

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of Edgar S.)	
Vitek,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 10-2436-EL-CSS
)	
American Electric Power Company, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2011 JUN 28 PM 4:15
PUCO

This is to certify that the images appearing are an
accurate and complete reproduction of a case file
document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician fe Date Processed 6/28/2011

To: The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

From: Edgar S. Vitek
5330 Sinclair Road
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Re: Brief for Case # 10-2436-EL-CSS

Date: June 21, 2011

Brief Due July, 8, 2011 at the P.U.C.O.

Four days after the May 10, 2011 hearing was conducted by the P.U.C.O. (Case # 10-2436-EL-CSS) between Edgar S. Vitek and The American Electric Power Company, I returned to my office and found conformation of what I had testified to at the hearing namely that mail sent to 5530 Sinclair Road, Columbus, Ohio 43229 is returned by the postal service as undeliverable.

I attach a copy of the official letter addressed to me by the postal service dated May 13, 2011.

Briefly, the typed (But never verbally delivered at the hearing) seven page testimony of A.E.P. and the thirty nine copied pages attached to that A.E.P. testimony (In the form of seven exhibits) at the May 10, 2011 hearing are similar to an army of words marching to the tune of misinformation. The following items exemplify:

Item: A.E.P.'s testimony for the P.U.C.O. hearing "filed 5-3-2010" (S.I.C.) on page 3, line 22, states that "The Company attempted to contact complainant at the phone number provided on the account regarding unpaid bills on August 16, 18, 23, and September 10, 2010, but there was no answering machine and no option to leave a message.

Yet exhibit "B" of that same A.E.P. testimony states that on 10-19-2010 entered by Amanda Thatcher, "Attempted to contact Edgar Vitek at 614-846-3282 on 10-19-2010 at 2:30 pm, left voice message with my name and call back number, trying to advise Mr. Vitek that we have received the complaint he sent to the P.U.C.O. via a letter".

The A.E.P. Company can't have it both ways. Either "There was no answering machine" at the 614-846-3282 phone number, which is the only phone number customer Vitek has, or the A.E.P. representative Amanda Thatcher "Left a voice message" at customer Vitek's 614-846-3282 phone number. Either A.E.P. did not try to use customer Vitek's voice message service and misinformed the P.U.C.O. in the A.E.P. testimony, or A.E.P. actually used Customer Vitek's voice message service and communicated with customer Vitek.

Item: A.E.P.'s testimony on page 6, line 6, has Ms. Jeunelot saying: "My view of the Complainant's account history with A.E.P. reflects that Complainant does not reside at 5342 Crawford Drive based on account records, complainant has recently verified that his residence is located at 5330 Sinclair Road, Columbus, Ohio 43229".

The handout of A.E.P.'s attorney at the hearing cited a "P.I.P. history list" as proof that customer Vitek "Recently verified that his residence is located at 5330 Sinclair Road". A.E.P.'s attorney's questioning of customer Vitek established only that customer Vitek had several telephone conversations with P.I.P. employees about his honest intentions to move his residence from 5330 Sinclair Road, which was and will continue to be his business office, to his new residence at 5342 Crawford Drive as soon as renovations at that H.U.D. property location had progressed far enough that customer Vitek could begin residing there. Customer Vitek filled out P.I.P. paperwork accordingly, as he was instructed by the P.I.P. representatives.

Item: When (During the A.E.P. testimony at the May 10, 2011 hearing) customer Vitek reflected back A.E.P.'s phrase "You have not fulfilled the obligation(s)" of exhibit A's first paragraph titled "Reconnect Requirement", he then asked the A.E.P. representative if A.E.P. had fulfilled the obligations that the electric company had to customer Vitek, and the representative avoided the question. So no answer was ever given by A.E.P. at the P.U.C.O.'s hearing regarding the obligation of The A.E.P. to notify customer Vitek of his usage bill for 5342 Crawford Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43229.

Item: Similarly, when customer Vitek asked The A.E.P. testifying representative to, please, supply to customer Vitek copies of regulations – which A.E.P. obviously possesses – Regulations that are customer friendly (In addition to the copies of company friendly regulations which A.E.P. supplied in it's exhibits) A.E.P.'s attorney objected; And the P.U.C.O. attorney examiner commented to customer Vitek that discovery had ceased.

As an aside, customer Vitek – Here in (In this brief) – Requests that the P.U.C.O. supply to customer Vitek relevant regulations that are customer friendly.

Item: In customer Vitek's submitted testimony of May 10, 2011, offering a snippet of the P.U.C.O.'s journal entry of January 21, 2011, I quoted (in part) "A.E.P. stated, however, that the error was immediately recognized and resolved, and A.E.P.'s meter was reenergized the same day".

Continuing the May 10, 2011 testimony of customer Vitek: "Immediately recognized and resolved"? I request that the P.U.C.O. require of A.E.P. the names of which of the 18,712 employees immediately recognized the company's error; and that the P.U.C.O. require of A.E.P. an explanation of why A.E.P. employees continued to mail 7 (SEVEN!) notices to a non-existent billing address in April, May, June, July, August, and September of 2010; And that A.E.P. explain to me -- (As if I were a six year old) -- Just how any of the company's 18,712 employees immediately resolved the company error and on what "same day" they reenergized my meter".

Briefly, A.E.P. made mistakes with regard to company treatment of customer Vitek and arrogantly attempted to punish this particular customer, rather than the company employees who made these mistakes.

To add insult to injury, A.E.P. ignores it's responsibilities to customers, then covers up company failure by misinformation and continues harmful procedures of the company that sorely need to be corrected.

Edgar S. Vitek

Edgar S. Vitek (Complainant)

5-21-2011

Date



5-14-2011

May 13, 2011

Edgar Vitek
5330 Sinclair Rd
Columbus OH 43229-5002

Dear Mr. Vitek:

This is in response to your recent inquiry regarding handling of undeliverable or incorrectly addressed mail.

Nondelivery of mail occurs for a number of general reasons including mail without postage, incomplete, illegible, or incorrect address, or mail unclaimed.

Dead mail is matter deposited in the mail that is or becomes undeliverable and cannot be returned to the sender from the last office of address. Some reasons that mail cannot be returned to the sender include no return address, or the classification of the mail does not entitle it to return service.

Except for unendorsed Standard Mail items, all undeliverable First-Class Mail, Standard Mail, and Package Services items that cannot be returned because of an incorrect, incomplete, illegible, or missing return address are opened and examined at the Mail Recovery Center (MRC) to identify the sender or addressee. Insured First-Class parcels containing Standard Mail or Package Services enclosures (sent under DMM S913) are handled the same way.

You provided the address of 5530 Sinclair Road, Columbus OH 43229, as an example. This address is not recognized by the US Postal Service as an address we serve. Mail sent to this address may be returned or handled as undeliverable in a manner described above.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to explain our policy regarding undeliverable mail. I hope this information responds directly to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kathy Seim".

for
Kathy Seim
Manager, Consumer Industry and Contact

Reference: OR45505634