```
1
         BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
2
3
    In the Matter of:
4
     Sherry A. Wiley,
5
             Complainant,
6
                               : Case No. 10-2463-EL-CSS
       VS.
7
    Duke Energy Ohio,
8
             Respondent.
9
                          PROCEEDINGS
10
    before Mr. Kerry K. Sheets, Attorney Examiner, at the
11
12
    Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad
13
    Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:00
    a.m. on Thursday, May 12, 2011.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
                     ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
               222 East Town Street, Second Floor
                   Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
23
                (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
24
                      Fax - (614) 224-5724
25
```

```
2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
            Ms. Sherry A. Wiley
 2
            5370 Aster Park Drive, Apt. 909
            Hamilton, Ohio 45011
 3
                 Pro se.
 4
            Eberly McMahon, LLC
 5
            By Mr. Robert A. McMahon
            2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100
 6
            Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
 7
                 On behalf of the Respondent
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

,		3			
1	INDEX				
2					
3	WITNESS PAGE Shirley A. Wiley				
4	Direct Testimony 12				
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. McMahon 93 Redirect Testimony 136				
6	Redirect restimony				
7	Lee A. Firich Direct Examination by Ms. Wiley 72				
	Cross-Examination by Mr. McMahon 78				
8	Redirect Examination by Ms. Wiley 85 Recross-Examination by Mr. McMahon 92				
9	-				
10	Cindy Givens Direct Examination by Mr. McMahon 158				
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Wiley 171				
11					
1213	COMPLAINANT EXHIBITS IDFD ADMTD 1 - Envelope from Department of 15 217				
13	Development				
1415	2 - Bill 10/20/10, with handwritten notes 33 217				
16	3 - Bill 4/22/10, with handwritten notes 40 217				
17	4 - Security Deposit Receipt, 6/2/10 41 217				
	5 - Extended Payment Plan Letter, 10/21/10 48 217				
1819	6 - Bill 11/18/10, with handwritten notes 51 217				
20	7 - Bill 12/21/10, with handwritten notes 52 217				
21	8 - Bill 1/26/11, with handwritten notes 53 217				
22	9 - Bill 2/22/11, with handwritten notes 62 217				
23	10 - Bill 3/23/11, with handwritten notes 64 217				
	11 - Bill 4/21/11, with handwritten notes 66 217				
2425	12 - Security Deposit Receipt, 5/4/10 66 217				

·				4
1	COMPLAINANT EXHIBITS	IDFD	ADMTD	
2	13 - List of Payments Made	67	217	
3	14 - Department of Development Receipt	77	217	
4	15 - Department of Development Timeline	77	217	
5	RESPONDENT EXHIBITS	IDFD	ADMTD	
6	1 - Direct Testimony of C. Givens	159	217	
7	A - 4/22/10 Bill	96	217	
8	B - 5/21/10 Bill	100	217	
9	C - 6/22/10 Bill	102	217	
10	D - 7/22/10 Bill	188	217	
11	E - 8/20/10 Bill	103	217	
12	F - 9/21/10 Bill	111	217	
13	G - 10/20/10 Bill	112	217	
14	H - 11/18/10 Bill	115	217	
15	I - 12/21/10 Bill	116	217	
16	J - 1/26/11 Bill	118	217	
17	K - 2/22/11 Bill	118	217	
18	L - 3/23/11 Bill	119	217	
19	M - 4/21/11 Bill	121	217	
20	N - Credit Activity History	132	217	
21	0 - Respondent's Requests for Admissions	151	217	
22				
23				
24				
25	Thursday Morning	g Sess:	ion	

May 12, 2011. 1 2 3 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has set for hearing at 4 5 this time and place Case No. 10-2463-EL-CSS, In the 6 Matter of Sherry A. Wiley versus Duke Energy Ohio. 7 My name is Kerry Sheets, I am the 8 attorney examiner for the Commission. 9 We will now have the appearances of the parties, please, starting with the Complainant. 10 11 Your name and address, ma'am. 12 MS. WILEY: Good morning. I am Sherry A. Wiley. My address is 5370 Aster Park Drive, 13 Apartment 909, Hamilton, Ohio, 45011. 14 15 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you. 16 For the company. 17 MR. McMAHON: Good morning, your Honor. Bob McMahon on behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. With 18 19 me is Cindy Givens with Duke Energy. 20 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Very good. Do we have any preliminary matters to take care of this 21 2.2 morning? 23 I do, your Honor. A couple MR. McMAHON: 24 things. One, with respect to the potential testimony

by the representative of the Ohio Department of

```
1
    Development, by entry dated -- let me make sure I
 2
    have the date right -- March 23, 2011, the Commission
 3
    denied Ms. Wiley's requested subpoena to the
     Department of Development. It would appear that she
 4
 5
     issued the subpoena nonetheless, in contradiction to
 6
     the terms of the entry dated March 23, 2011. So we
 7
    would object to any testimony from a witness by the
 8
    Department of Development pursuant to a subpoena that
 9
     was apparently issued improperly by Ms. Wiley.
10
                 We can do one at a time.
11
                 MS. WILEY: May I make a comment, please?
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Why don't we
13
     address them separately. Give her a chance to
     respond. I will interject I think she resubmitted
14
15
     the subpoenas, and they were issued on that basis.
16
                 MR. McMAHON: If that's the case, then
17
     that's fine.
18
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Were you going to
19
     add anything more?
20
                 MS. WILEY: No. That's basically what I
21
    was going to say.
2.2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What was your
23
     second issue?
24
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               The more important issue is
25
     that on February 17, 2011 Duke Energy served
```

```
Ms. Wiley with Requests for Admissions and
Interrogatories and Request for Production of
Documents. As the Court is aware, Ms. Wiley moved
for what we have all deemed to be a protective order.
She objected to responding to the discovery requests.
```

2.2

By that same entry dated March 23, 2011 in finding 16, the Court said that Complainant's motion for protective order regarding Duke Energy's discovery request should be denied. Duke Energy, therefore, would move for the admission of all 46 requests for admissions which Ms. Wiley failed to answer after the Court denied her motion for protective order on March 23. Ms. Wiley did not answer these discovery requests, so all of the 46 requests or admissions should be deemed admitted under applicable PUCO rules.

MS. WILEY: Of course not. I totally object to that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Go ahead and stand up and respond. There is background noise. You have to speak up.

MS. WILEY: Mr. McMahon did in fact do the motion for the 46 statements or whatever, but I also did a motion to object to those statements because at the hearing on the 14th, we had already --

in the first hearing gone over 99 percent of the 46, and I had also admitted into the hearing a letter from Casey James from the Veterans Service Commission, as well as a letter from Heather Benton from Meadow Ridge Apartments, and the letter from J. R. Rainear, Customer Service Department of Duke Energy.

In his interrogatories, like I said, they were all admissions to false accusations, so in my motion I put -- dated March 5, so I am within that window of time to respond -- I, Sherry A. Wiley, object to Respondent's 46 statements entitled Request for Admissions and the eight interrogatory statements and the request for production of documents.

But I did actually resubmit it, the documentation that I had at that time which is what he requested in his motion at that time, and those are the letters that I just stated that I forwarded to him. He received a copy of this, and it's docketed.

It said, Every single one of the 46 statements Robert McMahon, attorney for Duke Energy, the Respondent, is leading me to admit to lies and falsehoods. These statements are not questions but statements which are totally contradictory to every

statement I made in the hearing February 14, 2011.

Mr. McMahon was hoping I would not receive this false request for admissions in time to respond to his actions. This is a malicious gross act of deception and the ethics that the PUCO and the Ohio State federal court systems stands for.

Robert A. McMahon is intentionally being deceptive and knowingly trying every falsehood to prevent me from obtaining information from Duke Energy by requesting that I try the case for him by falsely admitting to these 46 statements he has conjured up when I made it clear in the hearing the total opposite.

On March 3 I asked for the full name address, telephone number, and all contact information of the Duke Energy representative that accompanied him at the hearing February 14 in which he only gave me Cindy Givens with no other contact information. I needed that information so I could serve her a subpoena because my intention at that time was to serve a subpoena so I could get the information I had been requesting since October 2011 since I made so many other verbal requests and never received it, all of them.

So I put, I really doubt that this is her

real name. He then told me to serve the subpoena to
him. It's evident that Duke Energy and Robert A.

McMahon are intentionally trying to give me a hard
time because I am not an attorney, yet they know I
have a very strong case against them.

2.2

These tactics are a desperate and pitiful attempt to again derail this case and a terrible reflection of attorneys everywhere and the courts and the PUCO court hearing system.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let me stop you right there. Now, your motion for protective order was denied.

MS. WILEY: I didn't request a motion for protective order.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That has been sustained by the Commission and been denied. What did you say about you resubmitted? I didn't catch that part. There was some document you have ahold of?

MS. WILEY: It's the Butler County

Veterans Service Commission, Casey James' business

card. Should I bring it up there so you can see?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can.

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, if it helps, we don't take issue with her resubmission of several

```
documents. My point is simply she never responded to the 46 requests for admission. As we sit here today, she has never answered them.
```

MS. WILEY: I did. I objected to those.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What you are showing me is a stamp that says Butler County Service Commission.

MS. WILEY: It's a business card.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And there's a letter on the back.

MS. WILEY: Yes. And we will go into more detail with the letter because this is so pertinent and relevant to the whole case.

 $\label{eq:And this is the letter from the Meadow} % \end{substitute} % \end{substitute}$

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Meadow Run

Apartments and a further letter from Duke Energy. I

think all this was filed in the file.

MS. WILEY: Right.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What I'll do now is take Mr. McMahon's motion under advisement at this point.

MS. WILEY: You will take it under advisement. What does that mean?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That means I'll

rule on it just a bit later. What we will do is go ahead with the hearing at this point.

We will have your testimony now.

- - -

2.2

SHERRY A. WILEY

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have previously given your name and address, Ms. Wiley. I want you to give your testimony in a narrative fashion. Just state your complaint. Okay?

Please speak up.

MS. WILEY: The reason I filed a complaint against Duke Energy with the PUCO is because back in September, around the 13th, I submitted to Duke Energy by fax a letter that the HEAP organization forwarded to me by mail, and this is the envelope stamp dated September 16 stating that \$271 is going to be forwarded to Duke Energy on my behalf to offset the total balance of my account.

They were verifying that this is the correct utility company, and if I object on anything or feel it was the wrong address, please give them a call back.

Lenore Conrad, who was temporary with the HEAP organization, who is no longer with them, called my daughter, Diamond --

MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to testify what you know from your own personal knowledge.

MS. WILEY: Okay. But it's in their record. That's the HEAP organization's record, that Lenore Conrad did call my daughter Diamond on the 11th.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to testify to your personal knowledge what you heard from the Department of Development or Duke.

MS. WILEY: Okay. Upon receiving the letter from the HEAP organization, I called Duke Energy Customer Service Department and asked for the fax number, which they gave me and I faxed the letter over to them.

And then after I got the confirmation, I went back to the phone and called them back, and I got the representative, and this is what started the whole nine yards of why we're here.

I let her know that payment is

forthcoming because I received this letter, it's going to be in the mail, \$271.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are talking about Duke's representative?

MS. WILEY: Yes, Duke's customer service payment arrangement department. And she said, yes, she can see it's in the system. It was deposited into the system on August 2. It got to them on August 2, but it has not been deposited into my account yet. Where it is in the system, in about two more weeks it should drop. That was her experience, you know, by being a CSR at Duke customer service in that department.

So she said that as long as she received it before October 19, I would not be in jeopardy of my services being disconnected. But she said, she reconfirmed where it is in the system, it should drop within two weeks. Again, this was around September 16, around, and that's the postmark for the envelope that the letter came in.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to, you are holding up an envelope.

MS. WILEY: This is the envelope that the actual letter came in. This is the postdate. I just need to show you one more thing.

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you want that
 2
    marked as an exhibit?
 3
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, please.
 4
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Have you seen it,
 5
     counsel?
 6
                 MR. McMAHON: I have not, your Honor.
 7
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you want to
 8
     look at it?
 9
                 MR. McMAHON: Yes, please.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will mark this
10
11
    Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. You won't get it back for a
12
    while.
13
                 MS. WILEY: May I make a copy of it?
14
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, you can make
15
    a copy of it.
16
                 Go ahead, please.
17
                 MS. WILEY: She said this is how it
    worked from this point. At the end of the month --
18
19
    we are still in September -- I'm going to get my bill
20
    for the following month, and she said just disregard
21
     it. I'm going to get three statements. She said I'm
22
     going to get another bill in two weeks. Two weeks
23
    after that, I'm going to get a reminder notice. Two
```

weeks after that I'm going to get a disconnection

notice; and then 10 to 14 days after that, I'll get

24

the final disconnection to my service, and that would take us up close to Thanksgiving, close to Thanksgiving.

I said, okay, great, that would give me enough time to take care of the balance of the bill.

Energy went into my account and totally erased all of the payment arrangements that I had made. She put me on hold while she made the arrangements, and according to all the documentation that I requested from Duke Energy — which is not everything that I requested. That information isn't in there. So since it's in their system, of course, I'm not privileged to. I can only attest to what actually happened.

That's what started everything. On October 19 my services was disconnected.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 19th of?

MS. WILEY: October 19, 2010. My kids and I got home around 6:00 o'clock. We had no power. I immediately called Duke Energy customer service. I spoke to Tony the first time, and Tony said that, yes, my services are disconnected. My account had been closed. I need to pay the full amount, which at that time was \$730 around, paraphrasing, around \$730

to have my services restored.

2.2

I asked Tony is there an alternative. Is there anything I could do about that. He said, No, pay the bill, real nasty. I asked for a supervisor. He said there was no supervisor around and that he was the only person in charge that I'm going to speak to. He was the customer service that answered the phone.

I told him of course that's not right. I worked in a call center before. I hung up.

I called right back. I got Lonnie.

Lonnie told me -- that's the only name he told me. I can only give you the information they told me.

Lonnie told me the same thing. He initially told me there were no supervisors on staff in the evenings, and then later in our conversation he said, Well, let me put you on hold and get a supervisor. So I held for about 20 minutes. He came back to the phone, and then he hung up on me.

That night we went over to my parents' house because we can't stay in that house that has no electric, one; and, two, I have a minor. My son is under 18, so things could be really difficult if the police or child protective services or somebody else was to come by and my son who is under 18 is in a

house with no electricity. I could be in a lot of trouble. So we left and went over to my mom's house and stayed there.

The next morning at 8:00 o'clock when the Lynn Street office, that's the physical office where you go in Duke Energy and pay your bill and get service and everything restored, I went in there at 8:00 o'clock when they first opened. I was right there.

I spoke to three women, three different customer service persons. I asked each time for the manager, if there's not a supervisor available, may I please speak to the manager, the general manager, somebody who had a little more authority than all the customer service people that are here.

She told me there were none at this location. I said, This is the only physical location you have here. This is the main Duke Energy office, and you're telling me there's no manager, no general manager, no nothing. She said no, that was it.

All three women, all three women told me
I had to pay the \$730 in order to get my services
back on and that they couldn't turn my services back
on, that I need to call customer service to have that
on.

I said, Of course, you take payment arrangements. You start service. You end service here. You do all of that physically here in this office, you know. She says, Well, go get \$730 and come back, real nasty, real rude, much attitude.

2.2

So I have a cell phone and I called the Customer Service Department, like she requested for me to do. She told me to get out of her line because I could not be on a cell phone while up there in her window doing -- at the window paying my bill. And there's a big sign right there saying "no cell phones" when you're in line.

I said, You just told me to call customer service in line, you know, to make arrangements or something. She said, Yeah, but you can't do that here. Then she called security immediately and told them to make me leave.

So I went to the back of the building, called the customer service person, and this customer service person -- now, I've spoken to Lonnie, Tony, and three women at the physical office, and all of them told me there was nothing I could do.

I called this customer service person, and she tells me that she can reinstate my service if I paid \$175. And I asked her, I said, Did not Tony

and Lonnie, the three women I just finished talking to, did they not know that? She said they should have. She said they had the same training she had. They should have known about the winter rule.

I asked her, What is the winter rule? During certain months of the year you are able to claim the winter rule, regardless of the amount of your bill, and pay \$175.

I said, Well, can you reduce that from \$175 to \$100? And she let me know that couldn't be done, or whatever, so I said okay. So I left. And this is still on the 20th. This is on the 20th.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: October 20, 2010?

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

So I went around trying to pull all that money, funds together and everything, and later on that afternoon about 3:00 o'clock, after I picked up my son from school I called back, and I got a different payment arrangement customer service person.

I asked her if I could pay \$125, because at that time, that's how much I had got together.

All she did was mock me and told me, No, you cannot. I don't know how else to explain this to you. Are you stupid and can't understand?

I said, Oh, my goodness, are you calling me stupid? I just spoke to five of your customer service people that didn't even mention a winter bill. I speak to a sixth one, and he tells me about the 175, and you have the nerve to call me out, my name, because I'm trying to find out is there something else out there that I don't know within your organization and your department. She said, I don't know how else to explain this to you. You need to pay the \$175 to get it restored.

2.2

So we went to the 20th without service because I'm still trying to get the rest. On the 21st, on October 21st, 2010, about 9:00 o'clock in the morning, I called again, and I spoke to another representative who told me the same thing that the other two, the sixth and seventh representative told me, and she said, Are you ready to pay?

At that time I had all the funds together on my credit card, and I gave her the information over the phone, the payment information over the phone so she could restore my services.

Now, when I requested the telephone conversations and everything, of course, Tony and Lonnie was not a part of the conversations that were recorded. The notations that the three young ladies

at the physical office down on Lynn Street, even though I was watching them type something into the computer while they had my account up, there was no notes from them either.

I have on this disk I think it's two or three conversations out of all the conversations I had. It's the young lady on the 20th who let me know that if I paid the \$175 that I could have my services turned back on.

And this is the comment that I made. I said, I called to make payment arrangements about a month ago to help me pay one bill, and now my service is turned off, and I'm forced to pay not one, but two bills. I'm forced to pay my current bill plus \$95 for an agreement that was intact that should have saved my services from being cut off.

She said, Well, if I don't know the name of the young lady who did that, and she don't see any notes in the system, there's nothing that she can do about it.

And I said, How in the world can I — everything is on your end. When your customer service persons tell me that they're making notations, I can't go through the phone and see if they're actually making these notations. When I'm

physically there at the site, I can't go around the counter to make sure that they're actually putting in the information as they're telling me that they are.

She asked me, Did I want to go through and have my services restored? I told her yes. I told her to go ahead. I gave her my credit card information. She said it would be on in a couple hours. This was about 9:00 o'clock on the 21st of October, and that's what these two are.

Since, October since this happened, I've called Duke Energy and requested to them to have a copy of my account, everything pertaining to my account, every note, every telephone conversation, every memo, every privileged and unprivileged piece of paper that pertains to this account at this address, can I have a copy of it, to request a copy of it.

I requested that in October. I requested that when I called the PUCO and started my initial complaint with the PUCO and they accepted it. You all accepted it as a formal complaint to go ahead and process and get us to this point. And it's my understanding that you don't accept all of the complaints that come your way, but, evidently, this had enough validity that you accepted this one.

```
I went to the VA Administration -- I'm
 1
 2
     sorry. I need to back up. I called the utility
 3
     advocate, state office department, and spoke to a
 4
    Brian somebody as well.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Consumer Counsel,
 5
 6
     is that who you spoke to?
 7
                 MS. WILEY: It's the utility advocate.
 8
     It's the state department. They're parallel with
 9
    your department.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I assume
10
11
    Consumers' Counsel. Okay. Go ahead.
12
                 MS. WILEY: Spoke with a Brian there, and
     I explained my situation to him, as well as to the
13
14
    PUCO, and he had requested documentation,
     information.
15
16
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.
17
                 MS. WILEY: Oh, not at all. Actually,
18
     some of my paper, I have one memo where Pamela Ball
19
    has sent to Brian because Brian called either Pamela
20
    Ball -- I have the memo.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to
21
22
     testify of your own personal knowledge. You can
     submit the memo as evidence in this case as an
23
24
     exhibit if you want.
25
                 MS. WILEY: Okay.
```

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: But you can only
 2
    testify as to what you know, your personal knowledge.
                 MS. WILEY: Okay. Then I'll go back to
 3
     the VA. November the 8th I had a meeting with the
 4
 5
         I'm a veteran, so I went to the Veterans
 6
    Administration to see if they could assist me and pay
 7
    my utility bill. I had paid the 175 and got my
 8
     services restored, but I wanted help with the
 9
     remainder of the bill, as well as other assistance.
10
                 I met with Casey James, who is the
11
    representative there, and there's a letter in here
     from Casey that I showed you giving very much detail
12
13
     on the hard times that Duke Energy and the false
     information that Duke --
14
15
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.
16
                 MS. WILEY: It's the letter that he
17
             I was physically right there when it
     wrote.
18
    happened.
19
                 MR. McMAHON: The letter is hearsay as
20
    well.
21
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You say he wrote
2.2
    a letter?
23
                 MS. WILEY:
                             Yes.
24
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Go ahead with
25
     your testimony.
```

```
1
                 MS. WILEY: As I was meeting with Casey,
2
    he needed a copy of my bill, and he called Duke
3
    Energy. When he called Duke Energy -- now, my bill
    states "Final Disconnection Notice" at the top of the
4
5
    bill.
6
                 Could I get that out? We are going to go
7
    over it a little later in more detail.
8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Is it in the
9
    file, ma'am? Do you want to have it submitted as an
    exhibit?
10
11
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, along with my notes and
12
    everything, yes.
13
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Well, we don't
14
    have to submit the whole file. If you have specific
15
    exhibits you want to offer in this case, we can mark
16
    them. We have one here, the outside of the envelope
17
    that came in. Do you have other exhibits, not
```

MS. WILEY: Okay, I do.

exhibits as you want.

18

19

20

2.2

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Then you have to get them out and have them marked.

talking about the whole file? You mentioned a

memorandum or letter. You can submit them as

MS. WILEY: Can we go over in order so I don't lose my spot?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We can go off the record at this point and get them out.

Off the record.

2.2

(Discussion off record.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, Duke Energy objects to the Complainant's Exhibit No. 2 as hearsay. Clearly this is an out-of-court statement offered to prove the truth of the matters asserted in that. Ms. Wiley does not have any witness from the veterans association. She does not have Mr. James, who offered the letter, to come in and authenticate it.

While she might be privy to certain communications, she can testify to her personal knowledge. That letter absolutely is hearsay and we object to its admission into the record.

MS. WILEY: Sir, if I can, I totally object to that. It's the same as if I do a subpoena and request documentation, the person does not have to physically be here in order for them to bring in the requested documentation and to speak on that documentation, and that's my understanding of the subpoenas.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think counsel is right; this letter does represent hearsay. But you can testify of your own personal knowledge what you had heard on the speaker phone. So you can proceed on that point.

MS. WILEY: On November 8, 2010, in Casey James' office at the Veterans Administration, Casey took my bill and called Duke Energy customer service. He spoke to a young lady named Carrie. Carrie stated that the last payment --

MR. McMAHON: I guess I would object to the extent Ms. Wiley is reading from a letter. If she has personal knowledge, her credibility and memory is at issue for purposes of representation.

MS. WILEY: That's fine.

Carrie, the customer service representative for Duke Energy, told Casey that my bill was \$25. I was not in jeopardy of being disconnected again, and I did not have to pay a deposit or anything else.

Casey asked her -- again, she's on speaker phone. We are there in his office. Casey asked her again, is she --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Who is Casey?

MS. WILEY: The Veterans Administration

```
representative.
```

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. And he was told by?

MS. WILEY: Carrie, who is the Duke Energy representative.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That you owed?

MS. WILEY: \$25.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Proceed.

MS. WILEY: And Casey asked Carrie am I in jeopardy of being disconnected? She told him no. He asked what the \$25 was for. She said it was a reconnection fee for the services that I had reconnected on October 19.

So I asked her, is there an outstanding bill. She told Casey no. I was totally blown away. I said, So on this bill, it states that I have to -- I want to submit this, too.

On this bill, my November due date bill, which is for services from September 20 to October 19 when I was cut off, it says that I owe \$739.61. Are you saying I don't owe this? I'm not responsible for this? She said in her records which she sees is the only amount for the bill that I had was \$25.

So Casey says, Well, okay, ma'am, thank you. And I asked her before she hung up, I said,

Carrie, can you please send me documentation on my whole account? You know, I need that in writing. I need something in writing stating that my past and present bill is only \$25.

2.2

And she said sure, she can do that.

If you notice some of the documentation that I asked Duke Energy for and they said what they have, all of the information as printed out is time stamped and dated for November 8, 2010. I received this through counsel, Duke Energy's counsel, around February 14 at the hearing.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: At the settlement conference?

MS. WILEY: I'm sorry, at the settlement conference, February 14. And every single note that he presented and gave me is dated for November 8, 2010. So Carrie did print out most of my account, which she had privilege to, most of it, and then it was siphoned through, because the only thing that shows that they gave me are the connection times, when the gentleman went out to disconnect my service and when they went out to reconnect my service, and this is all dated the same day, November 8, and I got it way back then.

If we can go through further, I wanted to

wait towards the end to do that, but the bill is not an accurate and true account of my bill. Starting from my first bill in April when I initiated service, it's not a true and accurate account. I noticed they added \$93 from my first bill along with my current usage and the deposit. This \$93 does not account for anything on the bill. It's an extra amount. And I would like to submit all of the bills that I have just to show this, to prove this.

2.2

So they added on an extra \$93, plus the \$140 deposit, which was fine. I knew I had to pay a deposit when I got the services turned on. But this amount does not account for anything, and it is added from the first bill throughout my whole account.

When we get into July and August, in that area, there's another \$47 that's not accounted for. It's not a past due amount. It's not a late fee. It's not a partial payment or anything. It's just \$47 that's been added on. There's a few instances in all my bills that shows, especially the last two bills, April and May of this year, 2011, they both show extra amounts and fees added on to the account, and I can account for that. I went through each bill and I can account for all of that.

Let's see, in the order that you gave --

```
1
     I need for this to be part of the record, sir.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You want this
2
3
    marked as an exhibit?
4
                 MS. WILEY: The whole packet.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let counsel come
5
6
    up and look at it.
7
                 Off the record.
8
                 (Discussion off the record.)
9
                 MR. McMAHON: Whatever Ms. Wiley is now
     submitting I guess is proposed Claimant's 3.
10
11
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It's 2, actually.
                 MR. McMAHON: Right, you sustained the
12
    objection on the VA letter. This is proposed Exhibit
13
     2, which is a series of documents, including
14
15
    handwritten notes. Duke Energy would object to
    everything that is handwritten. We wouldn't object
16
17
    to any actual bills or copies of documents produced
    by Duke.
18
19
                 But all these notes and information
20
    Ms. Wiley has written on these various documents,
21
     including a history of communication, is
2.2
     inappropriate hearsay. If she wants to testify about
23
    things, that's one thing, but unverified,
24
    unauthenticated notes and things like "lies," things
25
     like that, are not admissible.
```

```
MS. WILEY: Can I make a comment?
 1
 2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I will overrule
 3
     the objection, counselor. You can cross-examine her
     on this information, this handwritten information.
 4
 5
                 What I will do is mark this as
 6
     Complainant's Exhibit 2.
 7
                 MS. WILEY: Thank you.
 8
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               I guess, for the record, my
 9
     other objection would be Ms. Wiley failed to produce
10
     that document in response to our request for
                              Today is the first time
11
    production of documents.
12
     I've ever seen that first page with all of her
13
    handwritten notes. It was not produced in discovery.
                 MS. WILEY: I totally object.
14
                                                This is
    what they gave to me.
15
16
                 MR. McMAHON: The first page is what I
17
    referred to.
                 MS. WILEY: These copies that's already
18
     in here are the copies that they gave to me.
19
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think he is
21
     objecting to the handwritten notes.
2.2
                 MS. WILEY: I wrote these last night in
23
    preparation for the case.
24
                 MR. McMAHON: All the more reason the
25
     first page should not be admitted. She just admitted
```

```
she wrote that last night.
```

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 MS. WILEY: I can verbally attest to it.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can

4 cross-examine her on this if you wish.

MS. WILEY: We will jump to the first bill.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let me see if I can summarize your complaint as received so far. You object because your complaint is the representative from the Veterans Administration was told the wrong thing over the telephone and it caused --

MS. WILEY: Me not to get the benefit from the Veterans Administration. I was denied.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Now, you were also saying that certain charges on your bill are incorrect.

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. What I'm going to ask you to do is just to verbally state which ones you object to, and we will see if we can condense and make your testimony a little more concise here.

MS. WILEY: Okay. I apologize.

My first bill is dated for May 14.

That's my first bill. It's for services from

```
1
    April 3 to April 21.
2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: May 14 --
3
                 MS. WILEY: April 3, 2010.
4
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: April 3, 2010,
5
    okay. Go ahead.
                 MS. WILEY: To April 21st of 2010.
6
7
     is my first bill. On this bill that's only 17, 18
    days for my first bill. And then it calculates --
9
    really, I don't know what else it calculates.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Is that bill part
10
11
    of what you submitted already?
12
                 MS. WILEY: No, sir. This is a brand-new
    packet. This is my first bill at that location with
13
14
    Duke Energy. A connection fee for the apartment is
15
    charged for $25 because it was my first time
16
    receiving service there, but there's 47 that's not
17
    accounted for.
18
                 Here it says that there was an agreement,
19
    as Cindy Givens stated in her direct testimony of
20
    Cindy Marie Givens in here. Cindy makes the comment,
21
     if I may -- give me just a moment, please.
2.2
                 The direct question is, "Please explain
23
    how you are familiar what the Aster Park Account."
24
    And further down in the first paragraph she states --
25
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What page are you
```

on?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MS. WILEY: I'm on page 8. Actually, let me go back to page 5 and read this whole paragraph.

"I have personally researched DE-Ohio records for Ms. Wiley's Aster Park account on more than one occasion, including when she filed the original Complaint leading to the settlement conference in February 2011 and again in preparation for my testimony for the hearing in these proceedings. DE-Ohio keeps and maintains customer account information in a comprehensive computer database called the Customer Management System (CMS). CMS is used by all call center, receivables and customer service personnel and used to keep track of service requests, customer calls, inquiries, turn on, and disconnection orders, billings, account status and histories. CMS has been the single customer management system used by DE-Ohio and its predecessor, CG&E, since 1993."

If this was accurate, if what she says is accurate, then all of my telephone calls that I had with the five representatives, Tony, Lonnie and the three young ladies that I physically went down to the Lynn Street office, all of that would be on my account. I saw them typing something, but out of the

information of the documents that I requested for them, it wasn't among that. The information I got from them is just the turn on and the reconnections of the gentleman who came out to my apartment and turned my service on and off and a few other things I'll present shortly.

2.2

So if this is true, then they would have a record of those telephone calls because this comprehensive system shouldn't be able to discriminate which calls are coming through and which calls it is going to record and which calls it is not going to record, or which customer service notes it's going to accept and which customer service notes it's not going to accept. I had a problem with that in her narrative.

If we may, we may as well jump back.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You will have a chance to cross-examine the company witness when she gets on the stand. What I need you to do is state your complaint in a concise fashion.

MS. WILEY: On my first bill, May 14, there is an amount for \$47, and it says agreement No. 305-9252 for \$47. But there's no agreement stated anywhere on what that is. I have no idea what that agreement is. It shows that there's an

```
agreement for my deposit, which I did make an agreement for my deposit, and I have here on the bill $140 deposit amount due, and that right under it, agreement for $140. I have that.
```

2.2

But on the second page under agreement information, it has \$93. This \$93 followed the account all throughout the whole ordeal. Now, I don't know what this \$47 is, that amount. I just don't know what it is. But the \$47 is still there, plus the \$93 that's still there.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What document is this?

MS. WILEY: My first bill, the first bill that Duke Energy sent out to me, this is my first bill.

Again, the notes, that was from my account that was taken -- can I show you this?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.

MS. WILEY: It shows where the security deposit was requested in the account. These are the notes that they sent me dated November 8.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to an untitled document from Duke Energy sent to you as part of discovery.

MS. WILEY: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Go ahead.

2.2

MS. WILEY: That I did make an arrangement for the \$140 that I paid in June on June 3 for that amount. And this is the amount of my bills, everything. As you see on the actual bill itself, the agreement amount due is \$47, and this is the agreement for the deposit. Down here it says agreement balance \$93.

Now, Duke Energy, I don't know if this is a payment made or whatnot. I really don't recall that or anything. But the \$150, I did make that payment in June, so if this is a payment that is not included in their listing of payments received --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Which amounts?

MS. WILEY: The 47, but I was charged the 47 plus the 93. This 93 follows throughout, and here are my notes. What is the 47 for? What is the arrangement? What is the 93? I only have gas and electric. What is the 47 for?

In her notation she mentioned that all arrangements are documented in the system or whatever, but this 47 and this 93 is not in there. The \$140 is -- that's the deposit, and that's the deposit I paid in June. I paid \$150. The \$10 went towards the bill. This 47 and 93 is something that

```
1
    they added, and it's not accounted for.
2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Now, did
3
    you want this marked as an exhibit?
4
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will let
6
    counsel look at it.
7
                 MR. McMAHON: Again Duke Energy objects
8
    to this document and any other documents that have
9
    handwritten notes.
10
                 MS. WILEY: These are my deposit
11
    receipts.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You want this as
13
    part of the deposit?
14
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir. These are my
15
    receipts from Duke Energy showing that they received
16
    my $150.
17
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record.
                 (Discussion off record.)
18
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Counsel objected
20
    to what has been marked as Plaintiff's
21
    Exhibit 3 because of the handwritten notes on the
2.2
    front, and my ruling is the same as with Plaintiff's
23
    Exhibit 2. You have an opportunity to cross-examine
```

Complainant's Exhibit 4 has been marked.

plaintiff on this exhibit if you wish.

24

25

These are entitled Security Deposit Receipt. There are two receipts in the exhibit, and they will be included in one exhibit. I shall not, however, include the envelopes they came in.

Now let's proceed.

MS. WILEY: We are back at November 8, 2010, at the VA Administration with Casey. Casey denied my application because on the application I put that I had \$739.61 as an overdue balance for my Duke Energy bill, and when he verified that, she told him it was only \$25.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So that basically is your complaint right there, is that correct, plus these 47 and 93 dollars that you aren't sure on the bill?

MS. WILEY: The foundation for the whole complaint is wrongful disconnection because I had a payment arrangement agreement in effect through a Duke Energy representative -- I'm sorry -- back in September, around September 13, 16, around that time, 2010.

When the young lady called my daughter on September 11 -- I know you objected to that -- she went ahead and forwarded a letter, and that's the envelope that you have for September 16. When I got

2.2

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir. I immediately went up to my management company's office to use their fax machine and their phone. I called Duke Energy from up there and got the fax number, had them fax it over for me, and called Duke Energy back from their phone to make sure they got the fax, and this is where we went over the whole conversation where she — where we set up the payment arrangement and she told me it would go up until just before Thanksgiving, around Thanksgiving, which would have given me time to pay.

MR. McMAHON: Objection. Witness has already testified to these events.

MS. WILEY: He asked me to restate.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No. I want to make sure you have completed your testimony now. You got in everything about what you say happened at the Veterans Administration office.

MS. WILEY: Just about. I'm sorry.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And the charges you weren't sure about on your bills.

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Is there anything

```
else to add?
1
2
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
3
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
                 MS. WILEY: When we finished up with
4
5
     Casey and he denied my application because of what
    the young lady told him, I went back to him in
6
    December and asked him if he could write a letter
7
8
    regarding our -- my visit there on November 8. He
9
     said he would be more than happy to, and he did, and
    that's the letter that you saw but won't get
10
11
     admitted. But he wrote that letter.
12
                 He called her back and another
13
    representative told him --
14
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to
16
    testify to what you know.
17
                 MS. WILEY: Then I'm finished with that.
     That's in the letter. She gave him wrong information
18
19
     again, but that's hearsay.
20
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, move to strike.
21
                 MS. WILEY: That's fine. I'll move
2.2
    forward.
23
                 My bill -- the PUCO accepted my
24
    complaint, and my bill for December 2010, because it
25
     accounted for October 19 up until November 20 or so,
```

right up in there, that was the lowest bill I've ever received from Duke Energy.

2.2

Now, during that period, I am a full-time premedical student, and my daughter is now in college as well, and my son is a full-time high school student. During that time during the day I was at home. My classes are on line. I was at home, you know, during the day.

My daughter works at Macy's periodically. She's not full time. She's part time, but for most of part of the day she was at home. So there was somebody home at the house running the heat, because in October and November it was cold. There was snow days where the schools had closed down and the kids weren't in school, not that many, but there were a few.

During that time we ran the heat. The computer was used. The regular utilities, the refrigerator, all that was used and everything. The lights were on. TVs were on, and my bill was \$108, and that's the lowest it has ever been.

From November 21st to December 19, around that time, nobody was home that much. I worked -- I was still a full-time student, but I worked part time at the post office. My daughter was full-time

physically in school and still working at Macy's, and my son was still a full-time high school student, so for the most part of the day nobody was at home.

2.2

My bill between that period of time —— and the heat was running, you know, it was on, but it was turned down. My bill for that month was \$180 and some change, \$180. Now there's nobody home. The heat is turned down low, and my bill is high when there's nobody home. But when we're physically there from October 21st to the 19th of November, when we're physically there running everything, my bill is low. It doesn't make sense.

I've put that in the motion in earlier testimony in the first conference hearing back then. So should I resubmit that as well?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think we already have that part.

Now, does that conclude your testimony about the complaint?

MS. WILEY: Almost, sir. I know I'm running slow. I'm just trying to cover everything.

In the order that you gave, I did a motion to please stay the disconnection of my services in January, for my service for Duke Energy not to turn off my services until we had our decision

made in all of the hearings, in all of the conference hearing and this trial as well.

2.2

And what you granted on the 24th of February, you made an order that Duke Energy not cut off my services for the bills that are in question, the bills that are in question.

So I made a motion also and even in Mr. McMahon's motion that you made on February 16, the second paragraph, he puts Respondent — the name of the motion is Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., Memorandum in Opposition to Complainant's Request to Stop Disconnection of Services.

In the second paragraph Mr. McMahon writes, "Respondent tentatively waived the prior disconnection notices due to the pending hearing because Respondent wanted to address the issue at the settlement conference on February 14, 2011 in the hopes of avoiding a conflict with the Complainant."

So he also admitted to my services not being disconnected pending --

MR. McMAHON: Objection to that characterization. There was no admission by Duke Energy as to anything.

MS. WILEY: This is his words. This is his motion.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's sustained. You have to avoid characterizing other people's words here. I want you to state your complaint. We are almost done with that.

2.2

MS. WILEY: Okay. All of the bills from October to present, all the bills Duke Energy has incorporated into the current bill, my old bill and my new bill. So in the motions where I requested a stay of my electricity not to be turned off pending the decision from these hearings, that would be inclusive of all the bills.

My proof of that, the bills that you already have, but starting from October -- I will give you all of them. I will fast-forward a little bit. For October 2010 in the Current Billing area, it shows the total amount for the bill.

Now, when they reconnected my service, they forced me into an agreement. They forced me, and this is the letter from Duke Energy representative J. R. Rainear, Customer Service Department.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you referring to now, ma'am?

MS. WILEY: This letter from the Duke
Energy representative. When my services were turned

```
off on October 19 in order to have them restored --
 1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you offering
 2
 3
    this as evidence?
 4
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm assuming it's
 5
 6
    a letter from Duke Energy.
 7
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir, their reconnection
 8
    person.
 9
                 MR. McMAHON: This is proposed Exhibit 5?
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes.
10
11
                 MR. McMAHON: Again, just for the record,
    Duke's only objection is to any handwritten notes.
12
     The actual documents from Duke Energy there's no
13
14
     objection.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
                                                What I
16
    will do is mark it as Complainant's Exhibit 5, and,
17
     once again, you may cross-examine her about any
    handwritten notes. She's the one who actually wrote
18
19
     them.
20
                 MS. WILEY: I did.
21
                 In the letter I was forced, and I told
22
    you this before, that I had to pay my old bill, which
23
    was $739.61, plus my current.
24
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The letter states
25
    you had to do that?
```

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir. They said I had to pay my old bill, and we broke that up into \$95 installments, \$95 installments.

2.2

And I told the customer service person, because they weren't going to reconnect it unless I agreed to it, and I told her -- and that's one of the messages that was deleted from our -- never put on the CD. I told her, I called, and that's when I made the comment, I called in September to make arrangements for one bill, and now since my service is being reconnected, I am forced to pay not one bill but two bills. That's not fair to me because your customer service person said she was putting this in the account. So when she told me that, I took her at her word. I can't go through the phone to make sure she's doing what she's doing.

MR. McMAHON: Objection. This has already been testified to.

MS. WILEY: I was just going over the letter. He said -- she said that I had to agree to this, and this is what the letter attests to, that I had to pay both bills.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Now we will move on to the next point.

MS. WILEY: Okay. The reason I needed to

```
1
     emphasize that because only on -- for my bill for
2
    October, due date of October, the $95 -- actually,
    that was before. I think you have it already. The
3
    November bill, its due date is November 11. It's
4
5
     still under -- this should be a brand new bill.
6
     should start brand new services and everything so the
7
    total shouldn't be $739.
8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring
9
     to Complainant's Exhibit 2.
10
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir. My December bill,
11
    the December bill is the only bill that shows the
12
     separation of my past due bill and my current usage.
13
    My current usage here is showing $228, and it's not
     counting the $100 payment that I had made, plus it
14
15
    does account for the $175 payment that I made, but
16
    this should be for one bill, and it's not.
17
                 But it's showing two separate accounts.
     It is showing my old account and new account.
18
19
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to this other bill. Do you need to mark this, too?

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir. It offsets all the rest. It proves my point.

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is kind of -- I see the bill has been split and stapled here on the bottom.

```
51
1
                 MS. WILEY: I accidentally did that.
2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are up to
    No. 6.
3
4
                 MS. WILEY: On my January bill when I
5
    paid the $100 --
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Wait a second.
6
7
    We are up to No. 6 now.
                 MR. McMAHON: Same objection as
8
9
    previously to any handwritten notes.
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm going to mark
11
    this as Complainant's Exhibit 6, and it will be for
12
    the December billing.
13
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
14
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, the
15
    objection has been sustained.
16
                 MS. WILEY: For my January bill, they
17
    revert back to incorporating the old bill into my new
    account because it's saying current amount due. It
18
19
    doesn't say past amount due or agreement amount;
20
    current amount due, $780.11. So they incorporated
21
    the old bill with the new bill.
2.2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are referring
23
    to the January billing, and we're up to No. 7. You
24
    want this?
25
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Complainant's Exhibit 7. I assume you have the same objection, counsel.

MR. McMAHON: Yes, your Honor.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Once again, I'll overrule that. Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 will be the January billing.

MS. WILEY: And this, the February bill, pretty much put everything in motion. In February, in the month of February on the 25th, you, sir, Mr. Sheets, ordered a stay of disconnection on bills not in dispute. But from what I showed you, they incorporated the old bill into the new bill so they put all the bills together. It's not separated anymore. The only time they separated the bill was in December when they said, okay, this is the amount you had to pay. This is the amount for current. The December bill is the only one they did that for.

For all the other bills prior and all the other bills from January to present they incorporated it into the bill, and I can justify that in March. But let me stick with February for right now. In February you made this order to stay disconnection based on bills in dispute. Mr. McMahon, attorney for Duke Energy, stated that --

```
MR. McMAHON: Objection.
```

2.2

MS. WILEY: It's in his motion. Can I just read his motion? Would that be the same?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think you can state what he filed in the motion.

MS. WILEY: Okay. In his motion, what I read before, he put that it was a courtesy. Those were his words, a courtesy that Duke Energy did not disconnect my services pending the decision from the settlement hearing. That's in his motion, wrote that in his motion.

So but everything changed in March. I'll stick to February. So then later on, February 25, you gave the order not to disconnect, and in February I made a payment as well, so I need that. I need that entered in as well.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This will be Complainant's Exhibit 8. And same procedure, I'm assuming that counsel will object.

MR. McMAHON: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The handwritten notes, I will overrule that.

Now, this Complainant's Exhibit 8 refers to the February billing, correct?

```
MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now we are up to

March, is that correct?

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Is this the last

one?

7 MS. WILEY: This is the most important

8 one.

1

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

9 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, proceed.

MS. WILEY: In March I submitted a motion for good faith payment because I already made motions that my bills were not a true and accurate account of all my payment histories.

On the bill -- and I did a separate motion for a good faith payment of \$50 a month because I felt, and in previous motions I felt, that I was being overcharged in my billing as well.

On my March bill it states that I have to pay -- if my services are connected, I have to pay a \$40 deposit to have my services turned on. I would have to pay the \$730.11 to have it restored if my services were discontinued.

But with Mr. McMahon's motion and your order, I felt I was safe, not that I wasn't going to pay my bill or anything like that, no, that's not

what I'm saying, but I was safe as far as being disconnected because you gave the order and his statement in the motion.

2.2

You approved my subpoenas to serve Duke Energy on the 22nd of March. On the 23rd of March I was disconnected. My services were disconnected. I was totally blindsided. Again, the order was not to disconnect my services for the monies or the bills that were pertinent to the case, and I had already filed a motion stating that all the bills were inclusive to the original amount. They weren't separated. Both of those were included. I already did a motion for that.

Nevertheless, they put me off, and we were out of our home for five days. It took me five days to pull everything together so we could have our services turned back on because I had to pay the \$730.11, plus a \$50 deposit, plus a \$25 reconnection fee. So that totaled \$805 I had to come up with.

Actually, within four days, because as my lease specifies, and as the letter I need to submit from my management company from Heather Benton, it states that if our services are disconnected, we have 72 hours to get them reinstated before our eviction, before we go through the eviction process and it

```
becomes permanent.
```

2.2

Can I get that letter?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, you can get the letter.

MS. WILEY: I'm winding it up. I know it's been a long time, but I am winding this up. But I will get that letter so you see that.

We were displaced. We didn't have anyplace to go. I couldn't afford a hotel or anything like that. My parents were painting the house, the inside of the house, so they didn't want us over there. I had to pretty much beg my parents to let us stay there until I got service back on. So we were displaced these five days because you granted me the subpoenas and which I served on them.

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

MS. WILEY: That's not hearsay. That's what you did, you granted the subpoena.

MR. McMAHON: Foundation.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to explain a little bit more about that as why. You said there was granting here of an order and you were displaced.

MS. WILEY: Okay. On February 25 you gave the order for my services not to be disconnected

```
for the amounts that were in question, which was my whole bill because they incorporated the old and new bill together. And I made a motion on the 5th in regard to that, plus I went a step further. I made a good faith motion I would pay $50 an month because that is a more accurate account of what my billing should be for the apartment, the little apartment that we have, until the decision is made at the hearing, until we can come up with something at the hearing.
```

So I did those motions as well, but on the 22nd when the subpoenas were approved, on the 23rd my services were cut off and my kids and I were displaced. I finally convinced my parents to let me stay. We had to inhale paint fumes for those days, but nevertheless I got the money together.

I went over to the SELF organization. I went to that organization.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What does SELF stand for?

MS. WILEY: It's Support to Encourage Low Income Families.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Now proceed.

MS. WILEY: I spoke with Athena Malley,

who is a HEAP coordinator.

2 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What is HEAP?

MS. WILEY: Department of Development,

I'm sorry. What does HEAP stand for?

5 MR. FIRICH: Home Energy Assistance

Program.

2.2

MS. WILEY: Thank you, Home Energy
Assistance Program. She's their representative. And
I asked them for assistance.

Now, what they did for me, they assisted me from different entities within their department. They assisted me with \$175 from one account, 250 from another account, and 157 from another account. And then I paid \$380 to include with that. I had made a payment on March 13 for \$50, as I stated in my good faith motion that I would do until we came to an agreement or an accurate monthly account. All together that totaled \$1,012, which is more than \$850.11.

So when I went to finalize this through the SELF organization on the 28th, we initially met on that Friday, from Friday the 26th, the 25th, on that Friday they agreed they would help but I needed to pay my part, which was the 380. So I got the \$380 and paid that on the 26th, which was that Saturday.

And when I went in on Monday on March 28, they paid the remainder, so all together from all the payments it totaled up to be \$1,012, which was more than what they --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You stated that before. When we went to go finish up the transaction, the young lady called Duke Energy service department to make the payment, let them know they were forwarding this money electronically toward my account. I showed proof I paid 380. The young lady in the customer service department said the amount had changed.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.

MS. WILEY: I was on speaker. She was on speaker.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Proceed.

MS. WILEY: She said I had to pay an extra \$142 plus the 805.11. I said why? Where did this come from? We agreed on this on Friday, and now here we were Monday morning finishing up the transaction, which they let you know we would finish up on Monday, and now you're telling me I have to come up with an extra 142.

The SELF organization said, We can't give you any more so we're going to have to cancel the

agreement. I said Oh, no, we are not going to cancel the agreement. Give me ten minutes.

Athena Malley, when I initially met with her, I asked her, does she know Cindy Givens? And she let me know yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Who is Athena Malley?

MS. WILEY: She is the representative for the HEAP department. Yes, she knows Cindy Givens, and she gave me her contact information. Now, I had requested this contact information for Cindy Givens since the last conference hearing we had on February 14 from Mr. McMahon.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Settlement conference you're talking about?

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir, settlement conference on February 14, in which he just gave me her contact information on this direct testimony
May 5. That's when I got it in the mail, May 5. I requested it in February; got it May 5, a week prior.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, your Honor. The Court might recall you ordered that we were not required to provide any further contact information regarding Ms. Givens and that Ms. Wiley would contact Ms. Givens through counsel. That was the Court's

```
order back in I believe March of 2011.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I will sustain that objection.

Now I need you to proceed to the end of your testimony, ma'am, in a concise fashion.

MS. WILEY: Okay. I called Cindy Givens and left a message on her voice mail saying that Athena had called you on last Friday and spoken to you in regards to this agreement, and this is what is on my bill. And now we're finishing up the agreement, and we're told an extra \$142 is being added on to there. You have changed your agreement today. I need for you to call Athena immediately. This is Sherry Wiley. I gave her my contact information.

And then I called James Lynn, who is the attorney-examiner here at the PUCO. I called him, and I told Mr. Lynn, I said, They changed the agreement again. We had an agreement on this past Friday, on the 25th of March, that \$805.11 needed to be paid to my account. Here we are finalizing our agreement Monday morning, we just went over the weekend, and they added --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You stated that before.

MS. WILEY: Okay. And when I went back into Athena's office, she said — okay, I don't know if I can say this. She had spoken to Ms. Givens and she said we are proceeding. So I went back to the young lady who was doing my paperwork, and we called Duke Energy again, and the customer person said that we could go ahead and finish the transaction. So we finished the transaction. \$1,012 was paid on my account.

At that time my bill was a ridiculous — for March, due date March 16, it said my bill was \$1,076.72. So if I paid \$1,012, and my total bill was 1,076.72 that leaves what? About \$64 roughly that should have been on my account. Here's the receipts for the payment and the letter from the SELF organization on where the monies came from and everything.

On my April bill --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's the March we just spoke about.

MS. WILEY: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's mark this Complainant's Exhibit 9. We were on the April; is that correct?

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I want you to see if you can get through this in a very concise fashion.

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

2.2

that.

The \$1,012 for the April bill for 2011 this year was not on my April bill. It showed that I owed \$1,247.75. And this bill, as well as my March bill, is inclusive. It's showing the old bill as well as the new bill. They've been incorporated together, and it's showing that I owe \$1,247.75.

And this is a disconnection notice. From January to present that's all I've received, disconnection notices. They had wiped out the reminder notices which allows a person to have two extra weeks, because first you get your bill; two weeks later you get a reminder notice; two weeks later you get a disconnection notice.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, foundation.

MS. WILEY: That's what the customer service person told me back in September 2010.

21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll overrule

MS. WILEY: They took away two weeks.

They wiped out the reminder notices.

The \$50 payment I had made on February 16

```
is not showing on my April bill. The $50 payment
 1
 2
     that I made in March, on March 13, isn't showing on
 3
    my April bill, and then, of course, the $1,012 is not
     showing on my April bill, and, again, we jumped from
 4
     about $64 for what my bill should be from the
 5
 6
    payments that I've made to $247.75.
 7
                 To bring it home, and I will be finished,
 8
     I would like to include the April bill, please.
 9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Complainant's
    Exhibit 10 will be the April billing. I will assume
10
11
     counsel has the same objection to the April billing.
12
                 MR. McMAHON: Same objections, your
13
     Honor.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That will be
14
15
     overruled also with respect to that.
16
                 MS. WILEY: My May bill for 2011 is a
    bogus bill. I say it's a bogus bill because it
17
     shows -- we were totally disconnected on March 23.
18
19
    From March 23 to March 28 we were totally
20
    disconnected. There was no partial anything.
21
     this bill for gas it says from March 22 to April 20.
2.2
    My gas wasn't on. I was disconnected.
23
                 It has for electric March 28 to April 20.
24
    My services were turned back on on the 28th, and
25
```

that's about the time that my meter is read so I'm

assuming that's okay. But down here it says another electric from March 22 to March 24. I was totally disconnected. This is another occasion of where they've incorporated usage and dollar amounts and usage amount for services that we didn't receive because I was disconnected.

2.2

Here my current amount due is \$423.08.

400. Now in the \$805.11 that I had to pay to have my services restored, and on the March bill they stated I had to pay \$40 for deposit on the bill, but in the notation that Cindy Givens had given to the customer service person because he read it back to me on March 26 when I paid the \$380, her notation in the account it was a \$50 deposit.

So I paid a \$50 deposit, plus a \$25 reconnection fee, plus \$730 for the bill totaling \$805 to have my services turned back on. But the HEAP organization blessed me with a little bit more to where everything totaled up to be \$1,012.

So here on this bill it says security deposit amount due.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to the May 16 bill?

MS. WILEY: Yes. Security deposit amount due, \$45. I paid \$50. Reconnection charge, that was

```
included in that money as well. They're charging me another $25. And this, this is just an account of all the other untrue, not truthful accounts of my bill. This is just more evidence.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Mark this as Complainant's Exhibit 11.

MS. WILEY: I'm sorry. This is going with that. This letter says I paid a \$45 deposit, but I paid \$50, but the bill says I didn't pay any deposit. This is for May 4 this year. Those were for June of last year.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll let counsel take a look at this.

MR. McMAHON: No objection, your Honor.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will mark this as Complainant's Exhibit 12. That document was entitled Security Deposit Receipt, Duke Energy, Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.

MS. WILEY: This is what Duke Energy had given me for the payment history. Again, this is dated for November 8, 2010, but I received this at the conference hearing on February 14, and they're not showing the \$100 payment I made in December, the \$50 payment I made in February, and all the other payments that I've made. But they're showing a

```
1
     $10 payment.
2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You got this
3
    document from Duke Energy during discovery?
4
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.
5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: An untitled
6
    document, one page. It appears to be a history of
7
    transactions, which I will mark as Complainant's
8
    Exhibit 13.
9
                 MS. WILEY: Just to finish up.
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm assuming
11
    counsel has seen this already.
12
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               That's fine, your Honor --
13
    actually, I didn't realize there was handwritten
14
     language on it.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Looks like there
16
    are notations on the documents, Plaintiff's
```

18 MR. McMAHON: Objection. Same objection
19 to the handwritten language.

17

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Exhibit 13.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll overrule that objection.

It's time to wrap it up, Ms. Wiley.

MS. WILEY: I'm done. On April 20, 2011, this year, Mr. McMahon sent me a letter saying that they didn't have to send me anything else.

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Who sent you that
 2
     letter?
 3
                 MS. WILEY: Mr. McMahon. He initially
 4
    did a motion to the Court to suppress the subpoena.
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: A motion -- to
 6
    the Commission?
 7
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir. It says Duke
 8
    Energy Ohio, Incorporated, Memorandum in
 9
     Opposition --
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, we have
11
     that.
12
                 MS. WILEY: In here he states that me
     serving Diane Kuhnell was not a valid person to serve
13
     the subpoena to.
14
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You're reading
16
     from that letter Mr. McMahon sent to you?
17
                 MS. WILEY: I was paraphrasing.
                 MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, Duke Energy
18
19
     objects to this whole line of testimony. This is
20
     about prehearing discovery issues that the Commission
21
    has already addressed. It has nothing to do with
2.2
    merits of Ms. Wiley's claim.
23
                 MS. WILEY: Oh, it does, if I may.
24
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okav.
25
                 MS. WILEY: In this letter here he states
```

```
that she's not the right person I should have served the subpoena to, and whatnot, but since the beginning I'm requesting Cindy Givens information so I can serve her a subpoena.
```

2.2

is right, all the subpoenas, that's been taken care of before the hearing, ma'am. What we want to concentrate on is your complaint, and we proceeded through 13 exhibits now. Do you have any more to add at this point?

MS. WILEY: The cross-examination for Ms. Givens on her testimony here, I would like to have the opportunity to make comments. I don't know if I could do that here.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You would have to wait until the proper time to do that.

MS. WILEY: Just request that I'm able to do that.

To address this, Mr. McMahon in discovery forwarded me another disk.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What now?

MS. WILEY: Mr. McMahon during discovery forwarded me another disk of a telephone conversation pertaining to this account. He said that it's from my daughter from August 27, 2010, and it's dated for

```
February 24 of this year, 2011.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: He sent you a

3 | letter with it?

2.2

4 MS. WILEY: This disk of a conversation.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: A CD.

MS. WILEY: Of a conversation of my daughter calling Duke Energy in regards to, you know, our bill or whatever. And it's unintelligible. I don't know what's on this disk. I can't hear what's on it.

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, we object to this testimony. It has nothing to do with Ms. Wiley's case. This is a prehearing discovery issue. And, by the way, this is the first time that we had heard the disk is unintelligible. She has had it since February and never once called me to say she couldn't understand the disk. It has no bearing on today's case.

MS. WILEY: It has everything to do with today's case because it is part of the discovery process.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: As I said before, we wound up the discovery. I'll let you make one statement. Are you done?

MS. WILEY: Yes, sir, I've addressed all

```
1
     the bills and proven they're not true and accurate
 2
    accounts of my bills. I've proven that my old bill
     is incorporated into my current bill, which should
 3
    have been adhered to when they disconnected me on
 4
    March 22.
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You stated all
 6
 7
    that before. Are you finished?
 8
                 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir, with the request
 9
    for the opportunity to cross-examine Ms. Givens.
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
11
                 Let's go off the record at this point.
12
                 (Recess taken.)
13
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will proceed
    with Mr. Firich.
14
15
                 (Witness sworn.)
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: State your name
17
    and address.
                 THE WITNESS: Lee Firich, 569 Price Road,
18
    Newark, Ohio, 43055.
19
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Could you spell
21
    the last name, please.
2.2
                 THE WITNESS: F-I-R-I-C-H.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Now your
23
24
     questions, Ms. Wiley.
25
```

LEE A. FIRICH

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 | By Ms. Wiley:

2.2

Q. Thank you, Mr. Firich, for coming, I appreciate it.

Can you please describe, tell us your title at the Department of Development, please?

- A. Yes. I work for the Ohio Department of Development. I'm the operations manager for the Home Energy Assistance Program, which is under the Office of Community Services.
- Q. And what do you do for the HEAP organization exactly?
- A. My duties are to make sure that the applications for the Home Energy Assistance Program are processed for eligibility. That is the main purpose of my job.
- Q. So you pretty much oversee the application process and make sure that all the requirements are met and the applicant is --
- A. That all eligibility criteria is met and entered into the computer system for the determination of eligibility for the program.

Q. Once a person is accepted into the HEAP program and you all have determined the amount of benefits that you're going to apply to them, what is the normal and regular process?

A. The normal process, once eligibility is determined, depending on the type of payment to be made, if it is a direct credit, which is to one of the main utility companies, including Duke Energy, as long as there is an account there that we have determined meets the criteria, then we would make a data file accessible to Duke Energy, in this case, and once they have their staff match the files to their records, once they match the files to their records, they, in turn, respond to us with a data file stating that they are accepted.

We then wait until we receive a reconciliation letter signed by the representative which allows us then to make this actual payment to the utility company for all the records that are on that file.

- Q. Okay. You said that the utility company, or in this case, Duke Energy, once you set them up for a direct credit, they send you back a data file.
- A. It's a file where they've accepted everything that was matching on the file that we sent

them or we gave them access to in our computer system.

2.2

- Q. Pertaining to this case, what date was Duke Energy's acceptance of the data file?
- A. We are talking about a payment, a HEAP payment, that was for a credit for Sherry Wiley of \$271. I have a time line here. We actually determined eligibility July 28, 2010. We had notified there was on our website, there was a payment for a \$271 credit for Sherry Wiley.

On August 20, 2010 is the date the file was returned from Duke Energy with acceptance notice of the \$271 credit for Sherry Wiley. The letter, acceptance letter or remittance letter form that was signed by the Duke Energy representative, did not get faxed to us until — and did not arrive until November 12, 2010.

- O. November 12?
- A. November 12, 2010. And payment from us to Duke Energy was made November 26th, 2010.
 - Q. Thank you, sir.
 - A. That's according to our records.
- Q. So the actual payment for the \$271 to
 Duke Energy was made right after Thanksgiving,
 November 26?

A. Somewhere around there. These are according to the computer records as to when. Now the physical check might not have — or whatever, I'm not sure if it's a check or an electronic fund transfer, if that actually went — what specific date that actually went to Duke Energy.

- Q. And once the company sends you back that information stating that the payment was actually made on November 26, 2010, do you close the file or what happens then?
- A. We add in our records that there was a reconciliation, and on our computer records it shows that -- that the payment was received, and we designate that it's complete.
- MS. WILEY: Can I ask you a question or make a statement?
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to speak up.
- MS. WILEY: Can I make a statement to you?
- 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No. You have to 22 ask questions.
- MS. WILEY: Just totally ask questions?

 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ask questions.
 - Q. Lenore Conrad, are you familiar with the

HEAP organization employee Lenore Conrad?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- A. Lenore Conrad worked as a temporary staff member through the Diversity Search Group that was on a temporary assignment with our office.
- Q. I actually subpoenaed her as well to come but Ms. Christiane Schmenk --
- A. Christiane Schmenk is our chief legal counsel for the Department of Development.
- Q. She contacted me and let me know that Lenore was no longer with them, that she was a temporary with them, and April 8 was her last day.

Do you have any documentation in regard to all of that, the date that Duke Energy sent you back anything?

- A. I have a time line that I typed up with what I just spoke about, and I have a copy of the reconciliation letter that was faxed to us and when we received it.
- MS. WILEY: May I see that, please? Is it okay?
- 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's let counsel 22 look at these, too.
- MS. WILEY: Can we please admit these, too?
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You want those

77 marked, too? 1 2 MS. WILEY: As evidence, yes, sir. 3 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, bring them 4 over. What are we up to, 14? 5 MR. McMAHON: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This will be 7 Exhibit 14. What I will do is mark the document 8 entitled Ohio Department of Development, Office of 9 Community Services, Vendor Notification Authorization, Complainant's Exhibit 14. 10 11 And then I'll mark on letterhead for the 12 Department of Development, I believe this is the time 13 line that you typed up. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 15 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm mark this as 16 Complainant's Exhibit 15. 17 Do you want to ask questions about these? MS. WILEY: I'm good. 18 19 Thank you so much, Mr. Firich, for coming 20 out in regard to the subpoena and the paper 21 documents. 2.2 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Does that 23 conclude your examination of this witness? 24 MS. WILEY: Yes, sir.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will now let

1 the company have cross-examination. 2 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 By Mr. McMahon: 5 Mr. Firich, I just have a couple Q. 6 questions. 7 Α. Okay. 8 Q. I guess, first of all, are you aware when 9 Duke Energy credited Ms. Wiley's account for the \$271 HEAP credit? 10 11 Α. No. 12 Q. If I told you that they credited it in early August of 2010, would that surprise you? 13 14 Α. No. 15 MS. WILEY: Object, because he already 16 stated that the actual acceptance by Duke Energy did 17 not come in until November. I think it was the 16th, November 16, so the acceptance from Duke Energy, 18 19 Mr. Firich already stated didn't come until November. 20 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Maybe we are 21 talking about two different things here. I'll let counsel clear that up. 2.2 23

Q. Let me ask you this. Was Ms. Wiley entitled or did she qualify for more than one HEAP credit of \$271?

24

- MS. WILEY: I object.
- A. For which payment year?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

24

- Q. Good qualifier. The \$271 you testified to, what year was that for?
- A. That was for HEAP fiscal year 2009 to 2010.
 - Q. Which runs from when?
- A. Normal payment runs from July 1 —
 June 1 through the end of May of 2010. In this case
 because there was some missing information in her
 file, we collected that later, so then because the
 application was made before the deadline, we actually
 determined eligibility even though it was past the
 normal due date.
- MS. WILEY: Can I object to this because it has no relevance to this whatsoever.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Start again.

 Speak up.
- MS. WILEY: Can I object to this line of questioning because it has no relevance to it? The payment was -- the 271 payment was accepted --
- 22 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I believe it does 23 have relevance, ma'am, so you are overruled.
 - Q. Let me hand you what has been marked as Exhibit E to the testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens

- 1 | previously filed before the Commission. This is the
- 2 Duke Energy bill for Ms. Wiley's account, No.
- $3 \mid 5840-2090-14-4$, with a due date of September 13,
- 4 2010.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

21

- 5 A. Okay.
- Q. Do you see a HEAP direct credit of \$271 reflected on that bill?
- 8 A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Okay. So it would appear from the Duke bill that -- do you also see this bill was prepared by Duke on August 20, 2010?
- 12 A. Yes.
 - MS. WILEY: Sir, I totally object. I state this objection because he works for the HEAP organization. He doesn't work for Duke Energy. He has no control over what Duke Energy, what dates they put down.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will accept

 his testimony for what it is, ma'am. Your objection

 overruled.
 - MS. WILEY: Okay.
- Q. Now, you said that you notified Duke
 Energy of Ms. Wiley's eligibility for 271 after you
 determined the eligibility on July 28, 2010.
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. And according to Duke Energy, Ms. Wiley received that credit within several weeks of your notification.
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

- Q. Okay. Is there any other \$271 HEAP credit that Ms. Wiley was eligible for in calendar year 2009-2010?
- A. Not to my knowledge, not in our computer system.
 - Q. Even for the year 2010-2011?
- 11 A. I don't believe there was a \$271 12 eligibility payment, no.
- Q. I want to make sure we are all talking about the same dollar figure.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. I understand in the spring of 2011

 Ms. Wiley received another HEAP credit that has

 nothing to do with the 271.
- 19 A. That's correct.
- Q. The 271 Ms. Wiley asked you about and you testified to was approved by HEAP and credited to Ms. Wiley's bill, correct?
- A. From a copy of the bill, it looks like it was credited.
- Q. Okay. Whether Duke sent a letter back to

```
the Ohio Department of Development in November doesn't mean that they had not already credited Ms. Wiley's account, correct?
```

- A. That's correct. Most companies, as soon as they receive the notifications from us, most companies prepare -- we usually tell them, clients, to look for the payment on their bill between 30 to 60 days of the receipt of their notification letter, which would have been sent to Ms. Wiley on -- around July 28.
 - Q. Okay.

2.2

- MS. WILEY: Object. I didn't get that letter until September, September 13, that you have the envelope up there. That's when I got that letter.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's overruled, ma'am. It's not a valid objection.
- THE WITNESS: That's on the time line July 28.
 - Q. Do you need to see your time line?
- A. Yes. Make sure that's what was in the computer file.
- Q. One last question about

 Exhibit 14 because you didn't say this during your direct testimony, but just how do we know that

1 | Exhibit 14 has anything to do with Sherry Wiley?

2 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is

Complainant's Exhibit 14?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

have.

MR. McMAHON: Yes, sir.

- A. Based on our computer information.

 There's no actual list that goes along with this.

 It's all inside our computer, and the computer list would have the names of the people and the clients and the respective dollar amounts that they would
 - Q. Okay. So just to sum up, it's accurate that the HEAP credit that was provided to Ms. Wiley of \$271 and approved by the Ohio Department of Development appears to be provided her by Duke Energy, right?
 - A. Based on that bill there, yes.
- Q. And you have no reason to believe otherwise.
 - A. No.
 - Q. And no one, neither Ms. Wiley or Duke Energy, have ever indicated to you that she didn't get that credit, have they?
 - A. No.
- Q. And you looked at the Ohio Department of Development's records before coming here today,

```
right?
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

- A. Yes.
- Q. And there's nothing in the Ohio

 Department of Development's records that Ms. Wiley

 ever contacted your organization to complain she

 never received the 271 credit, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - MS. WILEY: Can I object? Can I make a statement?
- 10 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can't make 11 that statement. You can make an objection.
- MS. WILEY: I make an objection because

 Mr. Firich had already --
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It has to be specific grounds for an objection. Is it not relevant? Is it asked and answered? You have to -
 MS. WILEY: He's twisting terms and words
- 18 around. Now Mr.--
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's not a

 valid objection. You have an opportunity on redirect

 if you want to ask him a question, okay, clear up

 what he has said on cross; understand?
- MS. WILEY: Okay.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Any further
- 25 | questions, counsel?

MR. McMAHON: No. Sorry. Nothing

2 further.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now it's redirect. You can ask him, but only what you talked about on cross.

2.2

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Ms. Wiley:

- Q. You mentioned that in August that there was a payment made on the account for \$271. But you had made a statement that on August 20 that Duke Energy had either accepted the initial contact information from you, whatever, and that the acceptance didn't happen until after the 20th.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So if they had accepted it after the 20th, in their records and on the bills they're saying they applied this credit on August 12.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to ask a question. You can't make a statement and testify.

Q. So is it possible for Duke Energy to apply a credit for \$271 to my account on August 12, as they stated, when you earlier stated that on July 28 I was accepted into the program and then on August 20 that you all had sent them however you do

```
it, electronically or by letter, sent them a data file, and they accepted the data file on August 20, are they capable of accepting payment before you send them the data file?
```

- A. Yes. As soon as we make the payment file available to Duke Energy, which -- what did I say, was August --
 - O. 20th.

2.2

A. No, that's when they returned the acceptance file to us.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have the time line you want to show him here?

MR. McMAHON: I believe it was August 9.

- A. We made available to Duke Energy the file on August 9. Once we make the file available, they can start making payments to the account as soon as they verify that the account is theirs.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. So when they send the information back to us, that's just verifying that they've accepted those payments as valid accounts that they will credit. When they actually make the credit on the bill, they do not tell us.
- Q. In your experience with the Duke Energy Company, once a company accepts the data file and

then sends it back to you, or whatever, you mentioned 60 days, within that 60 days is when the payment actually falls into the account or a payment is actually made into the account, and then they send the data file back to you. Is that normally how it goes?

2.2

- A. The payments are put on bills depending on when the billing cycles fall, and that's why we normally tell people to allow 30 to 60 days for it actually to show up on your bill, because depending on when it actually comes, when the billing cycle is, when your bill and which cycle it's on, when it's going out, it could be that period of time. We have no control over that.
- Q. The thing I'm trying to make clear or to state is that they could have actually applied the credit anytime between August 9 and November 26, anytime between that, in your opinion.

MR. McMAHON: Objection. Is that a question?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to ask a question, ma'am.

- Q. November 12, what did you say transpired November 12?
 - A. November 12 is when they sent us a letter

authorizing payment stating that they've accepted every single file, every single account on the file that we sent them, and before we can actually send a check to Duke Energy, we have to have a signed authorization from the company stating they've accepted that. They did send us that. It wasn't faxed until November 12, but that could have no bearing on when they actually make a payment on a bill.

2.2

Q. So when the representative told me in September that she can see the credit in the system but it hasn't been applied to my account yet, that, in your opinion -- I know you're not a Duke Energy customer service -- but in your opinion and with your experience on how the other accounts normally work, the normal flow of all the other batch accounts you work with, would you say that they would have that 60-day window where they would apply --

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

A. Again, we don't know when they apply the account.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: He's answered the question, ma'am.

A. And our records could state that we have not received the reconciliation, but that does not

```
necessarily mean it was not credited because we don't know when they credit the accounts. That is not something we collect in our files.
```

Q. I received a letter from the HEAP organization saying --

- MR. McMAHON: Objection, this is beyond the scope of cross.
- MS. WILEY: You have to ask a question now.
 - Q. When you send a letter out to the recipients of the funds, do you send the letter after you've already forwarded the account, because the letter is verifying that they are the right utility company and that this is the amount that you will be sending out? Do you normally send that letter of verification to the recipient, not to the utility company, after you send the funds to the utility company?
 - MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the scope of cross.
- MS. WILEY: No, it's not. It's a question that he can answer.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You got to stick to what he said on cross-examination. Now, I heard a couple of three questions in there. What is your

```
question to this witness?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q. To the account, do you normally do that after the utility company has already accepted the file?
- A. Letters are normally sent when determinations are made. Now, it says July 28. The actual date that might have been on the letter might be a few days after that, depending when they are actually mailed through the computer system, but they're normally about the same time.
- Q. So in your system does it document when letters are sent out according to that file?
 - A. July 28.
 - Q. That a letter was sent out?
- A. To you, yes.
- 16 Q. A letter was sent out to me on July 28?
 - A. That's what it has in our file.
- 18 Q. No. And that's this envelope up there.
- 19 The envelope is postmarked --
- MR. McMAHON: Objection. Is Ms. Wiley testifying or asking a question?
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What's the question? You can't testify. What's the question?
- Q. In your file is there any documentation from Lenore Conrad, because when I asked you to come

```
to the hearing --
```

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

2 MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the scope of cross.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. He didn't ask about that on cross. So you have to stick to what he said, ma'am.

- Q. Do you have the documentation that Duke Energy sent back to you stating the acceptance of the file for August 20?
 - A. Yes, I showed it to you.
 - O. That's what that was?
- 12 A. Yes.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you referring to?
- MR. McMAHON: Exhibit 15.
- 16 THE WITNESS: Exhibit 15.
- MS. WILEY: Let me look at that again. I thought that was something else.
- Q. Here it says -- what authorization date are we referring to when it says August 2?
- 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring 22 to 15, Complainant's Exhibit 15.
- MS. WILEY: Exhibit No. 14.
- A. That is the actual date that comes up in our computer that we've run the eligibility

- 1 information through the computer. That's August 2.
- 2 When we actually made the file available to Duke
- 3 | Energy with this information was August 9.
 - Q. So the eligibility wasn't ran on the 28th of July. It was ran on August 2.
 - A. The eligibility determination was July 28.
 - MS. WILEY: Can I just comment on this?

 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No. You have to ask questions at this point.
- MS. WILEY: Okay, I'm done.

until sometime in November 2010.

12 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have any on recross?

14

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. McMahon:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. One question. Let me see if this fairly summarizes what appeared to have happened here.

July 28 your office determined that Ms. Wiley was eligible for a \$271 HEAP credit. You notified Duke Energy on August 9 of her eligibility. She received a credit for \$271 during August of 2010, which showed up on Exhibit E, her bill, and your organization did not pay Duke for that credit, among other credits,

A. That's correct.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You're excused.

Ms. Wiley, take the stand again please.

You are still under oath. I want you to answer in concise answers to counsel's questions.

MS. WILEY: Sure.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. McMahon:

Q. Ms. Wiley, you went through a lot of information. I will try to be concise but might be jumping around a little bit, so bear with me here.

Let me start off with these various exhibits that you have marked. To the extent these exhibits have handwriting on them in blue ink, when did you make those handwritten notes?

- A. Last evening. That would be May 11.
- Q. Okay.
- A. 2011.
- Q. Okay. So last night on May 11, 2011 you went through all of these exhibits and made the notes that are reflected in blue ink, correct?
 - A. Highlighted in green, yes.
- Q. And that's also when you highlighted information there.

- A. Some of it, yes.
- 2 Q. Okay.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

21

2.2

- A. Some of it I did this morning.
- Q. And those notes would have been made last night, which was well after you received each of those various documents from Duke Energy or whomever else sent them to you, correct?
- A. I made motions from October -
 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Talking about the notes.
- Q. That's not my question, just the notes.

 You made these handwritten notes long after you
 received the actual documents.
- A. And after I had telephone conversations and motions --

16 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Just yes or no.

- Q. Just yes or no.
 - A. Yes, I did all those last night.
- Q. Which was long after you have received the documents, correct?
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. You need to answer out loud.
- 23 A. Yes.
- MR. McMAHON: On that basis, your Honor,
 I would move to strike and object to again to the

```
1
     introduction of any handwritten notes. I believe the
2
    Court is capable of taking into consideration the
3
    actual documents and disregarding the handwritten
    notes. None of those notes were contemporaneously
4
5
    made. As Ms. Wiley admitted, those are out-of-court
6
    statements offered for the truth of the accuracy of
    the information, so they're inadmissible information.
7
8
                 MS. WILEY: I object to that. Can I put
9
     in my two cents, please?
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Just answer the
11
    questions, please.
                 I'll overrule the objections. You can
12
13
    cross-examine her at this time on any of those notes.
14
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               Okay.
15
                 Ma'am, I will start with your first bill,
            Q.
16
    with Duke Energy.
17
            Α.
                 Do you mind if I get --
                 I'll show it to you.
18
            Q.
19
                 I'd rather have my own.
           Α.
20
                               I prefer since I'm
                 MR. McMAHON:
21
    conducting the cross-examination that the witness
2.2
     look at the exhibits that are marked so there is no
23
    question about her testimony.
```

is the best way to handle it, ma'am.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think that that

24

MR. McMAHON: Thank you.

- Q. I will start with Exhibit A, the attachment to the testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens. You made some comments about you don't understand the \$47, the \$93, and you think Duke was charging you twice for those things. I'm just going to ask a simple couple questions. You were told you had a deposit of \$140, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you agree with me that 47 plus 93 is 140? Here, I'll give you a piece of paper.
 - A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

14

2.2

- A. And that was paid on June 3.
- 15 Q. I have no questions, ma'am.
- 16 A. Then why is it on my July bill, too?

 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ma'am, just
- 18 answer the question yes or no.
- MS. WILEY: Okay.
- Q. And you didn't make that deposit of \$140 21 all at once, did you?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- O. You wrote a check for \$140?
- A. I don't think I wrote a check. You sent
 me the deposit letter, and they're up there as

```
1 exhibits. If that's the case, why --
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am.

MS. WILEY: I'm sorry.

- Q. Let me ask you this. Exhibit A, isn't it true, shows you were charged the deposit of \$140, and then you were credited that so that you could pay it over time, correct?
 - A. Uh-huh.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

25

- Q. You have to say that out loud.
- A. Yes. And that's the May bill, right?
- Q. Right. And then you paid that later.
- A. June 3 I paid \$150, which covered the 140 deposit, so the \$47 should not be on that July bill because it was paid June 3.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes or no, ma'am.

- A. What was the question again?
- Q. Actually, I believe you answered my question. The \$150 payment that you made is reflected on Exhibit C to Cindy Givens' testimony, which is the bill generated June 22, 2010, with a due date of July 14, correct?
 - A. Can I please see --
- Q. Ma'am, if you can just answer my question.
 - A. I can't answer that intelligently because

```
this shows a full credit of $150, and I recall
1
2
     looking at my bills, the copies of my bills that says
     $140 with $10 going to the bill. So, yes, in total
3
     it was $150, but it satisfied, and it showed that it
4
     satisfied, the $140 for the deposit, plus the
5
     $10 that went towards the bill, and that is on my
6
7
    bill. So I don't want to say yes to this.
8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That would be the
9
    same bill, ma'am? Is that a Duke Energy bill?
                 THE WITNESS: I would need to compare it
10
11
    to ensure.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What month are
13
    you referring to, ma'am?
14
                 MS. WILEY: I made the payment June 3,
15
    probably the June or July bill.
16
                 MR. McMAHON: I'm not so sure she marked
17
    that one.
18
                 MS. WILEY: It's up there.
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We stopped at May
20
    or June?
21
                 MS. WILEY: We stopped at May of this
22
    year.
23
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm talking about
24
    the marking of the exhibits.
25
                 MS. WILEY: That should be up there.
```

```
MR. McMAHON: I don't believe that Ms. Wiley introduced any bill with a due date of July 14, 2010 into the record.
```

MS. WILEY: Okay. Without doing that, then look at the deposits because I know we entered the deposit receipts for the \$150.

- Q. I'll be happy to show you the deposits, ma'am. This is what you introduced as Exhibit 4, the first page of which shows a \$10 payment, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

16

17

18

19

2.2

- Q. And the second page shows a payment of \$130.
 - A. The \$10 went towards the bill.
- Q. The two of these add up to \$140, and that takes care of your deposit, right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And the other \$10 from your deposit you made otherwise went toward your bill.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. I don't think we are arguing about any of that.
 - A. The 47 is still on the July bill.
- Q. No, it's not, ma'am. You are totally wrong, ma'am, and don't understand your bills.
 - A. I object to that comment.

- Q. You are talking about the bill due in July or generated in July?
- A. May I see, because I don't memorize my bills.
 - Q. I hand you Cindy Givens' testimony with all the bills attached. Show me where the \$47 comes up again on your bills.
 - A. In the stack you have here I don't see it.
- Q. Okay.

- A. In the stack I have, it's there.
- Q. Now, you established service in April of 2010 and were already getting disconnect notices on bills generated May 21, 2010, right?
 - A. Can I see the bill?
- Q. Sure. I'm showing you what has been marked as Exhibit B attached to the testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens. It's the bill generated May 21, 2010, to your account with a disconnect notice, correct? Do you agree with me?
 - A. That's what this says.
- Q. Now you're looking at Exhibit A. I'm looking at Exhibit B. Do you agree with me that within just over a month and a half of you starting service, you're already getting disconnect notices on

```
1 | your account, correct?
```

- 2 A. I see that this bill that you have
- 3 dated June 14 --
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes or no, ma'am.
- 5 | I need you to answer the question.
- 6 MS. WILEY: But it doesn't rightfully
- 7 answer the question.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, it does, yes
- 9 or no.
- 10 A. What I have in front of me, yes.
- 11 MS. WILEY: Now I still can't answer?
- MR. McMAHON: I have no pending question,
- 13 ma'am.
- MS. WILEY: Can I ask a question?
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, you can't ask
- 16 | a question.
- 17 Q. And the response to that disconnect
- 18 | notice is when you made this payment of \$150 that we
- 19 just talked about, correct?
- 20 A. No, that's not correct. That's dated
- 21 June 14. The payment was made June 3.
- Q. Ma'am, Exhibit B was generated by Duke on
- 23 May 21, 2010, correct, with a due date of June 14,
- 24 correct?
- A. Uh-huh.

- O. You have to answer out loud.
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

25

- Q. And the payment that you made of \$150 is then reflected on Exhibit C, which is generated

 June 22 with a due date of July 14, correct?
 - A. That's what that says.

MS. WILEY: Now can I make a statement?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Just answer the questions.

- Q. After making that payment of \$150 in June of 2010, you didn't make any payments in July of 2010, did you?
 - A. No.
- Q. You didn't make any payments in August of 2010, did you?
 - A. Well, you all received a payment, yes, from the HEAP organization.
 - Q. I'm not talking about the HEAP payment, but thank you for clarifying that. Did you make any payments of money to Duke Energy in August of 2010?
 - A. No, I didn't because I received a credit from the HEAP organization towards my account.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The answer is no, you did not make any payments.
 - Q. We will get to that HEAP credit in a

- second. In fact, at the end of July 2010 you called

 Duke Energy to discuss your outstanding account,
- 3 | correct?

4

- A. The end of July?
- Q. Correct.
- A. Possibly, yes.
- 7 Q. And you were told you had a due date of 8 August 13.
- 9 A. I don't know.
- Q. Okay. Now, let me show you what has been marked as Exhibit E, which is attached to the testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens. Exhibit E is a
- copy of your bill from Duke Energy prepared on
- 14 August 20, 2010 with a due date of September 13,
- 15 | correct?
- 16 A. Uh-huh. Correct.
- Q. And Exhibit E reflects that you got the HEAP credit of \$271, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. So this bill goes out in the mail
- 21 August 20 and you got it in the mail, right?
- 22 A. In October, yes.
- 23 Q. You got the bill mailed on August 20 in
- 24 October?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Yet isn't it true that your daughter called Duke on August 27, 2010 to talk about your late bills?
- A. Yes, she did call about the bill.

 MS. WILEY: Can I make a comment about
 that?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, you may not.

8 This is cross-examination.

- Q. So you're saying and it's your testimony that Exhibit E is not what prompted your daughter to call about the past due bill, that she just called on her own?
 - A. No. I instructed her to call.
 - Q. Because you received Exhibit E.
- A. What is Exhibit E?
- 16 O. The bill.

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- A. For September, no. Remember, I didn't get that until October 1.
- 19 Q. Well, that's what you said.
 - A. You didn't mail it out until --
- Q. So just out of the blue on about

 August 27, 2010, for no apparent reason you told your

 daughter to call and talk to Duke about your late

 bills.
- MS. WILEY: Now can I give an answer?

He's saying "out of the blue." It wasn't out of the blue.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am. Yes or no answers to the questions on cross.

- Q. On August 27, 2010 you told your daughter to call Duke, and you're saying it had nothing to do with Exhibit E.
 - A. Yes. I told my daughter to call, yes.
- Q. Now, when you started testifying today, in your complaint as well, you have said -- you said it both today and you said it all along, you called Duke on September 13 or 14, 2010.
 - A. I did. Yes, I did.
- Q. Perfect. I'm glad you confirmed that again. Yet before you claimed this Exhibit 1, this letter from the Ohio Department of Development -THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's the

THE WITNESS: The envelope.

- A. Look at the postmark.
- Q. It's postmarked September 16, 2010.
 - A. Yes.

envelope?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. Now you're saying you got something postmarked September 16, 2010 and you called Duke on September 13, 2010.

- A. On or about September 13. That's on all the memos I did. That's in all statements I made, on or about the 13th.
- Q. So 30 seconds ago when you reconfirmed again you called on September 13, 2010, you're saying it might have been September 16?
 - A. Well, you're twisting it.
 - Q. Just answer my question.
 - A. Restate it.

- Q. Earlier when you said you called on September 13, now you're saying it might have been September 16?
- A. The letter was dated September 13. Okay? It's postmarked on the 16th. So on or about, as it's stated in my complaint on both of them, on or about the 13th, which was the date of the letter, which the postmark says the 16th, because most companies, especially the large ones, send it through their mail system and it gets stamped out, as it's going out, so yes.
- Q. Let me ask you this. As we sit here today, we have no idea what was in this envelope marked as Complainant's Exhibit 1?
- A. Well, yes, we do. I asked Mr. Firich what's the normal process, and he said that I'm

notified by letter that a payment is going to be made or deposited into my account. That's the envelope it came in. The organization didn't send me anything else for any other reason, nothing else.

- Q. Mr. Firich, to the extent Mr. Firich testified that letter went out to you on or about July 28, you're saying he's wrong, he doesn't know what he's talking about, and the letter to you came in this envelope postmarked September 16. Is that what you are saying?
 - A. My question was to Mr. Firich --
- Q. I'm not asking what your question was; I'm asking what your testimony is.
 - A. Restate.

2.2

- Q. You're saying that he doesn't know what he's talking about. You didn't get a letter dated July 28. The only letter you received supposedly came in this envelope September 16.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Yet we don't have the letter here today, correct?
- A. You don't have a letter from him either, and in the subpoena I requested --
- Q. Just answer my questions. You haven't produced any letter either in discovery or during the

course of this hearing.

2.2

- A. It was stolen, no.
 - Q. Someone stole your letter.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You also claimed you faxed a letter to Duke, yet you don't have any fax confirmation page or information to confirm you did that.
 - A. I faxed it from the management office.
 - Q. Just answer my question, ma'am.
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Now, you testified that supposedly when you called Duke on or about September 13th, 14th, or 16th, whatever day it was, someone from Duke told you that the \$271 had not been applied to your account.
 - A. Yes, she did.
- Q. Yet as we now know, looking at Exhibit E, your bill, that \$271 is reflected on a bill mailed to you August 20.
- A. I think I made it clear when I said I can't go through the phone or speak for the Duke customer service representative. When they tell me it hasn't gone through the system yet and it should be applied to my account in the next two weeks, all I can do is take what she says as being true.
 - Q. You also said you had some type of

payment arrangement with Duke.

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. You don't know how much per week or month you are supposed to pay?
- A. I never even made the comment of how much I was going to pay for those periods.
 - Q. I'm trying to understand --
- A. I'm answering your question. I'm answering your question. The time line that she and I went over was two weeks, two weeks, two weeks. Two weeks I get the bill. Two weeks after that I get a reminder notice. Two weeks after that I get a final disconnection notice. Then I have 14 days after that before the actual disconnection will happen, which will take me up to about -- I never said that this amount was going to be paid on this date or two weeks later this amount. I didn't say that. And I agreed --
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ma'am, I will stop you right there. Please try and remember this is cross-examination. Yes or no answers. You will have an opportunity, I'll let you make a restatement here in response to what he just said on cross on redirect.
 - Q. So I guess my question to you,

- essentially you're telling us that Duke agreed to a payment plan without confirming with you how much was due at any given point in time; you just had until Thanksgiving to pay your bill.
- A. The entire bill. That was our agreement, yes.
 - Q. You never agreed to -- no one ever told you \$100 a week, \$50 a week, nothing like that.
- A. No. We were counting on the 271 from the HEAP organization to hit my account, to hit my account, not that it had already hit my account, but to hit my account in two weeks, as she stated, and that payment of 271 would take me over until and allow me to get the bill, the reminder notice, and then the disconnection, and then two weeks after that the final disconnection.
- Q. Okay. So isn't it true that during the month of September 2010 you didn't make any money payments to Duke Energy?
 - A. I didn't have to because the benefit --
 - Q. Just answer my question.
 - A. No, I didn't.
 - O. You did not?
- 24 A. Un-uh.

2.2

Q. And you also did not make any payments to

- Duke Energy during October, at least through October 20, 2010.
- A. False -- wait a minute. The 20th, no, because I was anticipating the 271 would be made.
- Q. That's not my question. I'm not asking what you were anticipating. I'm asking what you paid.
 - A. No. I made the payment on October 21.
- Q. Okay. When we look at Exhibit F to the testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens, which is the bill generated September 21, 2010, there are no payments reflected on that bill, correct?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. And that has a disconnect notice, right?
- A. Again --
- Q. Just answer my question. That has a disconnect notice, doesn't it?
- A. I'm going by -- yes. Yes, it does.

 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You need to
 answer the questions, ma'am, yes or no.
- Q. Do you deny getting this bill in the mail, Exhibit F?
 - A. Oh, yes, I got that.
- Q. When did you get that?
- A. I don't know.

- Q. Okay. Let's look at Exhibit G, Exhibit G to Cynthia Marie Givens' testimony, the bill prepared October 20, 2010, with a due date of October 11, 2010, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And that also has a disconnect notice.
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. Did you get this bill in the mail?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. When?
- 11 A. I don't know.
- Q. You're not sure when you got Exhibit F
 and G, but you know you didn't get Exhibit E until
 sometime two months after it was mailed by Duke.
 - A. Excuse me.
- Q. That's what you said. Exhibit E you denied getting in August. You said it came much later.
- 19 A. I got this bill on October 1.
- Q. Okay. How do you remember that?
- A. Because that's where it showed the credit. That's when it showed the credit.
- 23 Q. 271, ma'am?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. This bill generated October 20, 2010,

credit, 271?

- A. I got this bill -- you asked me when did I get it. I'm telling you when I got it. I got it the first week of October because it showed the credit of 271.
 - Q. Did you get it before or after Exhibit F?
- A. I got the September bill before I got the October bill.
- Q. So you were disconnected for nonpayment, correct?
 - A. Yes; wrongfully disconnected.
- Q. I know you say it's wrongful. And you went down to Duke Energy's office and the person that you spoke to, one of the people, was a person named Clara Huggins, correct?
- A. Oh, I don't know. They turned their badges around and I couldn't tell what their names were.
- Q. You were told you were eligible for the winter rule.
 - A. She didn't mention the winter rule.
- Q. How do you know? You don't even know who Clara Huggins is.
- A. If you're talking about the three representatives -- and that's what you said, I went

downtown to Duke Energy -- I spoke to three
representatives down there physically in the thing.
Neither three of those woman told me anything about
the winter rule.

When I got on my cell phone and called the customer service person, that's when she told me about the winter rule. I said the five other people, Lonnie and Tony and these women that I just spoke to, they didn't know about the winter rule. She said they should have. They have the same training she had.

- Q. Okay. But the bottom line is you were told by Duke Energy about the winter rule, and you actually exercised your rights under the winter rule.
 - A. Customer service person No. 6, yes.
- Q. Okay. So you paid the \$175 down, even though you tried to negotiate it down to 100 or 125, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Are you aware that the \$175 is the amount set by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio?
 - A. No, I didn't.
- 23 Q. Okay.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

A. I didn't. They just told me that's what
I had to pay and go from there. And I figured since

- 1 I spoke to five other representatives who told me I 2 had to pay \$730.11 in order to get it turned back on,
- 3 then maybe speaking to the right one might give me
- 4 some more pertinent information on Duke Energy's
- bylaws, or whatever, or other winter rules or 5
- 6 whatever going on because I am not a Duke Energy
- 7 representative.

10

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

- 8 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, ma'am. You responded to the question. Now we will go on to 9 another question.
- 11 I'm going to show you what has been 12 marked as H to Ms. Givens' testimony. This is a copy of your bill prepared by Duke November 18, 2010, with 13 a due date of December 8, 2010. 14
 - Α. Okay.
 - And this bill reflects your payment of 0. \$175 on the December bill.
 - Α. The December bill, yes.
- 19 Okay. You call it the December bill Q. 20 because that's the due date.
 - Α. Yes.
 - Okay. This bill reflects the \$175 you Q. just talked about under the winter rule to get your service restored, correct?
 - Α. Yes.

- Q. It also reflects they were going -- Duke was going to take the balance of 739.61 over time, correct?
 - A. The forced agreement, yes.
- Q. I understand you say it's forced, but Duke agreed to, just like the winter rule requires, \$175 down and the balance over time, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And then Exhibit I to Ms. Givens' testimony, this is your bill generated by Duke December 21, 2010 with a due date of January 11, 2011, correct?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

- Q. And this bill now has a disconnect notice, correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. And this bill reflects your one payment of \$100 you talked about earlier, right?
- 19 A. Yes. On December 3.
- Q. No other payments, correct?
- A. \$175 in October; December, 100, yes.
- Q. Okay. And in November, which was going to be my next question, in November 2010 you did not make any payments to Duke Energy, did you?
 - A. We already clarified that.

- Q. No, we didn't. November 2010 you didn't make any payments to Duke Energy, did you?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- Q. Okay. So the payments that you made in 2010, calendar year 2010, were the \$150 in June.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. The \$175 in October and the \$100 in December, correct? Payments that you made, not credits.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then the one credit you received was \$271, and that was back in August 2010.
- A. Argumentatively you say in August because

 I was told it would be September, yes.
 - Q. Just want to try to figure this out.
- 16 A. Uh-huh. There is a payment every other --
- Q. Ma'am, there's no question.
- 19 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: There's no
- 20 question.
- Q. And you did not make any payment to Duke in January of 2011, did you?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. And I'm going to show what has been marked as Exhibit G, which is a copy of your bill

generated by Duke on January 26, 2011, with a due date of February 17, 2011; is that correct?

A. Exhibit J.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

- Q. I'm sorry, I said G. J is correct.
- A. Uh-huh. For February, my February bill is showing that I didn't pay anything in January, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Fair enough.
 - A. Now, I'm not --
- Q. The next bill is Exhibit K, which was prepared by Duke on February 22, 2011, with a due date of March 16, 2011, correct?
 - A. That's my March bill, yes.
- Q. And then your March bill has a disconnect notice on it, right?
 - A. It does.
- Q. The March bill, as you refer to it, reflects your one payment of \$50 that you made in February, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And that's all you paid in February of 22 2011, correct?
 - A. Along with the motion I put, yes. Yes.
- Q. Let's go on to your next bill, Exhibit L.

 This is your bill prepared by Duke on March 23, 2011

- with a due date of April 14, 2011, correct?
- A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

- Q. Okay. And this bill also has a disconnect notice, correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Since this bill was generated on March 23, it accurately reflects that you did not make any payments to Duke Energy from March 1 through March 23, 2011, correct?
- A. False. I made a \$50 payment on March 13.

 And it's actually -- if you go to the end of

 Ms. Givens' packet, it is actually documented back

 there as being received.
- Q. Are you sure it wasn't made April 13, 2011?
- 16 A. 3/13.
- Q. Do you have proof of the payment?
 - A. You're holding it. Go to the last page.
- Q. Just for the record, you're looking at the financial history attached as Exhibit N to the testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens.
- A. \$50 payment on March -- February 21, because in my packet it has something different. Even in this packet it doesn't have the \$1,012.
 - Q. We're not there yet, ma'am. You are

- trying to show me where you supposedly made a \$50 payment on March 13, 2011.
 - A. I did.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

- Q. You said it's reflected here in Exhibit N, correct?
 - A. It is reflected on my packet.
- 7 Q. Would you like to get your copy and show 8 us?
 - A. Yes, I would.
 - Q. To make the record clear, you have now gone and picked up your copy of the direct testimony of Cynthia Marie Givens that Duke served on you last week, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Show me in your copy where there's the payment of \$50 made in March 2011.
 - A. It's on April 14.
 - Q. Okay, fair enough.
- A. Actually, showing both \$50 payments that I made, but you put them both in April.
- Q. But you're now saying you made them in
 March, even though you have no proof you made them in
 March.
- A. You are showing two \$50 payments in the month of April on the same day.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

2.2

- A. I made a \$50 payment in April and a \$50 payment in March, but you're showing them both in April.
 - Q. But as you sit here today, you have no proof you made a \$50 payment in March, other than you testified to it.
 - A. Yes, I do. It's on my card statement.
 - Q. But you don't have that here.
- 10 A. No, because I was going by this. Yes, I
 11 do. I do have it.
- 12 Q. I'm asking the questions. You can 13 testify later.
- MS. WILEY: Can I get it?
- 15 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Sit down, ma'am.
- Q. Let's go to Exhibit M. Exhibit M is a copy of your bill generated by Duke on April 21, 2011, with a due date of May 16, 2011.
 - A. Yes, the bogus bill.
 - Q. You say "the bogus bill." Let's go through it. Exhibit M reflects the credits that you testified to, 175, 250, 157, and 430, correct?
 - A. There it is, the \$50 payment.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes or no, ma'am.
- A. Yes. But that \$50 payment is included in

the 430.

2.2

- Q. I agree. That's my point exactly. You testified to a payment of \$380, which we'll get to.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Then you made the \$50 payment.
- A. No. I made the \$50 payment first on the 13th. Then I made the \$380 payment on the 26th.

 See, you have that. \$380 payment on the 26th of March. You have that. But the \$50 payment was made on March 13 before this.
- Q. So you're telling me you made another \$50 payment in April?
 - A. You're mixing up my words.
- 14 Q. I'm asking.
 - A. On March 13 I made a \$50 payment. On March 26, I made a \$380 payment. You have the \$380 payment for March 26 stated right here, but on the bill included in everything you have a \$430, I think it is, \$430 inclusive on that bill. So the \$50 was paid, but it was paid on the 13th. It wasn't paid on the -- otherwise, this would say 430 instead of 380. I do have the receipt for this, and it's --
 - Q. You agree 380 plus 50 is 430?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. So if you made a payment of \$380 after

- March 23, 2011 and a \$50 payment --
- A. Before.

- Q. No, after. That would correctly reflect as a \$430 payment on your bill generated April 21, 2011.
- THE WITNESS: How do I answer that? He's twisting it.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Answer yes or no.

- Q. What's your answer?
- A. Say it again.
- Q. Let me ask it this way. Have you been given -- isn't it true, I should say, that you've been given credit from Duke for all payments that you've made?
 - A. Of course not.
- Q. Wait. Hold on. You're telling us you made payments to Duke you have never been given credit for?
- A. Oh, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Let me rescind that. According to what we are going through right now with the \$50 payment thing, to answer that question, yes, because you're trying to say that I didn't --
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It's a simple question. All you have to do is answer yes or no.

You can respond to his question.

- Q. Okay. Let's maybe set aside the issue of time. I don't want to argue with you any longer whether it was March 13 or April 14. As you sit here today, isn't it true you have been given credit by Duke Energy for all payments you've made to Duke Energy? It's a yes or no question.
 - A. And I'm solely going on this page here.
- Q. I'm not asking you to go on any paper.

 I'm asking you, as you sit here -- and you're the

 Complainant. I'm trying to find out what your case
 is about and trying to get to the facts. As you sit

 here today, isn't it true that Duke Energy has given
 you credit for every payment you made to the company?
 - A. Yes. But not on the correct dates.
- Q. Fair enough. You can argue that later.

 Isn't it also true that Duke has given you credit for every HEAP credit you were eligible for?
 - A. Yeah. It's in here.
 - Q. Yes, you said?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And Duke Energy has also given you credit for every other credit that you were otherwise eligible for from SELF, or whatever the organization is called.

- A. No, I don't know because I don't know all the credits that I qualified for, for SELF or any other agency for Duke.
- Q. You testified earlier, ma'am, about the credits you were entitled to by SELF, correct, at the end of March 2011?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You went and met with whatever her name was.
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

16

2.2

- Q. And aren't all of those credits reflected by Exhibit M to Cynthia Marie Givens' testimony?
 - A. Plus my payments?
- Q. I'm not asking about your payments. I'm asking about credits.
 - A. Yes, the credits they gave me.
- Q. Are there any credits you claim you should have gotten that are not reflected on your Duke Energy bills?
- 20 A. I don't -- I don't know what other 21 credits I would qualify for.
 - Q. Okay. So the answer is no?
 - A. Okay. Say it one more time.
- Q. Let me see if I can ask it this way.
- 25 You're not claiming that Duke failed to give you

credit for something that you were entitled to, whether it was from HEAP, SELF, the Ohio Department of Development or somewhere else.

- A. No, the payments are there.
- Q. Fair enough. Thank you. Now, you have made some passing references to believing that your bills from Duke Energy are incorrect and that you thought it was more appropriate that you pay \$50 a month.
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Yet do you have any basis, any facts to support that testimony about your actual kilowatt usage of electricity or your actual cubic feet of gas usage at your residence?
 - A. No.
- Q. So you've never measured your usage of electricity or gas, correct?
 - A. I don't know how to.
- Q. Okay. And just to be clear, you've never done it. You have no evidence to present today that would show that any of your bills incorrectly read your meters with respect to electricity or gas.
- A. Yes. I have shown that in the March bill.
 - Q. The March bill. How much in

- electricity -- you're talking about because you think
 you were billed during the time you were
 disconnected.
 - A. I don't have to think that. It's stated on the bill. I was billed for usage when it was disconnected.
 - Q. Actually, isn't it true you were disconnected on March 24, 2011?
 - A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- MR. McMAHON: I'd like the witness to answer without looking at some -- I don't know what she's looking at.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Can you provide an answer to that, ma'am?
- A. The subpoenas went out on the 22nd. I was disconnected on the 23rd, the day after the subpoenas came out.
 - Q. How do you know that?
- A. Because I looked at the -- I knew something had happened because you all came and turned it off.
- Q. Let me see if I can break this down. You agree you were not disconnected on March 22, correct?
 - A. No, I wasn't.
 - Q. So you agree with me you were not

disconnected that day. You said no and then stated, so I was a little confused.

2.2

- A. The 23rd is when we had no power.
- Q. Now, when they turned it off on the 22nd --
- A. No, they didn't turn it off until the 23rd, the day after the subpoenas. The subpoenas were issued the 22rd. The next day I was off.
- Q. Other than the issue about that you think you were improperly billed for a couple days of electric in March 2011 --
- A. I don't have to state that, that's on the bill.
- Q. You have no other evidence to support your claim that you have been overbilled with respect to your usage, either gas or electric, correct?
- A. I have made numerous requests for information from Duke Energy.
- Q. If you would just answer my question. As you sit here today, you have no evidence to support that claim, do you?
 - A. No; because you all didn't give it to me.
- Q. You've never independently checked your meter.
 - A. I don't know how, no.

- Q. The answer to my question, you haven't done it.
 - A. No.

2.2

- Q. During some of your testimony it appeared when you were talking about the \$25 reconnection fee and \$45 deposit you were told about in March 2011 -- do you remember those numbers?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. It appeared that you claim that Duke billed you twice for those items. Is that what you are saying?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. I will go back through a couple of these bills. Let me show you what you've already acknowledged, Exhibit M. That's your bill, what you refer to as your May bill, a due date of May 16, 2011, right?
 - A. Hold on.
- Q. I'm showing it here. You see the reconnect charge of \$25 and a security deposit of \$45. Do you see those two?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Do those items appear on any other bills in the April, May, March 2011 time frame?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Where?

2.2

- A. This is where I get slammed because, you see, this is in your all system. On the March bill --
- Q. So you're looking at Exhibit K to Cindy Givens' testimony.
- A. On the March bill it says a deposit of \$40 and a payment of \$730 is required to reconnect services.
- Q. Let me -- just to make the record clear, you're not looking at the amount due at the bottom of the bill. You're looking at the boxed area in the middle of the bill.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. My question, what other bill were you charged \$25 and \$45 more than once as you now claim?
- A. When did we make it? When I called on the 26th and spoke to the customer service person, the customer service person said that I had to pay \$730.11, plus \$50, not \$40, a \$50 deposit, plus a \$25 reconnection fee, which totaled 805.11 per Cindy Givens. That was her notation in the record, and they can't change it or anything else. So in the record that you all never gave to me, even through subpoenas and everything else I requested, and I

still --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

2.2

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ma'am, you are not being responsive to the question. He's asking about charges on the bill.

- Q. You claim you were charged the \$25 and \$45 twice. I see it on Exhibit M, which you've already confirmed. I'm asking you to show me another bill from Duke that shows that you were charged those items again.
- A. It was included in the final bill. Now, with the \$1,012 --
 - Q. What final bill?
 - A. Where the \$1,012 were paid, that reconnection fee and deposit was inclusive into that amount.
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: He asked what was the final bill, ma'am.
- THE WITNESS: That would be the May 16, 2011 bill.
 - Q. That's the one we are looking at.
- 21 A. All of these amounts.
 - Q. I'm not talking about payments that you made. I'm asking where you were charged by Duke. Do you understand the difference between a credit and a charge, right?

A. Yes, I do.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

25

- Q. The credits are the payments and the numbers down here are charges by Duke.
- A. See, this is where I get hung at.

5 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Answer the 6 question. We are talking about charges.

A. Yes. Yes, I was charged when I made the phone call in March, on March 26 when I made the phone call. On March 26 --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are referring to Exhibit N?

THE WITNESS: No, I'm not. March, March.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I want you to answer the question about the charges.

- Q. The bill was prepared April 21. This would be the next bill that comes out after the telephone call you are talking about.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. The next bill that comes out, Exhibit M, shows the \$25 reconnection charge and the \$45 security deposit, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And then you were never charged those items again, were you?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Where?

2.2

A. In your system on the customer service screen that Ms. Cindy Givens put on there that was read to me on March 26. So, yes, it was in that system and in your system --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think he's talking about a bill, ma'am.

- A. On paper, no.
- Q. So there are no bills from Duke Energy that show that you were charged more than once for the \$25 reconnection fee and \$45 deposit in March, April, or May 2011.
- A. Yes, there is, but I'm not privileged to that other information, even though you requested it. So yes, in your system it's documented there, but here on this paper or any other papers, bills, when I say papers, no.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Except for in the box in March.
- Q. So we have nothing here today that shows, you have no documentary evidence that shows you were charged twice for those items.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You do? Where is the piece of paper that shows it?

- A. In your system.
- Q. That's not my question. Do you have something here today that shows you were charged twice for those items?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Okay. And today is May, what is it, 12th, and we have all the bills up until the one due May 16, 2011, correct?
 - A. Say that again, please.
- Q. We have all of your bills through the one that is due May 16, 2011, right?
 - A. With inaccurate amounts, right.
 - Q. I know you keep saying that. Out of all these bills, Exhibits A through M attached to Cindy Givens' testimony, you can't point to any double charges for those \$25 and \$45 charges.
- A. Yes, I can because they are inclusive. But here on paper, no.
 - Q. I think we made the point.
- MS. WILEY: He twisted just everything -THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am, you
- 22 | can't.
- Q. Now, Exhibit 13, ma'am, right here, your
 Exhibit 13, you appear to take issue with the fact
 that the document does not reflect all of your

- payments. Do you recall your testimony?
- A. Yeah, I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. Let me just be clear here. This is a document that was printed in November of 2010, right?
 - A. November 8 to be exact.
 - Q. November 8, 2010.
 - A. Which I didn't get it till February 14.
 - Q. Okay. That's because it was in the course of discovery in this case.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- 11 Q. Would you agree with me that it's

 12 impossible for the document from November 8, 2010 to

 13 reflect payments you made in December 2011,

 14 February 2011, March 2011? Would you agree with

 15 that?
 - A. Yes.
- MS. WILEY: Excuse me. Will I have the opportunity to readdress?
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Redirect will come when he's done with cross.
- MR. McMAHON: That's all I have at this time.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now is redirect.

 You may respond to what he said on cross, but only

 what he said on cross. Go ahead please.

MS. WILEY: Ask him the questions?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, you don't ask him. You respond. You can make a narrative response as your testimony on direct was a narrative. You can now present a narrative on redirect. I want you to focus that on what he said in cross-examination and not add anything extra.

MS. WILEY: Okay. Can I get my papers?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, you can come up and refer to the papers.

2.2

as?

REDIRECT TESTIMONY

MS. WILEY: In regards to the payment history that Mr. McMahon is mentioning throughout all of this, it is inaccurate and deceitful.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's leave the characterizations out, ma'am. You can say it's not accurate. And you are referring to what now?

MS. WILEY: I am referring to the untitled document that this is supposed to be.

21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What is it marked

MS. WILEY: Complainant Exhibit 13.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now go ahead.

MS. WILEY: This request for all

```
documentation was made from October all the way up to
the subpoena date. When we went to the hearing,

Mr. McMahon stated in the hearing --
```

MR. McMAHON: Objection, she's talking about the settlement conference.

2.2

MS. WILEY: The settlement conference.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can't bring up statements from the settlement conference.

MS. WILEY: Which is what was presented then as far as a payment history, and, of course, it's not reflective of the current payment history. It started on November 8, 2010, and I was trying to portray --

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

MS. WILEY: He was not giving an accurate description of my payment for the time period of what we were in. So, of course, if this is dated for November 8 and we're in February 2011, of course it's not going to include my February or December payment on there to actually show that the payment was made instead of trying to make me look like a bad person that don't pay their bills.

Exhibit 12, this is the deposit for -THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Complainant's
Exhibit 12, correct?

```
1
                 MS. WILEY: Yes. It's dated May 4.
2
    would be the $50 deposit --
3
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the scope
4
    of cross.
5
                MS. WILEY: No, it's not, because in
6
    March.
7
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Limit it to what
8
    you were talking about, what you were cross-examined
9
    on.
                 MS. WILEY: Right. Right, he examined me
10
11
    to make a comment on the March bill. And in the box
12
    it said I had to pay a $40 deposit plus $730. I'm
    looking at their exhibit in her direct statement,
13
14
    Exhibit No. K, which in here is Exhibit 9, your
15
    Exhibit 9 here.
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Complainant's
17
    Exhibit 9?
                 MS. WILEY: In the direct.
18
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Exhibit K
20
    attached to Ms. Givens' testimony; is that correct?
21
                 MS. WILEY: Yes. And this is the March
    bill or the payment. In the box, in the middle of
22
23
    the March bill, which he had me read out loud, which
24
    I did, it said the deposit in the amount of $40, plus
```

the required \$730.11 in order to have my services

restored.

2.2

Now, this is what this says on paper in the March bill, which is the same as what is stated here. He said that nowhere else.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Here is Exhibit
K.

MS. WILEY: Exhibit K, I'm sorry. He said that nowhere that a deposit is stated, and that's not true. It is stated right here. It is also stated in their system. When I called to make the payment — and I'm not privileged to what they have in their database — but this is what the customer service person told me I had to pay, a \$50 deposit inclusive with the \$730.11, plus the 25 reconnection fee.

That wasn't billed later like the May bill is showing. That was inclusive and made up the original agreement of \$805.11 that I had to pay to restore my services, but that is in their system.

Now, the subpoena that I served on Diane Kuhnell, who is not here, nor is any of the information that I requested from her, which isn't here, should have been forwarded to me so that I could examine that, but she totally ignored the subpoena, even if she was the right or wrong person.

```
MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the
 1
 2
     scope. She is now arguing prehearing discovery
 3
     issues.
 4
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. He didn't
    cover that on cross. You have to go through the
 5
 6
    redirect and limit it to what he said on cross.
 7
                 MS. WILEY: Okay. What I had to work
 8
    with and what this March bill said is that it's
 9
     stated I have to pay $40.
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think we
11
    covered that, ma'am. You already stated that.
12
                 MS. WILEY: Okay. So he twisted the
    words for the March bill and asked is it stated
13
14
     anywhere else, this $45 security deposit.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you
16
     looking at now, ma'am? That's Exhibit M?
17
                 MS. WILEY: Exhibit M.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Attached to
18
19
    Ms. Givens' testimony.
20
                 MS. WILEY: And Complainant's Exhibit 11.
21
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: They are the same
22
    thing, correct?
23
                 MS. WILEY: They're the same thing, yes.
24
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Just make your
25
     statement.
```

MS. WILEY: Yes, but it's a different amount. It's saying a security deposit of \$45 and a reconnection fee of \$25 needs to be paid, along with my current bill that was already paid. That was inclusive in the \$805.11 mandatory payment that I had to pay in order to restore the services.

Now, because I paid the \$1,012 extra, I mean, the HEAP organization helped me pay that, but together we paid that, that was extra. That was to put me over, to help bring me over the amount that was required that they had said. They set that amount in their system for me to pay. And it states right here on the March bill going back to the bill that was talking about before my Exhibit No. 9, that the \$40 --

MR. McMAHON: Objection, repetitive.

MS. WILEY: But what was actually paid was the \$50 deposit, which here they only applied --

19 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you

holding up now, Ma'am?

MS. WILEY: This is Complainant
Exhibit No. 12, and this is in regard to the \$45
payment that was made for the deposit for the March
bill that was made in March, or whatever, but it was
\$50, not \$45, even though -- yeah, it was \$50 and not

```
$45, so in regard to that, that's wrong.
```

2.2

And going back to Mr. Firich, he mentioned Mr. Firich's statement, no, that's not --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What he covered on cross now, you got to stick to that. I don't think he was talking to Mr. Firich when he was --

MS. WILEY: My question about the customer service person on or about the 13th of September -- because that's when the letter was dated, even though the postmark says September 16, that's when the letter was dated -- I called the customer service person --

MR. McMAHON: Objection. This is repetitive and beyond the scope of cross.

MS. WILEY: You said anything we talked about on cross. He brought that up. He bought up the September bill and asked me if the September bill, was those amounts true when I got the bill and stuff. That's relevant.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm talking about what you covered on cross, if you have something to say about the specific question he asked on cross about that bill.

MS. WILEY: Yes. On Exhibit E for Ms. Givens' direct testimony, and --

```
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think he was
1
2
    asking about it, Exhibit E. I know that you have
    duplicates in there marked on your own exhibits, but
3
4
    why don't we just save time. Just direct your
5
     testimony towards the one he was using to
6
    cross-examine you.
7
                 MS. WILEY: Can I ask you this? All the
8
    memos we already --
9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to
    present your testimony now.
10
11
                 MS. WILEY: Mr. McMahon stated that on
12
    August the 9th, I believe it was August the 9th, that
13
    the $271 was applied to the account, that on August 9
14
    that was applied to the account, even though August
15
    the 20th I believe is when Mr. Firich stated the
16
    monies was applied to the account.
17
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, mischaracterizes
18
    Mr. Firich's testimony.
19
                 MS. WILEY: Isn't that on the time line?
20
                 MR. McMAHON: And it is beyond the scope
21
    of cross.
2.2
                 MS. WILEY: I'm trying to determine --
23
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have the
24
    time line?
25
                 MR. McMAHON: I guess the other thing,
```

```
1
    your Honor, there is just simply no dispute
2
    whatsoever that Ms. Wiley got the $271 HEAP credit.
3
     I don't understand why this is even --
4
                 MS. WILEY:
                             The dispute that I --
5
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               She admitted under oath
    that she got the credit. The timing, whether it was
6
7
    August 9, 10, 11, 12, it's irrelevant. It does not
8
    have any bearing to her complaint against Duke
9
    Energy. I don't know why we are spending an hour
    going through her testimony and Mr. Firich's
10
11
    testimony on the subject.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER:
                                         I'll allow you to
    take a bit more time to make a statement on redirect.
13
    Did you find the time line? Do you have it?
14
15
                 MS. WILEY: I do.
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Go ahead and
17
    testify.
                 MS. WILEY: Here Mr. Firich on the
18
19
     Complainant's Exhibit 15 states it was on the 9th
20
     that Duke Energy made the $271 payment in their
21
     account in your documentation, and even on that
2.2
    August bill, it says that the amount was -- and
23
    through my conversations with them -- that it was
24
     applied on the 12th of August, so we have
```

25

discrepancies on dates.

MR. McMAHON: Objection. It mischaracterized both the exhibit and Ms. Firich's testimony. He testified that on August 9 they advised Duke Energy she had been accepted. He did not know the exact date that Duke credited her bill.

MS. WILEY: What I was trying to say, since we're playing with dates, as far as when the amount was applied for, it would be most relevant that when I spoke to the representative on or about September 13 when she said she saw it in the system but it had not been applied to my account, that that was an accurate statement that she made. At that point it had not been applied to my account.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are going to go on to another point, ma'am, because we have your testimony that it was applied to the account, and you've read into the record what Mr. Firich's time line was.

MS. WILEY: Okay. Going back to all the bills that Mr. McMahon has stated, disconnection notices at the top of the bills and everything, yes, because they stopped sending me reminder fees. They stopped sending the reminder fees, which cut out two weeks of time all their other customer service persons get. We went from bill to disconnection

```
notice, from bill to disconnection notice to disconnection notice.
```

2.2

If you see from January all the way up until the month of May, all the way up to the month of April, actually, it's just the bill, the regular bill with no notation at the top, and then a disconnection notice at the top. But for the month of May of this year 2011 is the first one this year that actually says reminder notice. So they cut out that extra two weeks. It could have been retaliatory, discriminatory, or whatever.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, move to strike.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's not characterize.

MS. WILEY: Okay. But they did cut out the reminder fee, the reminder notice which would allow me --

MR. McMAHON: Objection, your Honor.

There's no two week reminder notice under any tariff or rule enacted by the Commission. Ms. Wiley is guessing at the billing practices and applicable rules.

MS. WILEY: Ms. Givens, in her statement --

25 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You will have an

opportunity to cross-examine her on her statement.

What we are talking about now is redirect, which ha

2.2

What we are talking about now is redirect, which has to be focused on what he said on cross-examination.

MS. WILEY: Okay. Well, the May 2011 bill, which did not reflect the usage of my service for March 22 to March 24, my service was disconnected, but yet it's showing usage for two days which it was disconnected.

You can see there is a discrepancy because there's two entries for electric and only one entry for gas, and since I don't turn off or on my power, somebody did, so it's evident that my service was turned off, yet they have me down for usage for the days that my service was turned off.

As far as the gas for March 22nd to

April 20, it is not an accurate account of my bill

because from March 23 to March 28 I was disconnected.

I did not have services, and we did not live -- we

weren't staying at the apartment. We were staying

with my parents at that time, so there was nothing on

except for the refrigerator, yet that's showing usage

for that time as well. So, no, that's not an

accurate depiction of my usage nor my record.

All my bills except for the December bill, all my bills from October to present and which

we went over shows an inclusive bill of my old bill as well as my new bill, which it's the current amount due, which is the whole bill inclusive, not differentiating the old bill from the new bill but everything inclusive, which should have been grounds for me not to be disconnected.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the scope of cross.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, it is beyond the scope of cross now. You have to address what he said on cross.

MS. WILEY: August 28 he did give me -my daughter did call Duke Energy. I asked her to in
regard to the bill, and, yes, he did give me an
unintelligible tape that I can't even play. And the
library has several different devices you can play a
CD on, and none of them worked for this CD. So I
have no idea what that recording was supposed to have
been about.

If you actually go through, which I did, all of my bills starting from April to the disconnection in October, if you actually go through and do the math for all the bills, you will still see that I was still being charged that \$93 that was carried over for each month in the total amount due,

the current amount due, that \$93 was still incorporated into that amount.

2.2

My notations on each one of my bills has the total bill column and an actual bill column, the actual bill starting from the first month of service in April.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: April what year, ma'am?

MS. WILEY: 2010, 2010, that was the first month -- I'm sorry, my first bill was in May of 2010. That first bill shows that there was \$93, you know, hanging on there as well as the \$47. But when you look at the usage, the current usage, the back usage and all that stuff and add that up in there, you will have an amount that is -- the total bill is inclusive of the 93 and the actual bill is not inclusive of the \$93. That's not stated on the bill. That's what the bill should be.

But if you look through the bills, and that's why I did the math on each one of the monthly payments starting with the first, you can clearly see that the \$93 was incorporated into each of the bills.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We covered that point, ma'am. I see your handwritten notes there.

Do you have any other questions you would like to

```
1
    explain he asked on cross?
2
                MS. WILEY: That's basically it. That's
3
    basically it. You said I can't talk about it.
4
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you
5
    saying? You have to speak up.
6
                 MS. WILEY: No, that's it.
7
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have any
8
    on recross?
9
                 MR. McMAHON: No, thank you, your Honor.
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. You're
11
    excused as a witness, but with this proviso.
12
    going to make a ruling. There's a motion pending
13
    about admissions that were not answered, and what I'm
14
    going to do is grant that motion and admit those
15
    admissions into evidence in the proceeding. Now, if
16
    you have any response now you would like to make
17
    about that, then now is the time to do it.
                 MS. WILEY: So I can talk about
18
19
    everything?
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, just the
21
    admissions here. That is the questions to you you
2.2
    did not answer that are being admitted in the
23
    proceeding, in the record of this proceeding. Now,
```

if you have any response to make about that, now is

24

25

the time to do it.

```
1
                 MS. WILEY: It's my understanding that
2
    all of the questions that he has asked me since I've
3
    been up here --
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, his written
4
5
    request for admissions. Do you have a copy?
6
                 MS. WILEY: The interrogatories?
7
                 MR. McMAHON: The Request for Admissions.
8
    Would you like me to mark it as an exhibit?
9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I hate to
    interfere with your numbering. What are we up to?
10
11
                 MR. McMAHON: Ms. Givens has A through N.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We can mark it as
13
    the next.
14
                 MR. McMAHON: Exhibit O.
15
                 Would you like me to hand it to
16
    Ms. Wiley?
17
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. This is
    what was sent to you you didn't respond to. It will
18
19
    be admitted into this proceeding. I'm giving you a
20
    chance to say something about that.
21
                 MS. WILEY: Then we have time to go
22
    through each and every single one of those questions?
23
    Because all of these questions is an admittance to a
24
    false statement, and I totally object to every single
25
    one of them, as I mentioned before, except for the
```

```
providing the documents, which I did forward to

Mr. McMahon. I did forward those documents to him

and to the hearing that we had on February 14, so

yes.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Does that conclude your response?

2.2

MS. WILEY: Oh, no, no, sir. Am I able to go through each one of them?

to make a response to the entire. You had an opportunity to respond to them to counsel, and as counsel has said, you did not do that. So what we are going to do is admit that document into evidence now. You made a statement. You said all of those were false statements according to you.

MS. WILEY: They are leading and false statements, yes. The first one says, Do I admit -THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I don't want to go through each and every one of them, ma'am.

MS. WILEY: Okay. For the first one, yes, I have service.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: There are some 46 there. Okay, and you're saying that they're all false statements.

MS. WILEY: Except for relevant ones such

```
1
     as the first one that asked me do I live at 5370
2
    Aster Park Drive, Apartment 909, Hamilton, Ohio,
3
     45011, yes. I established service there on April 3;
4
     and, yes, Duke Energy is the supplier for that.
5
    here --
                 MR. McMAHON: Excuse me, your Honor, I
6
7
    thought you indicated you had granted the motion to
8
    have those admissions deemed admitted because
9
    Ms. Wiley failed to respond. If that is the case, I
    think it is inappropriate for her now to respond.
10
11
     The time has come and gone, and you already granted
12
    the motion.
13
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER:
                                         I agree.
14
                 MS. WILEY: You are saying they're in the
15
    record?
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You made a
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You made a response in the record. That is what will be admitted in the record at this time.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MS. WILEY: That all the records are true and accurate when I made it clear that the billing amounts are not true and accurate?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am. What I need from you, and I obtained your response, you had an opportunity beforehand during discovery to respond to each of those questions.

MS. WILEY: No, not directly.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That will be admitted into evidence, that document, at this time.

MS. WILEY: So this is saying that I admit that each bill is a true and accurate account of my billing history for where I am at when I made this clear in my motion and statements here that they are not.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What I'm saying to you, that document will now be admitted under the rules of the Commission 4901-1-22, I believe, of the Ohio Administrative Code. You didn't answer when you were supposed to during discovery, and now he has moved for the admission of that, and now that motion has been granted.

MS. WILEY: When did I have the opportunity to address this? You --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That was sent to you during discovery, ma'am.

MS. WILEY: And I responded by a motion in regards to this. I just didn't do anything. I responded with a motion objecting to all 46 of these. I responded to that in a motion.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I believe that was covered in a motion.

```
MR. McMAHON: That was covered by the Commission's entry dated March 23, 2011. I have a copy, finding 16.
```

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Go ahead. You can read it into the record.

MR. McMAHON: 16 starts off, With regard to Complainant's motion for protective order, and the last sentence reads, "Accordingly, Complainant's motion for protective order should be denied."

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's what I remember.

MS. WILEY: So when you were speaking of a protective order, you were speaking about those interrogatories?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You had asked for a protective order covering those interrogatories, that you should not be required to respond, I believe.

MS. WILEY: Requested for an objection.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The ruling was that that was denied.

MS. WILEY: I requested an objection to those interrogatories because they had already been addressed and they were false and misleading statements to that. So when you said a protective

```
1
     order, which Mr. McMahon had requested a protective
 2
     or against me and pertaining to Ms. Givens'
     information --
 3
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are talking
 4
 5
    about these requests for admissions now.
 6
                 MS. WILEY: I know.
 7
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So what I told
 8
    you, that they were already admitted. They're being
 9
     admitted now into evidence. I gave you an
    opportunity to make a response.
10
11
                 MS. WILEY: The response that I'm making
12
    again --
13
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That you made.
14
                 MS. WILEY: -- is that they're not true.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. That
16
     finishes that.
17
                 MS. WILEY: So this is saying I admit to
18
     everything he put in here.
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Those questions,
20
    those requests for admissions are now being admitted
21
     into evidence, that document.
2.2
                 MS. WILEY: As an affirmative?
23
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Well, you did not
24
    answer them, so under the Commission's rules, the
25
     admissions are now admitted and the record is
```

```
1 received.
```

2.2

MS. WILEY: My goodness.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will proceed to the company's side of the case. Let's start with the company's side of the case.

MR. McMAHON: To be clear, the Complainant has rested her case?

MS. WILEY: Have I rested my case? No.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think we are done, ma'am.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor.

Before proceeding with the Company's case, I move for a directed verdict in light of both the Court's ruling deeming all 46 of the requests for admissions to have been deemed admitted and the admissions by Ms. Wiley on the stand regarding the accuracy of her bills and the information provided by Mr. Firich.

There is no dispute here that Ms. Wiley did not pay her bills in a timely manner; that Duke properly disconnected her for nonpayment both in October of 2010 and in March 2011; and Ms. Wiley has not sustained her burden of proof that Duke has violated any tariff or any rule or regulation of the Commission, so I would ask to dismiss her case

without even having to put on a defense.

1 MS. WILEY: I object to that only because 2 I did make it very clear that the March bill was not 3 a true and accurate account. None of my bills are 4 true and accurate, and we went over the May bill as well showing for service that's reflecting March 5 6 services that I'm being charged from March 22 to 7 April 20, and we were disconnected from the 23rd of March to the 28th, but on the bill it's showing that 9 I received service during that time, which is a false account. I made that clear. 10 11 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Ma'am, 12 I'll take that as your response. 13 What we are going to do is go ahead with the company's side of the case and let the Commission 14 15 rule ultimately in this matter. 16 MR. McMAHON: Thank you. In that case 17 Duke calls Cynthia Givens to the stand. 18 19 CYNTHIA GIVENS 20 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 21 examined and testified as follows: 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 By Mr. McMahon: 24 Could you please give your name and 0.

business address.

25

- My name is Cynthia Givens. My address is Α. 139 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
- And, Ms. Givens, I've handed what has Ο. been marked as Duke Exhibit 1. That's a copy of your direct testimony for these proceedings, correct?
 - That's correct. Α.
- Q. And did you review that testimony before it was filed with the Commission on May 5, 2011?
 - Yes, I did. Α.
- And does that Exhibit 1, is your Q. testimony there true and accurate?
 - Yes, it is. Α.
 - And in connection with the preparation Ο. and filing of your testimony, did you review Ms. Wiley's account records that are contained within Duke's Case Management System?
 - Α. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

- MR. McMAHON: At this time we would move for the submission of Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit 1, which is the Direct Testimony of Cynthia Givens and the attachments marked as Exhibits A through N.
- 23 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Very good. 24 will reserve ruling on that until after the

Now is it time for cross-examination? 1 2 MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, real quick, I 3 quess since I didn't know exactly what Ms. Wiley would put on in her case, I do have some supplemental 4 5 questions I think might help facilitate what happened 6 here. 7 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You're not 8 through with direct? 9 MR. McMAHON: I was just filing that. had some follow-up. 10 11 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I thought 12 you were done. 13 MR. McMAHON: Thank you. I apologize. should have explained that. 14 15

Q. (Mr. McMahon) Ms. Givens, there's been some questions as to whether Duke properly disconnected Ms. Wiley's electricity and the issue of reminder notices, and I forget the phrase that she used. Not repeating what is already in your testimony, can you explain the disconnection practices and rules that Duke follows?

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

A. The disconnection practices are that a customer must receive a 14-day disconnection notice on their bill, and that is to be followed in the wintertime by a hand-delivered, ten-day disconnection

notice.

2.2

- Q. With respect to Ms. Wiley, did Duke ultimately disconnect her services for nonpayment of bills that were more than 60 days past due, 30 days, or what?
- A. Well, the first disconnection notice was for an unpaid security deposit. That was the first one. The subsequent disconnection notices were for 60-day arrears on the regular utility charges.
- Q. Okay. And when you look at the bills, because I think there's been some confusion here, just any bill, you can start with A, Exhibit A, if you would like, to your testimony, the information in the lower right-hand portion of those bills, that's basically what a customer is charged every month and then reflects any payments or credit, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. What does the information that might appear in any of the bills that have disconnection notices or reminder notices in the middle of the bill, like in the box, what is that information?
- A. What the information is, like, for instance, on Exhibit A it just told her that a security deposit has been charged to her account, and

- that's reflected on the bill. That one doesn't

 include the disconnection notices. That just simply

 is providing information. That's the area of the

 bill that we provide specific information that we

 want to draw the customer's attention to.
 - Q. And that information, the middle of the bill is not always the same information that is reflected at the bottom.
 - A. No, absolutely. That's correct.
 - Q. So when you look at Exhibit B in the middle of the bill, there's a box that talks about you're going to be disconnected if you don't pay the \$140 deposit. That deposit is not reflected down below because it's already been billed on the prior month's bill, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. So essentially sometimes you have to go back and forth between the bills to kind of follow the time line.
 - A. Well, the deposit is reflected on the second page of the bill.
 - Q. You're looking at Exhibit B.
- 23 A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

- Q. And what do you mean by that?
- A. Well, after receiving the first bill,

Ms. Wiley called in and set up a payment arrangement on the security deposit. First payment was supposed to be \$47. When that payment was not received, the second bill, Exhibit B, came out and the agreement for the deposit was in default, and that's why there was a disconnection notice on it.

- Q. Okay. And that's the \$93 balance?
- A. Well, what it is, the \$140 was the deposit. \$47 was supposed to be paid, which that was the first payment, so then 93 would go into the bucket for the remaining two payments.

Once that deposit, an installment of \$47 was not paid, the \$93 was applied back to the regular bill and taken out of the agreement, off the payment plan. So then the entire 93 and the 47 adds up to \$140, which is why that is the amount of the disconnection.

- Q. And that became due immediately.
- A. Yes.

MS. WILEY: Do I object, or wait until they're finished?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What is your objection, ma'am?

MS. WILEY: Well, because she said that the \$93 and the \$47, because it wasn't paid --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It has to be an objection. If you have something you want to cover on cross, you can do that. If you have an objection about it is irrelevant or asked and answered, you have to make a specific objection. If you disagree with what she said, then you have to wait and cover it on cross-examination.

MS. WILEY: So I don't object, I just wait until she's finished if I disagree with what she's saying?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.

- Q. Let me ask you this. Ms. Wiley claims that the \$93 that you were just talking about appeared throughout the bills, she was charged maybe more than once. Can you explain that to the Court?
- A. Well, on the first bill, the \$93 is noted because again the amount the deposit was billed on the first bill. It also shows on the first bill, which is Exhibit A, that the \$140 was applied was placed on an agreement. The bill is asking for a \$47 installment amount and also showing the agreement balance as \$93, because it is anticipating her paying that 47 as agreed upon. So that's why it's on the first bill.

On the second bill it's on there because

when that \$47 payment or any other payment came toward the bill that was due on May 14, the agreement was removed. So at that point the \$93 that was set aside on the agreement for the deposit was placed back on the total bill.

That's why it is reflected, as well as the \$47 that she was supposed to pay, it is all added back together, and that's why it is asked for the total, the 140. After that month, it's not reflected on any other bills.

- Q. Because it's already been taken care of.
- A. Well, yeah. It's not on an agreement anymore. Now it's \$140 again.
- Q. Okay. Ms. Wiley, when she was testifying, she referred to some old bills, some new bills, and some old accounts and new accounts. Has Duke ever finalized an account in her name and set up a new account in her name?
- A. No. The service was simply disconnected for nonpayment. It didn't become a new account when the service was restored. It was, in essence, the same account. It was just turned back on, and because the winter reconnect order was used, the \$175 set up a payment plan, and then the charges remained on the bill but she was only supposed to pay

\$95 a month in addition to the current monthly charges. The 95 goes toward back balance, and then the current charges are to be paid.

Just let me say too, when you use the winter rule, you don't have an option. You either have to go on an agreement or on the Percentage of Income Program. You can't not do either. You have to do one or the other.

- Q. Thank you. Now, Ms. Wiley filed her complaint in this matter I believe in early November 2010; is that right? Does that sound right?
 - A. It does. I believe so.
- Q. Let me ask you this. When Duke Energy -you testified in your testimony that's been submitted
 about the disconnection in March 2011. Was that
 disconnection in any way tied to amounts that
 Ms. Wiley owed to Duke Energy before November 1,
 2010?
- 19 A. No.

2.2

- Q. Could you explain that?
- A. Well, it was -- it was disconnected because the current charges were not being paid.
- Q. When you say "current," what are you referring to?
 - A. The charges after the complaint was

filed.

2.2

- Q. Okay. For December 2010 and all through January, February, March of 2011?
- A. Right. Partial payments were made, but the current total charges for each month were not paid.
- Q. I want to be clear because there's been the suggestion or testimony that Duke disconnected her for nonpayment of the disputed charges. Is that accurate?
 - A. No.
- Q. Since there was some testimony from Mr. Firich from the Ohio Department of Development -- we didn't get into this in your filed testimony -- can you explain the HEAP process and how it works within Duke, as far as giving credits to customers' bills, such as Ms. Wiley?
- A. Well, as I mentioned, once the Ohio

 Department of Development notifies us that a customer
 is eligible for HEAP credits, that's when our system
 goes in and looks to make sure that the account
 number that is provided is one of our account
 numbers.

And typically when we get the information saying that the customer is eligible and they will

make a payment, we -- we apply the credit to the account at that point. We don't wait until they actually physically send money, which could be months down the road. Because they are authorizing, they're eligible for the credit, and we apply the credit at that time.

- Q. Why does Duke handle the accounts in that manner?
- A. Simply to allow the customer to have the credit on their account and not have to wait until we actually physically get the money from the Ohio Department of Development. It's done for the customer's benefit.
- Q. In this case if Duke had waited until, as Mr. Firich said, the Ohio Department of Development sent the money to Duke in November 2010, if Duke waited until then to apply the credit to Ms. Wiley's account, isn't it true she would have been disconnected sooner?
 - A. Yes.
- MS. WILEY: I object.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What's the
- 23 | objection?

MS. WILEY: I object because Ms. Givens isn't acknowledging the agreement that was made in

```
September. So in regard to his questions --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, that's something you want to cover on cross.
```

2.2

- Q. Can you explain the bill that's attached as Exhibit M to your testimony, the circumstances surrounding the dates of termination of Ms. Wiley's service and her claim that she was charged two days of electric when she didn't have service? Can you explain that to the Court?
- A. Yes. The electric service at Ms. Wiley's address was disconnected on March 24, at 2:01 p.m. The gas service was never disconnected, only the electric service, which is why the bill reflects usage between March 22 and March 24. The day of disconnection was March 24 at 2:01 p.m.

MS. WILEY: I object.

- Q. Okay. So then she didn't have electric service from March 24 until March 28, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And Duke didn't charge her for electric service during that time period; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- MS. WILEY: I object. It's stated on the bill itself that I was charged for two days, which is --

```
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You want to make a note of that, ma'am, and cover it on cross.
```

MS. WILEY: But he's still making this statement, so if it is covered on cross, he shouldn't be making the same statements because you corrected me when I did it.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am. Make a note and you will have an opportunity to ask this witness on cross.

THE WITNESS: I can clarify that if you like.

Q. Sure. Go ahead.

- A. The bill that went out on March 23 was a bill cycle of February 18 to March 22.
- MS. WILEY: I was referencing the May bill.
 - A. I'm getting to that. To try to answer your question, February 18 to March 22, the next bill that went out was billing dates March 22, and then for the electric, two days, because it was disconnected March 24.

That's why there's a two-day period, because the previous bill went up to March 22. So that's why there's a two-day window and then service. The electric service starts up again when it was

171 1 reconnected on March 28. 2 MS. WILEY: So you're accounting for two 3 days --4 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am, you 5 have to wait until your turn comes. 6 MS. WILEY: I'm sorry. 7 MR. McMAHON: I think that's all. Thank 8 you. 9 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Off the record. 10 (Discussion off record.) 11 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Wiley. 12 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 By Ms. Wiley: 15 Q. Ms. Givens, in your testimony on 16 page 5 and page 6, for the question asked, "How are 17 you familiar with the account, the Aster Park account, " as I emphasized before, you made the 18 19 mention DE-Ohio keeps and maintains customer account 20 information in a comprehensive computer database 21 called the Customers Management System, CMS. Can you 22 please read for me the rest of that paragraph? 23 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to speak

MR. McMAHON: I'd object. She's asking

24

25

up, ma'am.

the witness to read the rest of the paragraph in her offered testimony. That's not a cross-examination question.

MS. WILEY: Actually, it is, because here on page 6, Ms. Givens' statement, it says that this system they've had since '93 --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to ask a question on cross, ma'am.

Q. Does this system keep records, as you stated here, of all incoming calls to any account?

Does it keep track of, as you stated here, all the service calls, the customers' calls, the inquiries, the turn on/turn off, disconnection notices, billings, account status, history and payment arrangements? Does the new system you all had since '93, does it account for all of those?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. We have the question.

Can you answer that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

A. The calls aren't recorded in this
Customer Management System. That's a totally
different system. But, yes, every other activity
that takes place on an account is handled in this
system, yes.

- Q. Okay. And in the subpoena that I served to Ms. Kuhnell, I requested all information from the system pertaining to my account from this system --
 - A. Uh-huh.

2.2

Q. -- with emphasis on the calls and the recorded calls and everything of that nature. Now, with all the interaction that I've had with Duke Energy and everything, all of this documentation wasn't forwarded to me as requested in the system.

So my question is, yes, did this system record all of that information and that documentation was just not forwarded to me; or no, this system does not actually cover all of everything that you stated that it does?

A. The system --

MR. McMAHON: I'm going to object to the question to the extent Ms. Wiley's arguing prehearing discovery issues.

But if the witness can answer that's fine.

- A. Again, this Customer Management System does not record phone calls.
 - O. I know that.
- A. It does capture everything that's done on an account, and it captures the account history and

```
all of that stuff. It captures everything on the account. To my knowledge, everything was provided to you, so the only thing I can tell you is what the system does, and that's what -- if you asked for something, it was provided to you.
```

2.2

Q. So when counsel back in December,

December 2010, when he forwarded the motion to me
saying that this is all the information provided from
the system from that time, then I should have
received everything that's included here. All the
inquiries, all of the customer calls --

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

Q. -- even if they're not recorded, there should be some notes stated somewhere, according to your own testimony here, in the CMS system?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think she provided an answer to your question and I think the answer was --

MS. WILEY: Was what?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: -- duke provided everything, to her knowledge.

THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, yes.

MS. WILEY: No. It actually doesn't --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, ma'am, we are going to move on to another question now.

Q. For the bill that you have for Exhibit A and Exhibit B --

5 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Did you say

Exhibits A and B?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

2.2

MS. WILEY: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: These are attached to Ms. Givens' testimony. Is that what you are referring to, ma'am?

MS. WILEY: Hold on for just a second.

- Q. Yes. Attached to your testimony for Exhibit A, it states that I received a credit for \$140 for my deposit, correct?
 - A. No, it does not.
 - Q. On May 14, 2010, Exhibit A?
- A. That's not what it says. It says
 transferred to agreement. It does not say you
 received a credit.
 - Q. Transferred to agreement, okay. That \$140 was transferred to the agreement.
 - A. The 140.
- Q. So when you add up -- if I can ask this
 question -- when you add up the current usage for
 that month, which is \$35.73 and the 41, the usage for

my first bill, the usage for that month, according to you guys, is \$76.80.

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q. Okay. Can you go over to the second bill, which is Exhibit B, and you add up the current charges for gas and electric, \$52.27 and \$50.75, that together is \$179.72 for the usage. We are just looking at the usage. Would you say that would be accurate?
 - A. I'll have to rely on your math.
 - Q. Okay. Plus the \$1.15.
- MR. McMAHON: Are you adding \$52.27 and the \$50.75?
 - MS. WILEY: Plus the late fee of \$1.15, so the total was \$180.87. So for my current usage, that's plus the late fee, that's what the amount is.
 - Q. Now, the \$140 was applied for those two months' usage -- well, \$50, actually. That should have left a balance of \$30.87.
 - A. You also owed \$140 security deposit, which you never paid. That's why the balance was \$320.97.
 - Q. So where did the \$150 go to?
- A. It's not on either one of these bills because you hadn't paid it yet.

Q. For July, Exhibit C, same packet, Exhibit C, current gas and electric usage, \$132.49, \$48.56, and a late fee of \$2.56. So we're going for all three months. We are going for the bill in May, the bill in June, the bill that's dated July 14, inclusive of the late fees for June and July, total \$363.50 and the payment of \$150 has been made.

So if the payment of \$150 has been made, my true and accurate bill should be \$213.50?

A. No, that's not correct at all. That's not correct at all. You're not including -
MR. McMAHON: I object to Ms. Wiley's math.

A. That's not correct at all. If you look at Exhibit C, it clearly shows — that bill clearly shows you the breakdown. The amount that was due on your previous bill was \$320.97, which includes the deposit and current charges for those two bills. We received your payment of \$150. We charged the \$2.56 late charge, which left you with a balance forward of \$173.53, which I'm looking at Exhibit C.

In essence, all you paid toward your current charge to that point was \$10 because you had a deposit of \$140, and you paid \$150. So \$10 of your payment went toward your current charges, that's all

since you lived there. You still owed us \$173.53 in current charges.

2.2

Your deposit, at that point we gave you credit for the deposit, so you can see from the receipt you got, but you weren't paying anything but \$10 toward your actual utility charges from the time you moved in.

- Q. But by your own admission, you said the previous bill was 320.97. And then it says payment received, \$150 CR, for credit I'm assuming. And then under that it says late payment of \$2.56, with a total of \$173.53.
- A. As a balance forward, which means you still owe that.
 - Q. So that meant the \$150 was inclusive.
- A. The \$320 included the \$140 deposit, so after you paid the \$150, we applied \$140 of it to the deposit and \$10 toward your remaining balance, and then we added in your current charges. So at that point in time, as of the day this bill went out on June 22, you owed \$354.58, all in current usage, utility usage.
- Q. But that's where my argument stands because, as I stated before, if you take the current charges for the three months and add the \$140 fee in

```
there, you get the $360.94. That's not on the bill.
You subtract the $150 payment from that, and that's
where you get 213.
```

A. No.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, asked and answered.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. We have been through this before. Now we have to move on to another question.

MS. WILEY: But it is wrong. But it's wrong.

THE WITNESS: It's not wrong. It's clearly itemized on the bill.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We need to go on to another question.

MS. WILEY: Okay. It's wrong.

Q. Here in your testimony on page 7, you put, "By the time Ms. Wiley," I'm reading on line 21 on page 7, "By the time Ms. Wiley had applied for and been approved for a HEAP credit in the amount of \$271, this is not a payment but simply a credit, which once a customer is approved by the HEAP program, the credit appears on the account."

Whether you call it a credit or whatever,

did you lower the amount of my bill when you applied

it to my account?

- A. Absolutely. That's why you received a credit of 271. That's why your bill went from \$568.79 to \$292.11. It's clearly reflected on the bill in Exhibit 8, so it did lower the bill, yes.
- Q. So whether it is a credit or a benefit or payment, or whatever, it is relevant because it lowered the amount of the bill, correct?
- A. It's relevant because it's not a payment that you made. It's a credit, and that's what we called it.
- Q. So if, let's say, a church or somebody like that made a payment of \$150 toward my account for the SELF organization or another organization paid, a third party paid, you still would not consider that to be a payment but a benefit towards that? Yes or no?

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

A. It still deducts from your total balance, whether it be made by a church or you get a credit from HEAP. It still deducts from your total balance, but we're to specify what kind of benefit or credit it is. There's payments and then there's credits and then there's vouchers. I mean, we are specifying what kind of payment it was or what kind of credit it

was.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. But it lowers the bill.
- A. Absolutely.
- Q. So if it lowers the bill, it's accepted as payment.
 - A. Yes. And it was.
 - Q. Whether you received the money at that time or on November 26 when you actually received it.

9 MR. McMAHON: Objection, move to strike.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: She's answered the question.

MS. WILEY: But that was a relevant question for him not to object to because Mr. Firich stated that the payment was made on November 26 to the company.

MR. McMAHON: Ms. Wiley is testifying now. If she has a question, she should move on.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is cross-examination. You have to ask a question, and if you get an answer, then we move on to another question.

MS. WILEY: Okay.

- Q. What was the information or telephone call that my daughter made on August 27, 2010?
 - A. What did she say? What did she want?

O. Uh-huh.

2.2

- A. I listened to the call. But she asked she said you would be making a payment the following Monday by money order, and the representative gave her the locations of our pay stations. She also offered to take a payment by phone at that point, and your daughter said that her mom would be making the payment the following Monday. That was the extent of the call.
- Q. So there should be a notation in the account as to as far as that because that was pretty much a payment arrangement.
- A. No, it wasn't at all. It was just -- it wasn't a payment arrangement at all. Your daughter called to say you would be making a payment. That's not a payment arrangement. We made no arrangements whatsoever.
 - O. Was the account notated?
- A. No. That was not an arrangement. If a customer calls and tells us something, we don't make --
 - Q. But you have the recording?
- A. Yes, we have a recording.
- MR. McMAHON: And we produced it to you.
- MS. WILEY: It's unintelligible. I have

no idea what is on that disk.

2.2

THE WITNESS: You may not have the right kind of system to listen to it. I don't know. I listened to the call, and, again, your daughter was simply calling to provide information.

- Q. So was she informed at that time that the HEAP payment of \$271 had been applied to the account?
- A. No. Your daughter didn't ask that question. She wasn't a party to that account. Your daughter simply called to say you would be making a payment. We are not going to provide any information to her because she is not a party to the account.
- Q. But you discussed the concept of the account.

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

- A. We did not discuss it. She called to say you would be making a payment. We offered to give pay station locations.
- Q. When a person calls in regards to an account, does your customer service person go through the list of asking their name, their date of birth, their last three of the social before they can discuss any part of the account?
- A. It depends on what information they have. If they have the account number, they will -- it

- depends on what the person asks. They would not have been provided information, but they would have listened to what she had to say. They would not have set up a payment arrangement with your daughter because she is not a party to the account.
 - Q. You just said -- you're saying a person can call and ask questions in regards to the account and say a payment is going to be made on such and such date, which is an agreement --
 - A. No, it's not, not at all, not whatsoever. It is not an agreement.
 - Q. You would discuss that with that person without providing contact information?
 - A. We didn't discuss anything. She simply called to say, My mom is going to make a payment on the account on Monday, and we offered pay station locations. That's all.
 - Q. But you --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. She didn't even say how much she was going to pay.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: She answered that question.
- MS. WILEY: Oh, my gosh.
- Q. Here on page 8 it gives a complete
 preview of how the cycles are done. It says, "with

the required 10-day notice." And it's referring to disconnection of service.

- A. Disconnection notices, correct.
- Q. That with the required 14 and 10 days, which is 14 days when you get the final notice and then 10 days after the notice --
- A. The 14-day notice is on the bill. That's followed by the final 10-day notice.
 - Q. And it's titled Final Disconnection?
 - A. Yes, it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q. So when you received the bill, that says Final Disconnection. There's 14 days after that?
- A. No. If you look at your bills where you see disconnection notices on them, that's the 14-day notice. That's followed by a final 10-day notice.

 That says Final 10-Day Notice.
- Q. I'm glad you brought that up. Can we go back to your Exhibit A, please? In your Exhibit A for May 14, 2010, at the top of the bill right above the due date, what do you see there?
 - A. Right above the due date?
 - Q. Yes.
 - A. I don't see anything there.
- Q. That's fine.
 - A. I don't know what you mean.

- Q. You answered. Above the due date for June 14, this is my second bill, is it customary to send a reminder notice at that point?
- A. You didn't have a disconnection notice on your first bill. The reminder notice is simply saying that -- wait a minute. Which bill are we talking about?
 - Q. You're right.

2.2

- A. There is a disconnection notice. This isn't a reminder notice. We are not required to send a reminder notice, not at all. This is a disconnection for the security deposit. The security deposit must be paid.
- Q. What is the regular process and the requirement for receiving a bill, receiving a reminder notice, receiving a disconnection notice, and then receiving a final disconnection notice there?
- A. There is no requirement in our tariff that requires that we send out a reminder notice. If you notice when you got reminder notices, you didn't have a disconnection notice.
- Q. I know. That's what I'm emphasizing here.
 - A. Exactly. Your previous bill --

- 1 MS. WILEY: She answered. She answered.
 - Q. So from my first bill, there's nothing there. This is my first bill. My second bill I get a disconnection notice.
 - A. That's correct.
 - O. Not a reminder notice.
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. On my third bill, I get a reminder notice.
- 10 A. Uh-huh. Would you like me to tell you 11 why?
 - Q. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- A. Because the disconnection notice on your second bill is strictly due to your unpaid security deposit. That's why. We don't send out disconnection notices for utility charges until 65 days in arrears, but if a security deposit is past due, you get a disconnection notice the next month.
- Q. Okay. Thank you for saying that. Let's go to August, because we are keeping in mind the bill dated for July 14, at the top, Exhibit C, has a reminder notice.
- A. Uh-huh. Plus you had made a payment as well.
 - Q. Right. Now, the August 13 bill, what do

you see above the due date, Exhibit D?

2.2

- A. There's no disconnection notice because you made a payment of \$150, so your deposit was paid so you weren't in disconnect status at that time.

 Again, we disconnect for utility charges at 60 days in arrears.
- Q. So in September, September 13 at the top where it says Reminder Notice, it was because you had received the 271?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And then October the disconnection notice, and that would be the normal --
- A. That was the bill that went out in September, not October. That was the following month. It was the bill that went out in September. You had had a disconnection notice for your 60-day arrears of \$287.79, and you needed to pay that by October 15. That was clearly marked on the bill.
- Q. When services were disconnected in October and reconnected in October, the November due date bill, November 11, 2010, it was starting a brand-new bill, but yet this bill is a disconnection notice.
- A. No. The reason is because this bill was prepared before you ever used the 175 and paid. You

- didn't pay the 175 when the bill was prepared. You had not yet done that. This bill says, "If your service has not yet been disconnected, please pay \$478.50." You didn't pay the 175 on the winter reconnection rule until the next day, so none of that is reflected on this bill.
 - Q. Due date December 10, 2010, what do you see up there?
 - A. This is a bill showing your \$175 payment, and you're also on a payment plan at this point, which is why we are only asking you to pay \$228.34, which is \$95, your current charges, and the \$25 reconnection fee. This bill is on an agreement, so there is no disconnection.
 - Q. This is the only bill like this.
 - A. That's correct, because you didn't pay it, so the next bill that came out, you were no longer on an agreement.
 - Q. This bill is inclusive of the \$175 payment that was done in --
 - A. October.

- Q. As well as -- let's flip it to the next one, January bill. January would have reflected the \$100 payment that was made in December.
 - A. Uh-huh.

```
Q. What do you see above the due date on January 12?
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- A. Again, you had a bill that was due on December 10 for \$228.34. You did not pay that, so when your account billed again on December 21, your agreement was in default. It was gone. You made a payment of \$100 after, but the agreement was already gone. Once your agreement was removed, you were once again in danger of being disconnected.
- Q. Are you aware of any of the motions
 that --
- MR. McMAHON: Objection. Any motions
 filed by Ms. Wiley are irrelevant.
- MS. WILEY: I didn't file them. He filed it.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are you talking about?
- MS. WILEY: Mr. McMahon on February --
- MR. McMAHON: Objection. Any questions
 about motions filed before the hearing are outside
 the scope of direct and are irrelevant to these
 proceedings.
- MS. WILEY: Yes, they are. They are relevant.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I will give you

an opportunity to explain how this question is relevant.

MS. WILEY: Mr. McMahon's motion, I think it was in January or February, he mentioned that the reason why I was not being disconnected -- because I had defaulted in November on the agreement, I didn't pay the \$95 payment in November. I didn't pay it in December. I didn't pay it in January. So he made a motion in regards to the reason why I was not being disconnected is because in respect to us being in a hearing setting. And that was admitted -- here it is right here.

On February 16, Motion, Duke Energy Ohio, Incorporated, Memorandum in Opposition to Complainant's Request to Stop Disconnection of Services, in the second paragraph, Mr. McMahon's second sentence, "Respondent tentatively waives the prior disconnection notices due to the pending hearing because Respondent wanted to address the issues at the settlement conference February 14."

So that's why I asked Ms. Givens was she aware of this motion, because I had already defaulted on paying the \$95 because I objected to it at the beginning. I was forced into this agreement.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm going to have

```
to agree with him. It's beyond the scope of the hearing. These are prehearing motions. Now you need to address your questions to her about her prefiled testimony here.
```

2.2

Q. Are you aware of any of the motions -MS. WILEY: I'm redirecting the question.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No. You ask a question on cross-examination, and you have to base it on her prefiled testimony here or the additional direct Mr. McMahon made before you started cross.

MS. WILEY: Okay. I can ask her is she aware of any of the documents pertaining to this account, motions.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Not the motions. We are talking about this here, the prefiled testimony, you have a copy of that, and what he said in addition to this, his direct examination in addition to this. You must base your cross-examination on that.

MS. WILEY: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, you have to do that.

MS. WILEY: That's why I asked her was she aware of this motion.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That motion, the

- prehearing motion, doesn't have anything to do with her direct testimony.
- MS. WILEY: Actually, it does because in her testimony --
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: My ruling is it doesn't, so you must move on to another question.

MS. WILEY: Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Can you explain to me on page 9 of your statement, can you explain to me what you think happened when your customer service person spoke to Casey at the Veterans Administration?
 - A. I have no knowledge of that whatsoever.
- Q. But aren't all calls documented and recorded?
 - A. I can tell you what -- just from reading the letter, I can tell you what --
 - Q. What letter?
 - A. The letter you presented from the gentleman from the Veterans Administration.
 - Q. So there's no notation in the account, no notation or call history on that date and time.
 - A. I mean, honestly, no, we have no record of that phone call at all.
 - Q. So when you made this statement on page 6 that the system records or documents, and it's

inclusive from all the call centers, receivables, customer service personnel --

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think we've covered this.

- A. Let me explain. In order for us to locate a call, we either have to have the name of this representative, the full name of the representative, the approximate time. If you --
- Q. I'm speaking of the notation when a customer service person opens up the account, is it true -- you answer this. Is it true their employee ID, date, and time and all that is time stamped, whether visible by the customer service person or not? Isn't that time stamped in the system somewhere saying that that person accessed that account?
- A. No, not at all. If a notation is entered on the account, yes. I mean, no, that's not time stamped in any way. The system doesn't work this way.
- Q. So what is your recollection of the customer service conversation with Casey on November 8?
- A. I don't have a recollection of that. I wasn't a party to it.
 - Q. So what do you think happened?

MR. McMAHON: Objection, asked and answered.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's the answer. You have to move on.

Q. When I spoke to the five customer service persons on October 19 and October 20 and none of them mentioned the winter rule, except for the sixth young lady, the customer service person I had spoken to on the phone --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Has to be a question.

- Q. Here on page 9 of your direct testimony, you put that those notes reflect that a customer service representative explained to me my options to have my services reconnected using the winter rule. Is it customary and common practice for your customer service persons not to tell a person who has been disconnected during that time that they actually qualify for that?
 - A. Yes, I'm showing that they did.
 - O. Who did?
- A. The representatives that you spoke with noted on the account they told you about the winter rule. They also told you about the option for a medical certificate, and they also answered the

questions about your HEAP payment credited in August, all of that was noted on the account.

- Q. So that was noted on the account.
- A. Uh-huh. Because that's what happened, yes.
- Q. So when I asked for all the documentation pertaining to the account, was that just forgotten?
 - A. That was provided to you.

2.2

MR. McMAHON: It was produced.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it was.

MS. WILEY: No, it wasn't.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can't testify on the record. Ask a question now to this witness.

Do you have any more questions on cross-examination?

MS. WILEY: Yes, I do.

- Q. Did you make the notation in the account pertaining to in March, in March of this year, for my services to be restored? What was the monetary amount that you stated needed to be paid as well as the deposit and reconnection fees?
- A. Well, I stated you needed \$730.11 because that was the amount reflected on your bill that went out on February 22nd. The disconnection amount at that time was \$730.11.
 - Q. That bill was inclusive of my entire

bill, not just the current?

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- 2 A. No. That was your 60-day arrears. At
- 3 | the time, your total balance at that time was
- $4 \mid \$1,076.72$. That was just your 60-day arrears.
- 5 Q. Hold on, because I'm looking at the March 6 bill.
 - A. The March bill is even higher.
 - Q. I'm looking at the March bill, Exhibit K, and it says current amount due is \$1,076.72. So this amount here you're saying it's not inclusive of the 730 from --
 - A. Of course it is, yes.
 - O. So it is inclusive?
- 14 A. Yes. The 730 is the 60-day arrears, and 15 the total is \$1,076.72.
 - Q. For January, February, and March to present, my bill is inclusive of the old bill as well as the new bill?
 - A. Absolutely. You owed the entire amount.
 - Q. So when the order was made by Mr. Sheets on February 25 not to disconnect services for billing amounts that were in dispute, were you aware of that?
 - A. The order also said you were to pay current charges because they were not in dispute, and you paid nothing. I mean, you didn't pay the current

charges.

- Q. But didn't you just say that the bill was inclusive of the old, so where it says Current Amount Due on the bill because it's not separated like the December bill, in here it says Current Amount Due where it has the grand total amount, that's the amount that you were expecting because that's the current amount due?
- A. That's the amount that you owed. What you were --
 - Q. If Mr. Sheets said -- were you aware --
- A. You weren't disconnected -- you weren't disputing charges -- you weren't paying your current charges. When a person files a complaint at the Commission, they're required to pay the undisputed charges, which in your case were the current charges. You weren't paying those.
- Q. Were you aware of the order Mr. Sheets made on February 25?
 - A. I did not --
- 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think she 22 answered the question.
- MS. WILEY: Which was what? What was the answer?
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: She was aware you

were not paying the current charges, which is why you were disconnected.

THE WITNESS: It did not simply say we couldn't disconnect. There was a condition attached to that, if you weren't paying the current charges, and you were not.

- Q. The bill, as you stated before, was inclusive of the old bill and the new bill.
- A. There was no old bill. It was the entire account balance.
 - O. So that's what I was disconnected for?
- A. For nonpayment.

2.2

- Q. Were you aware of the motion that was made in regard to I think March 5, including all the bills into --
- MR. McMAHON: Objection to any question about prehearing motions.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. You need to confine your questions, once again, to the direct testimony.

- Q. Can you please clarify where you got the 730 amount from, please?
- A. I just pointed that out to you on the bill. That is your 60-day arrears.
 - Q. For what date? Where should I see this,

on what bills?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- A. It's on Exhibit K.
- Q. So the bill marked March 16, 2011?
- A. It's the due date.

 $\label{eq:MR.McMAHON:} \text{ Explain to her on Exhibit K}$ where you're talking about.

THE WITNESS: In the block where it says, "Important, your service may be disconnected if the past due amount of \$730.11 is not paid before March 18," that's where it came from.

- Q. In the system for March, in the system where services are disconnected, you made a notation specifically how much everything had to be paid in order to restore services. What was that notation?
- A. 730, plus the 50 deposit, plus the 25 reconnection fee.
- Q. And that was all-inclusive in order for service to be restored.
- 19 A. That's correct. That's a total of 20 \$805.11.
- Q. Even though this note says \$40 for deposit.
- A. If you look at Exhibit L, which is the bill that was issued prior to your service being disconnected, to be quite honest with you, we could

have required you to pay \$929.70, because that was the past due, plus the \$50 deposit, plus \$25 reconnection fee.

- Q. You were aware of the agreement at that time with SELF, because when I went to SELF and you stipulated everything that you just made, SELF, the organization, HEAP was ready to help me pay these bills. When you made that notation in the account for reconnection, you didn't say \$40, you did not say \$45, you said \$50 deposit.
- A. I said \$50 because a new bill had issued and the deposit increased to \$50 once a new bill issued.
- Q. And then a whole new balance with the \$50 deposit, \$25 reconnection fee had to be paid prior, and the 730 totaled up to 805.11.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So then when we paid the 805 -- no, let me back up a little bit. On that Friday on the 25th, March 25th, on that Friday when the agreement was paid for everything you just stated, and a payment was made on Saturday the 26th for \$380, that Monday when we came in, the agreement had been broken, and there was an extra \$142 that was going to be applied to the account until Ms. Athena called you,

- 1 Ms. Athena Malley.
- 2 MR. McMAHON: Objection to form.
- 3 Ms. Wiley is testifying.
- 4 MS. WILEY: No. No, not -- we called
- 5 you --
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to ask a
- 7 | question. You are testifying.
- Q. Did you receive a phone call from
- 9 Ms. Athena Malley?
- 10 A. Yes, I did.
- 11 0. What was the conversation?
- 12 A. She asked me what you needed to restore
- 13 | service. And I said exactly what I had on the
- 14 account, which was the \$730.11, a \$25 reconnection
- 15 | fee, and a \$50 deposit. I was not aware of any -- I
- 16 am not aware of any higher amount being quoted to
- 17 you. I clearly noted that amount on the account.
- 18 0. You did?
- 19 A. Prior to even talking to her.
- Q. Then on Monday, that Monday, I left you a
- 21 voice mail message. What was that voice mail message
- 22 stating?
- A. I don't really recall, to be honest with
- 24 | you. I believe you said --
- Q. Athena called you that day, and I did as

- well. We both called you that day and left a voice mail message. Later on that day you gave me a call back.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Do you remember that? Can you tell me what our conversation was about?
 - A. To be honest with you, I don't remember exactly what the conversation was. I remember I stated the amount that you needed to restore the service. That's what it was.
 - Q. Did you have any knowledge whatsoever that the customer service person under your directive had added another \$142 to the \$805.11?
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, assumes facts not in evidence.
- 16 MS. WILEY: Excuse me? It is.
- 17 THE WITNESS: I can answer that.
- 18 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll let her
- 19 answer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

A. It's not noted anywhere. There was no record anywhere that anyone told you a higher amount because, indeed, like I said, I noted the account and I told Athena the amount that you needed. I told you the amount that you needed. So there was no record that anyone had told you anything other than that,

```
so, no, I'm not aware of that, and there was no record of that.
```

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will have to let that stand as an answer. We will move on to another question.

Q. You stated -- I'm sorry. I'm on page 13 of your directive. I'm on line 5. The question is -- we will come back to the events in March 2011.

"Please explain DE-Ohio's response to Ms. Wiley's claim that she contacted DE-Ohio in September 2010 and was told she had until Thanksgiving to pay the balance due."

On line No. 5 you made this comment,

"which the company records" -- I'm sorry. Let me go
up to line 4. It says, "We searched DE-Ohio's
records of customer telephone calls, which the
company records and maintains for a period of 90
days."

If the company maintains and holds on to records for 90 days and I was just provided my daughter's unintelligible recording for August the 20th, how is that possible?

MR. McMAHON: Objection to the form, "How is what possible?"

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: See if she has an

answer.

- A. I don't understand the question.
- Q. Your system stated you keep things for 90 days. 90 days from August would be September,
 October, November that would be on file. So when you requested documentation or whatever and I didn't receive it in the first batch Mr. McMahon had given me in January, how are you able to obtain that record when it should have been wiped off your records because that's not 90 days but five months?
- A. That call was received along with all the other ones. We just neglected to provide it to you. It was retrieved with all the other ones. The only ones that weren't received were in September because there was no such call.
- Q. So you just neglected to forward that telephone conversation. Are there any other telephone conversations or notes or things like that Duke Energy has neglected to forward to me?
- A. We provided everything that we have on the account. We could not provide you the calls in September because the calls do not exist.
- Q. Okay. When you said you provided me everything, you kind of contradicted yourself because --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, you can't testify. You have to come up with another question.

- Q. So just to reconfirm what you stated, that you neglected to give me that conversation that was recorded in August --
- A. With your daughter, yes. We had it but we didn't give it to you.
 - Q. You didn't give it to me.
 - A. It was an oversight.

MR. McMAHON: For the record, we provided it to her within two weeks of producing the other conversations. We produced one disk of certain calls at the February 14 settlement conference, and by the end of February, we produced the other call relating to her daughter.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

Do you have another question?

MS. WILEY: Just as he objected and made that statement, I need to make this statement.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can't do that. You have to ask a question at this point.

MS. WILEY: So to reconfirm.

Q. So to reconfirm, you just neglected -MR. McMAHON: Objection, asked and

25 answered.

2.2

- MS. WILEY: We had an answer to that question already.
 - Q. Do you know Diane Kuhnell?
 - A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Who is she?
- A. She works in our legal department.
- Q. So she's a Duke Energy employee?
- A. Absolutely.
- Q. Are you aware I served her a subpoena?

 MR. McMAHON: Objection.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I didn't hear the question.
- MR. McMAHON: She asked if she was aware she served a subpoena on Diane Kuhnell. Again, it is prehearing issues.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Right. You have to confine yourself to the direct examination.
- Q. On page 14 of your direct, on line 8, and this is still in consideration to the comment she made earlier which she said that they neglected --
- 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ma'am, what are 22 you referring to?
- MS. WILEY: Page 14, line 8.
- Q. It says "Ms. Wiley has no evidence to support her claims and has never been able to

```
identify with any respect how much she was supposed
to pay to DE-Ohio under the nonextension payment
plan."
```

Would you say that Duke Energy has all the information it needed or 90 percent of the information it needed to pursue this case?

- A. We provided all the information requested.
- 9 Q. No. My question was -
 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think she

 answered the question, ma'am.
- MS. WILEY: No. I didn't ask her if she provided it.
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I disagree. My ruling will stand.

MS. WILEY: Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. In the conversations let me rephrase that. Are you aware that your customer service representatives in October through the 21st let me know that the \$271 payment was applied to my account on August 12? Are you aware of that?
- A. I was not a party to that conversation but I'm not --
- Q. Would that be a part of the notation in my account, because they read from that? I'm just

wondering if that date is notated in my account because five separate customer service representatives quoted August 12.

2.2

- A. They can look at the history of the account and see when the credit was applied. That is part of the account record, yes.
- Q. Earlier in Mr. Firich's testimony, as well as the time line right there, he -- are you aware that on the information that Duke Energy sent back to the HEAP organization it stated that the payment was applied on the 9th of August?
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, mischaracterizes
 Mr. Firich's testimony.
- MS. WILEY: No. I'm asking her is she aware of that.
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll let her answer that question.
 - A. What it actually says is that the payment was accepted, not entered on the account. It says "accepted." That is not being entered on the account. That's accepted.
 - Q. As payment, that's what he said, accepted as payment.
- A. Accepted. That is not stating when it was applied to the account. He would have no

knowledge of that, which is what he said.

- Q. No, that's not what he said.
 - A. Yes, that is what he said.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I think we have an answer. Next question.

- Q. On the documentation you send back to the HEAP organization, do you give the date that it was applied to the account?
- A. No, we do not. And they have no access to our records to know when it was applied to the account.
- Q. So you do not -- Duke Energy does not give a date that the funds were applied to the account.
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, asked and answered.
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It's asked and answered.
 - Q. Where do we get the August 12 from?
 - A. It's in our system on when the credit was applied to the account. All credits are shown, payments, credits, vouchers, anything are shown the date they are actually, physically applied to the account. That's what our reps would see. Our reps would have no way of knowing when any transmittal to

- the ODOD took place. They wouldn't have any way of knowing that. What they can see is what date the credit was posted to the account, which is August 12.

 That's what they can see.
 - Q. Okay. Earlier in your testimony you said the credit was applied on August 9.
 - A. No, I did not. We said it was accepted on August 9. Again, it was accepted. That is not applying it to the account. The August 9 date is what Mr. Firich mentioned. We didn't say that. He did.
 - Q. No. He mentioned the August 20 as the date of acceptance.
 - A. No.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can't argue with the witness. You have to ask another question.
- Q. Do you recall -- this is on the time line entered as an exhibit for me. Would you like to look at that? Can you read back that date that --
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the scope of direct.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think he's correct.
- Q. On page 15, line 6, the question is,
 "What about the claims that Ms. Wiley added to her

amended complaint concerning DE-Ohio's alleged failure to bill her gas and electric usage in a proper manner?"

2.2

On line 6 you made the comment,

"Ms. Wiley has never contacted DE-Ohio to dispute or
take issues with her past bills." I have never made
contact to DE-Ohio "to dispute or take issues with
the past bills, the gas and electric meters at the
residence, the reads on her gas and electric meters,
high or unusual usage of utility services or anything
of that nature."

The question is, according to this, have I -- am I clear in understanding this to say I never called to discuss a bill, to make payment arrangements, to say that this bill isn't accurate or complain about any bill in any way?

- A. No, that's not what it says.
- O. How should I understand that?
- A. What it says is that you've never called to question the actual usage on the bill, on the meters, the meter readings, anything of that nature. Your calls have all been regarding payments, disconnection notices, payment plans, deposits, nothing regarding the actual usage on the meter or meter readings or anything of that nature. That's

```
what it's talking about. That has never been questioned.
```

2.2

- Q. So when I called in November and when I called in December and I was complaining about the wrong amounts for the bill and I made the emphasis of the October bill being \$108, and that's from usage from October to November, and compared that \$108 to when we, my family and I, were at home, to the December 19 bill, which was, I think, \$199, \$180, \$199, and I said we weren't home but the bill is higher than the bill from October, are you saying I didn't make --
- $$\operatorname{MR.}$ McMAHON: Objection, assuming facts not in evidence and beyond the scope of direct.
- MS. WILEY: Excuse me. Of course it is.

 16 It is on the bill.
 - THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's have a question about what she testified to, not your testimony.
 - MS. WILEY: It's not my testimony.

 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: But a question to her. Now proceed.
 - Q. So you wouldn't take that by me calling customer service and comparing those two bills and the amounts of those bills as me never taking issues

```
with my bills?
```

2.2

- A. There's no record that you ever did that. First we heard of that was in the settlement conference. It was the first time it was ever mentioned. It was not mentioned in any of your complaints, nothing. It was first time we heard of it.
 - Q. It was never mentioned in my complaints?
 - A. Un-uh. Never. Never.
- MS. WILEY: So I address this because my April complaint it's addressed. In my November 1 complaint in the first complaint, I not only disputed wrongful --
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, now you're lapsing into your own testimony. She's provided an answer to the question. Now what we need from you at this point is another question on cross.
- Q. So November 8 when I spoke to Carrie, when I spoke to Carrie, customer service representative, on November 8, I asked her to send me a copy of my bills and all the account information, which --
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, beyond the scope of direct.
- MS. WILEY: I haven't asked my question

```
yet. Can I ask my question?
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to come up with a question and ask it.

- Q. Would you consider that being taking up issues with my bill?
- A. I'm not aware of that conversation. I can't answer that. There's no indication that you ever complained about the amount of the bill, only that you constantly questioned the \$271 HEAP credit and the fact that your service should not be disconnected because of the payment plan --
 - Q. Isn't that a dispute?
- A. No, it's not disputing the usage; no, it isn't.
- Q. I didn't say usage and you don't say usage here.
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, argumentative now.
- THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now you're arguing again. She provided an answer to the question. Now you have to move on to another question.
- MS. WILEY: She's caught herself in a lie.
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, move to strike.

```
1
                 MS. WILEY: Okay. I'm moving on, but
 2
    Ms. Givens has made a statement --
 3
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, you can't
 4
     argue here. You have to keep on with the questions
 5
     as long as you're doing cross-examination.
                 So, Ms. Givens, you're going to stick
 6
 7
    with I never questioned --
 8
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, asked and
 9
     answered.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We have to move
10
11
    on to another one.
12
            Q.
                 Who, to your knowledge, since you stated
     that you've worked with the PUCO for quite a long
13
     time and you're the person who does the research and
14
15
     everything pertaining to the case and claims, do they
16
     accept all complaints, the PUCO?
17
            Α.
                 I have no way of knowing that.
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, asking for a
18
19
     legal conclusion as whether the PUCO accepts
20
     complaints.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I agree. That's
21
2.2
     sustained.
                 (Discussion off record.)
23
24
                 (Recess taken.)
25
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the
```

```
217
 1
     record.
 2
                 You were conducting cross-examination,
 3
    Ms. Wiley.
                Do you have more questions?
 4
                 MS. WILEY: I'm done.
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have any
 6
     on redirect?
 7
                 MR. McMAHON: No questions, your Honor.
 8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You're excused.
 9
                 MR. McMAHON: Just to clarify, make sure
10
    that Duke Energy has moved for the submission of
11
    Exhibits A through N that are attached to Ms. Givens'
12
     testimony and Exhibit O, which was the discovery
13
     request that was addressed during Ms. Wiley's
     testimony.
14
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I will admit all
16
     exhibits in the case into evidence at this time.
17
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
18
                 MR. McMAHON: Duke Energy rests, your
19
    Honor.
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Very good. Let's
21
    go off the record briefly.
2.2
                 (Discussion off record.)
23
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will go back
24
     on the record. We have discussed a briefing schedule
25
     and agreed to submit simultaneous briefs on July 15.
```

```
218
 1
                  I consider the case submitted on the
     record. Thank you for coming.
 2
                  (The hearing adjourned at 3:53 p.m.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Thursday, May 12, 2011, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Rosemary Foster Anderson, Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires April 5, 2014.

11 (RFA-8626)

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/31/2011 11:31:08 AM

in

Case No(s). 10-2463-GE-CSS

Summary: Transcript Transcript of Sherry Wiley vs. Duke Energy Ohio hearing held on 05/12/11 electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Anderson, Rosemary Foster Mrs.