

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)
Eisenbach Consulting, LLC for)
Certification as a Competitive Retail) Case No. 10-454-EL-AGG
Electric Service Broker/Aggregator.)

In the Matter of the Application of)
Energy Edge Consulting, LLC for) Case No. 10-1327-EL-AGG
Certification as a Competitive Retail)
Electric Service Broker/Aggregator.)

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) On April 7, 2010, in Case No. 10-454-EL-AGG, Eisenbach Consulting, LLC (Eisenbach Consulting) filed an application for certification as a competitive retail electric service broker/aggregator. In conjunction with its application, Eisenbach Consulting also filed a motion for protective order on April 7, 2010, requesting protective treatment for exhibits C-3 and C-7 of its application. These exhibits contain Eisenbach Consulting's financial statements and credit report.
- (2) On September 7, 2010, in Case No. 10-1327-EL-AGG, Energy Edge Consulting, LLC (Energy Edge Consulting) filed an application for certification as a competitive retail electric service broker/aggregator. In conjunction with its application, Energy Edge Consulting also filed motions for protective order on September 7, 2010, and October 12, 2010, requesting protective treatment for exhibits A-14, C-3 and C-5 of its application. These exhibits contain Energy Edge Consulting's articles of incorporation, financial statements and forecasted financial statements.
- (3) The attorney examiner notes that, according to the applications filed in these two cases, the applicants are all corporations. Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-08, Ohio Administrative Code, corporations must be represented by an attorney-at-law, and a person authorized to practice law in other jurisdictions may appear before the Commission only upon the filing of an appropriate motion. The attorney examiner notes that the

individuals responsible for filing the motions for protective order do not appear to be an attorney licensed in Ohio. Accordingly, the attorney examiner finds that the motions for protective order in these two cases were not properly filed and, thus, cannot be considered by the Commission. If an applicant wishes to have the exhibits for which protection has been sought retained under seal, that applicant must have an attorney authorized to practice law in Ohio file an appropriate motion for protective order in the docket for the corresponding application by June 17, 2011. If no motion for protective order is filed in the docket for each application on behalf of the respective applicant by an attorney authorized to practice law in Ohio by that date, the docketing division is directed to release the exhibits filed under seal by each non-complying applicant.

It is, therefore,


ORDERED, That Eisenbach Consulting and Energy Edge Consulting comply with the requirements set forth in Finding (3). It is, further,

ORDERED, That, if no motion for protective order is filed in the docket for each application on behalf of the respective applicant by an attorney authorized to practice law in Ohio by June 17, 2011, the Commission's docketing division should release the corresponding unredacted exhibits, which were filed under seal in these dockets. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this entry be served upon all parties of record.


THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO


By: Henry H. Phillips-Gary
Attorney Examiner

 /sc

Entered in the Journal

MAY 16 2011



Betty McCauley
Secretary