUC Joint Application of MAIT, MetED, and Penelec page 1.*)

In the answer, the respondents admitted that MetEd , maintained ownership of the easement on our property. However, the respondents still have the audacity to claim that the complaint was filed against the wrong party.

In conclusion, the replacement project of the transmission lines and poles is part of First Energy's initiative of Energizing the Future. in the MetEd service territory. Our complaint was filed against MAIT, First Energy, First Energy Transmission and MetEd. In an effort to avoid repetition, we will further respond to your answer to our amended complaint against MAIT since MAIT is also being represented by the same law firm and Attorney.