

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of)	
Evelyn and John Keller,)	
)	
Complainants,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 12-2177-EL-CSS
)	
Ohio Power Company,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) On July 27, 2012, Evelyn and John Keller (Complainants) filed a complaint against Ohio Power Company (OPCo), alleging that OPCo failed to trim or remove trees and vegetation around the power lines which provided electric services to Complainants. Complainants state that as result of OPCo's negligence in trimming the vegetation, a tree fell across OPCo's power line during the storm on June 29, 2012. Furthermore, Complainants assert that OPCo negligently failed to repair the power line for more than six days after learning of the damage of the line on June 29, 2012. Complainants allege that they lost food products valued in excess of \$1,500 as a result of OPCo's negligence.
- (2) On August 16, 2012, OPCo filed its answer and a motion to dismiss, denying the allegations of the complaint. OPCo states it has complied with the applicable tariff and Commission rules, and that it has followed its standard business practice. Specifically, OPCo asserts that it is not liable to Complainants for damages in cases when supply should be "interrupted or fail by reason of an act of God." OPCo requests that the complaint be dismissed.
- (3) By entry issued August 27, 2012, the attorney examiner scheduled this matter for a prehearing settlement conference.

- (4) On September 4, 2012, Complainants filed a motion for an extension of time to file a memorandum in opposition to OPCo's motion to dismiss. Complainants assert that they are unable to reasonably respond to OPCo's motion until they receive discovery responses.
- (5) A prehearing settlement conference was held as scheduled on September 11, 2012. Following the prehearing settlement conference, the parties requested guidance from the attorney examiners on procedural matters. Specifically, the parties indicated to the attorney examiners that a mutually agreed upon date of February 1, 2013, was a reasonable deadline for Complainants to file a memorandum in opposition to OPCO's motion to dismiss.
- (6) The attorney examiner finds Complainants' motion for an extension of time to file a memorandum in opposition to OPCo's motion to dismiss is reasonable and should be granted. Accordingly, Complainants' deadline to respond to OPCo's motion to dismiss should be extended to February 1, 2013.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That Complainants' motion for an extension of time to file a memorandum in opposition to OPCo's motion to dismiss is reasonable and should be granted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That Complainants' deadline to respond to OPCo's motion to dismiss is extended to February 1, 2013. It is, further,

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

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Jonathan Tauber

By: Jonathan J. Tauber
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/sc

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

9/13/2012 4:03:29 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-2177-EL-CSS

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry granting Complainants' motion for an extension of time to file a memorandum in opposition to OPCo's motion to dismiss and extending the Complainants' deadline to respond to OPCo's motion to dismiss to 02/01/13. - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Jonathan Tauber, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio