## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

) )))

) ) )

)

)

ELLIE MAPSON	
Complaina	int,
<b>v.</b>	
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRI	С
ILLUMINATING COMPANY,	
Respondent.	

Case No. 12-1897-EL-CSS

## ANSWER OF THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (collectively "CEI"), by counsel, for its Answer to the Complaint states as follows:

1. CEI is a public utility, as defined by §4905.03(A)(4), O.R.C. and is duly

organized and existing under the laws of the State of Ohio.

- 2. While the Complaint consists of one unnumbered page, CEI will attempt to specifically answer the different allegations within the Complaint.
  - 3. CEI denies for lack of knowledge the allegation "about 7 years ago a new pole

was carried through my neighbors yard and installed next to an old pole, but the lines and equipment (transformer) were never transferred or updated."

4. CEI denies for lack of knowledge the allegation that "[d]uring the month of March 2012, this outdated equipment became noticeable in our homes light and power flicked on and off with frequent surges."

5. CEI admits that Complainant contacted CEI on March 30, 2012 to report a flickering light. A trouble crew responded and made repairs. CEI denies for lack of knowledge the allegations pertaining to what the trouble crew stated at that time.

6. CEI denies that 3 days later another repairman came out. CEI states that on April 10, 2012 and April 17, 2012 further repairs were made at Complainant's property. CEI denies for lack of knowledge the allegations pertaining to what the trouble crew stated at those times.

7. CEI denies that it was negligent and that its negligence caused damages to Complainant's property.

8. CEI generally denies the remaining allegations contained in Complainant's Complaint including those allegations that CEI lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form as to the truth of those allegations and therefore denies same.

## For its affirmative defenses, CEI further avers that:

9. The Complaint fails to state reasonable grounds upon which its requested relief may be granted.

10. The PUCO lacks jurisdiction over Complainant's Complaint.

11. The Complaint fails to set forth reasonable grounds for a complaint, as

Complainant has not alleged that CEI has violated any statute, rule, or tariff provision.

12. CEI at all times acted in accordance with its Tariff, PUCO No. 13, on file with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, as well as all rules and regulations as promulgated by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, the laws existing in the State of Ohio, and accepted standards and practices in the electric utility industry.

13. Complainant lacks standing to bring some of the claims in its Complaint.

14. CEI reserves the right to raise additional defenses as warranted by discovery or otherwise in this matter.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Complaint, CEI respectfully requests that the instant action be dismissed, and that it be granted any other relief that this Commission may deem just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Carrie M. Dunn</u> Carrie M. Dunn (#0076952) Counsel of Record FirstEnergy Service Company 76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308 Phone: 330-761-2352 Fax: 330-384-3875

On behalf of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Answer of The Cleveland

Electric Illuminating Company was served by regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, upon Ellie Mapson, 12820 Guardian Blvd., Cleveland Ohio 44135.

<u>/s/ Carrie M. Dunn</u> Carrie M. Dunn Attorney This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/12/2012 2:11:38 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-1897-EL-CSS

Summary: Answer electronically filed by Ms. Carrie M Dunn on behalf of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company