



FILE

MILOSH D. MILENKOVICH  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

March 12, 2010

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
DOCKETING DIVISION  
180 E. Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

PUCO

2010 MAR 16 AM 8:46

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

RE: Elizabeth Milenkovich v. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating  
Company.  
Case No. 10-195-EL-CSS

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed are two (2) copies of the Objection to Respondent's Motion to  
Dismiss. Kindly file the original, and time stamp the copy and return in the  
enclosed self-stamped envelope.


Thank you for your courtesies.

Sincerely,

  
Milosh D. Milenkovich  
MDM:jm

Enclosures.

cc: Attorney Grant W. Garber,  
Jones Day

This is to certify that the images appearing are an  
accurate and complete reproduction of a case file  
document delivered in the regular course of business  
Technician  3/16/10

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2010 MAR 16 AM 8:46

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

PUCO

**ELIZABETH MILENKOVICH**

**Complainant,**

**V.**

**THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  
ILLUMINATING COMPANY**

**Respondent.**

**Case No. 10-195-EL-CSS**

**OBJECTION TO RESPONDENT'S**  
**MOTION TO DISMISS**

Now comes Complainant, ELIZABETH MILENKOVICH, and through her Attorney, Milosh D. Milenkovich, states that the Complaint against The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company should not be dismissed as Requested by the Respondent, because the actions of the Respondent are unconscionable, against the public policy, monopolistic in nature, threat to the sound economic policies engaged in the economic recovery of the State of Ohio and the United States of America, and the actions of the Respondent are unconstitutional, thereby violating the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution.


All of the above stated reasons are very reasonable grounds establishing the standard upon which the basis for the hearing of the Complaint is adequately present.

The allegations of the Respondent that the Complainant is being served at the rate approved by the Commission are incorrect in fact. The PUCO did not approve a **300% rate increase** as the Respondent is insinuating.

And if in fact the PUCO did approve such a ridiculously high rate increase, than a hearing **must not be denied**, because the public scrutiny is a very necessary factor to evaluate the actions of the Respondent spelled out in the first paragraph above of this Objection to the Motion to Dismiss the Complaint. Permitting the outrageous rate increase of **300%** is a very compelling notion to have this matter heard, and if for some reason it no longer moves our callous conscience, then no one should be offended if this modus operandi does not become labeled as an economic terrorism, or a monopolistic tyranny stripping our society of any semblance of decency we are accustomed to.

For all of the foregoing reasons, CEI's Motion to Dismiss should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Milosh D. Milenkovich', is written over a horizontal line.

Milosh D. Milenkovich (0000047)

Attorney for the Complainant

5851 Pearl Rd., #302

Parma Hts., OH 44130

Phone: 440/842-2770

Fax: 440/842-2740