May 28,2009

Ms. Renee J. Jenkins
Director, Administration Department
Secretary to the Commission
Docketing Division
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Stteet

Dear Ms. Jenkins:

> Re: Answer
> Paul M. Benak y. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company Case No. 09-406-EL-CSS

Enclosed for filing, please find the original and twelve (12) copies of the Answer regarding the above-referenced case. Please file the enclosed Answer, time-stamping the two extras and returning them to the undersigned in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this matter.

Very truly yours,


MAH/kli
Enclosures
cc: Parties of Recond
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## BEFORE THE <br> PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

PAUL M. BENAK

COMPLAINANT,
vs.
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC LLLUMINATING COMPANY RESPONDENT,

CASE NO. 09-406-EL-CSS
)

ANSWER OF
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC
ILLUMINATING COMPANY

Comes now Respondent, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI"), by counsel, and for its Answer to the Complaint filed in the instant action says that:

1. CEI is an electric distribution utility and electric light company, as both of these terms ate defined in R.C. $\S 4928.01(\mathrm{~A})$ and is duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Ohio.
2. CEI admits that Complainant is a customer receiving electric service. CEI avers that it currently maintains an account in the Complainant's name, which reflects charges incurted for the provision of electric utility service.
3. CEI avers that Complainant has contacted Respondent's customer service department and that each inquiry was properly handled by a company representative,
4. CEI avers that the account was properly billed and metered at the service address in accordance with applicable tariffs, rules, regulations and laws of the state of Ohio.
5. With respect to the information contained in the Complaint tegarding use of appliances, CEI denies the allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations.
6. CEI generally denies all allegations, to the extent any exist; set forth in the Complaint that were not otherwise specifically addressed hereinabove.

## For its affirmative defenses, CEX further avers that:

7. CEI has breached no legal duty owed to Complainant.
8. Complainant has failed to state reasonable grounds for complaint or upon which its requested relief may be granted.
9. CEI has at all times acted in accordance with its Tariff, PUCO No. 13, on file with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, as well as all rules and regulations as promulgated by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, the laws existing in the State of Ohio, and accepted standards and practices in the electric utility industry.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Complaint, Respondent, CEI, respectfully requests that the instant action be dismissed, and that it be granted any other relief that this Commission may deem just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark A, Hayden
Attorney
FirstEnergy Service Company
76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308
Phone: 330-761-7735
Fax: 330-384-3875
On behalf of CEI

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Answer to the Complaint of CEI was served by regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to Paul M. Benak, PO Box 110, Jefferson Ohio, 44047, this 28 day of May, 2009.


Mark A. Hayden
Attomey

