





76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308

Ebony L. Miller Attorney

330-384-5969 Fax: 330-384-3875

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV 2009 JUN 16 AM 10: 24 PUCO

June 16, 2009

Via Federal Express and Facsimile (614-466-0313)

Ms. Renee J. Jenkins
Director, Administration Department
Secretary to the Commission
Docketing Division
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Dear Ms. Jenkins:

Re: Answer of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company

Tri-Pyramid Machining, Inc. v. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company

Case No. 09-0443-EL-CSS

Enclosed for filing, please find the original and twelve (12) copies of the Answer of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company 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,

Ebonyd. Milusp

Ebony L. Miller

ELM/jhp Enclosures

cc: Parties of Record

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

TRI-PYRAMID MACHINING INC.)	
COMPLAINANT,)))	
vs.) CASE NO. 09-443-EL-CS	S
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC)	
ILLUMINATING COMPANY)	
RESPONDENT.	,)	

ANSWER OF THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

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

- 1. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEP") is a public utility, as defined by §4905.03(A)(4), O.R.C. and is duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Ohio.
- While the Complaint consists of four typed paragraphs and a number of attachments,
 CEI will attempt to specifically answer the different allegations within the Complaint.
- 3. In response to Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, CEI admits it received calls the week of May 4, 2009 pertaining to high voltage. CEI neither affirms nor denies Complainant's statement that during the week of May 4th to May 9th the 3 phase power to its building was over the 5% voltage causing machines to overheat and shut off. CEI admits that it sent a person out to troubleshoot and attempt to repair the problem. CEI denies that it "adjusted [voltage] back to satisfy other customers that had low line power complaints". CEI neither affirms nor denies the Complainant's timeline of

events in Paragraph 1, the statements related to the operability of Complainant's equipment, and/or the alleged voltage spike.

- 4. In response to Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, CEI admits it received a call on Friday, May 9th. Further, CEI admits that it informed Complainant that CEI was working on the problem. CEI neither affirms nor denies Complainant's statement that Complainant was told that the substation would be back on line late afternoon and/or that due to loss of work the matter would be turned over to Claims. Further, CEI neither affirms nor denies Complainant's statement that it came in on Saturday and the voltage was "still" 260, and that Complainant could not get a hold of anybody because it was a weekend. CEI admits that on Monday, May 11th power was fine.
- 5. In response to Paragraph 3, CEI neither affirms nor denies Complainant's statement that Complainant received a call from Claims declaring that if there was no damage to the machines there was nothing they could do. Further, CEI denies there was a lack of communication. Complainant's Complaint acknowledges a number of calls with CEI the week of May 4th.
- 6. In response to Paragraph 4, CEI denies that it failed to communicate with Complainant, and denies that any of its actions were negligent.
- 7. CEI generally denies all allegations set forth in the Complaint that were not otherwise specifically addressed hereinabove.

For its affirmative defenses, CEI further avers that:

8. CEI breached no legal duty owed to Complainant, and Complainant failed to state reasonable grounds upon which its requested relief may be granted. While the Commission is empowered to hear electric service complaints, it is without jurisdiction or authority to hear claims

LEGAL DEPT.

₫005/006 '

sounding in tort or claims for money or civil damages, and therefore does not have the authority to grant the relief sought by Complainant.

- 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.
- 10. Even if the Complainant's allegations were true, CEI also has no liability under its Commission-approved rules and regulations. Rule IV(B) states "The Company will endeavor, but does not guarantee, to furnish a continuous supply of electric energy and to maintain voltage and frequency within reasonable limits. The Company [CEI] shall not be liable for damages which the customer may sustain due to variations in service characteristics or phase reversals." P.U.C.O. No. 13, Original Sheet No. 4, Page 3 of 24, IV(B).

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Complaint, Respondent, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, respectfully request that the instant action be dismissed, and that it be granted any other relief that this Commission may deem just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

Ebony L. Miller (077063)

Attorney

FirstEnergy Service Corp.

76 South Main Street

Akron, Ohio 44308

Phone: 330-384-5969

Fax: 330-384-3875

On behalf of The Cleveland Electric

Illuminating Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Answer of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company was served by regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to Tri-Pyramid Machining Inc., 36250 Lakeland Blvd. Unit #4, Eastlake, OH 44095, this 16th day of June, 2009.

Ebony L. Miller

Attorney