BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for the Establishment of a Charge Pursuant to Revised Code Section 4909.18.)	Case No. 12-2400-EL-UNC
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Change Accounting Methods.)	Case No. 12-2401-EL-AAM
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc, for the Approval of a Tariff for a New Service.)	Case No. 12-2402-EL-ATA

JOINT REPLY TO MEMORANDUM CONTRA MOTION TO STRIKE BY SIGNATORY PARTIES

The Signatory Parties,¹ including consumer advocates representing the approximately 611,000 residential utility consumers of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. ("Duke"), file this Reply to Duke's Memorandum Contra the Joint Motion to strike filed on November 2, 2012. In this pleading the Signatory Parties address Duke's turnabout claims that the Signatory Parties (not itself) "ignored the rules" under the Ohio Administrative Code and that the Signatory Parties unreasonably relied upon Duke's request for an expedited ruling.

As explained in the Signatory Parties' Joint Motion to Strike, Duke's Reply should be stricken under Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-12 because Duke has failed to comply with the Ohio Administrative Code. Under the Code, when a party seeks an expedited

1

¹ Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel, the Ohio Energy Group, the City of Cincinnati, the Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy, Greater Cincinnati Health Council, Ohio Manufacturers' Association, The Kroger Company, Cincinnati Bell, Inc. and Wal-Mart Stores East LP and Sam's East Inc. ("Signatory Parties")

ruling (inadvertently or otherwise) it is not entitled to a reply.² If Duke's reply stands, the Signatory Parties will have been prejudiced because they were not afforded the additional response time (8 more days) that they were entitled to under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-1-12(B). Instead, the Signatory Parties relied upon the statement in Duke's pleading that it was requesting an expedited ruling and responded within the shorter seven day time period allotted under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-1-12(C).³

Although admitting that the Signatory Parties are "superficially correct" and appear to make a "reasonable request" in their arguments, ⁴ Duke asserts that the arguments are "not supportable in this instance." In an ironic twist, Duke claims that while the Signatory Parties seek to uphold the procedural rules "with precision" they (not Duke) ignore the terms of the very same rule. Duke asserts that the Signatory Parties "knew—from the face of the document—that the one-sentence mention of expedited treatment should be denied under the terms of the applicable rule." Thus, Duke believes that the Signatory Parties should have treated the pleading as deficient and responded within the more elongated response period allotted under the rules for motions not seeking expedited relief. Duke then implies that any other reaction to the pleading was unreasonable and that it is the Signatory Parties who are at fault, not Duke, for relying on

⁻

² Ohio Admin. Code 4901-1-12(C).

³ Otherwise a memorandum contra may be filed within 15 days after service of a motion. See Ohio Admin. Code 4901-1-12(B)(1).

⁴ Duke Memorandum Contra Motion to Strike at 2 (Nov. 13, 2012).

⁵ Id.

⁶ Id. at 3.

Duke's pleading. Duke further seeks to disparage the Signatory Parties for not contacting

Duke to inquire as to whether expedited treatment was being requested. ⁷

Duke's arguments are absurd. Duke filed a pleading where in the very first paragraph of its motion it requested an expedited ruling: "Duke Energy Ohio further seeks an expedited ruling on its motion pursuant to O.A.C. 4901-1-12(C)." The Signatory Parties relied upon Duke's request for an expedited ruling, and filed a Memorandum Contra complying with the shortened seven-day response period. Duke filed a Reply to the Joint Memorandum Contra. On that same day, OCC's attorney contacted Duke's Attorney indicating that OCC intended to move to strike Duke's Reply unless Duke withdrew it.

Duke has failed to comply with the Commission's rules. No amount of fingerpointing can change that fact. The merits of a pleading—whether it has complied with the
rules or not -- do not change the response time required under the rules. The rules speak to
whether a request is made—they do not differentiate between a legitimate or illegitimate
request. Nor is there any "Did you really mean it?" duty imposed by the Commission
rules. The rules do not require an opposing party to inquire of the moving party whether
they really meant what they said in their pleading.

Accordingly, the Commission should follow the rules set forth in the Ohio

Administrative Code instead of the rules which Duke manufactures to remedy its error.

The Joint Motion to Strike Duke's Reply should be denied, unquestionably.

_

⁷ Id. at 3.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

On Behalf of Ohio Energy Group

/s/ Maureen R. Grady_

Maureen R. Grady, Counsel of Record Kyle L. Kern Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: (Grady) (614) 466-9567 Telephone: (Kern) (614) 466-9585

grady@occ.state.oh.us
kern@occ.state.oh.us

/s/ Michael L. Kurtz_

David F. Boehm
Michael L. Kurtz
Jody M. Kyler
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh St., Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202
mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com
dboehm@BKLlawfirm.com
jkyler@BKLlawfirm.com

On Behalf of Ohio Manufacturers' Association

/s/ J. Thomas Siwo_

J. Thomas Siwo Matthew W. Warnock Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, OH 43215 tsiwo@bricker.com MWarnock@bricker.com

On Behalf of the City of Cincinnati

/s/ Thomas J. O'Brien_

Thomas J. O'Brien Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, OH 43215 tobrien@bricker.com

On Behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy

/s/ Colleen L. Mooney_

Colleen L. Mooney Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy 231 West Lima Street Findlay, OH 45839 Cmooney2@aol.com

On Behalf of the Greater Cincinnati Health Council

/s/ Douglas E. Hart____

Douglas E. Hart 441 Vine Street, Ste. 4192 Cincinnati, OH 45202 dhart@douglasehart.com

On Behalf of The Kroger Company

/s/ Kimberly W. Bojko__

Kimberly W. Bojko Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP 280 Plaza, Suite 1300 280 N. High Street Columbus, OH 43215 Bojko@carpenterlipps.com

On Behalf of Cincinnati Bell, Inc.

/s/ Douglas E. Hart___

Douglas E. Hart 441 Vine Street, Ste. 4192 Cincinnati, OH 45202 <u>dhart@douglasehart.com</u>

On Behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.

/s/ Rick D. Chamberlain_____

Rick D. Chamberlain 6 Northeast 63rd St., Ste. 400 Oklahoma City, OK 73105 Rdc_law@swbell.net

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this *Reply to Memo Contra Motion to Strike* was served on the persons stated below via electronic transmission this 20th day of November 2012.

/s/ Maureen R. Grady_

Maureen R. Grady

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

John.jones@puc.state.oh.us Amy.spiller@duke-energy.com Steven.beeler@puc.state.oh.us Jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com sam@mwncmh.com Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com fdarr@mwncmh.com Rocco.DAscenzo@duke-energy.com joliker@mwncmh.com dboehm@BKLlawfirm.com mpritchard@mwncmh.com mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com cmooney2@columbus.rr.com jkyler@BKLlawfirm.com dhart@douglasehart.com tobrien@bricker.com haydenm@firstenergycorp.com tsiwo@bricker.com ilang@calfee.com mwarnock@bricker.com lmcbride@calfee.com jejadwin@aep.com talexander@calfee.com valami@aep.com mhpetricoff@vorys.com bojko@carpenterlipps.com mohler@carpenterlipps.com smhoward@vorys.com ioseph.strines@DPLINC.com stnourse@aep.com judi.sobecki@DPLINC.com Rdc law@swbell.net

Devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us
dakutik@jonesday.com
aehaedt@jonesday.com
ssolberg@eimerstahl.com
ssolberg@eimerstahl.com

randall.griffin@DPLINC.com

kosterkamp@ralaw.com

BarthRoyer@aol.com

jbentine@amppartners.org jouett.brenzel@cinbell.com mjsatterwhite@aep.com

<u>asonderman@keglerbrown.com</u> <u>Mkimbrough@keglerbrown.com</u> AEs: <u>Christine.pirik@puc.state.oh.us</u>

<u>wmassey@cov.com</u> <u>Katie.stenman@puc.state.oh.us</u> asonderman@keglerbrown.com

mkimbrough@keglerbrown.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/20/2012 10:36:04 AM

in

Case No(s). 12-2400-EL-UNC, 12-2401-EL-AAM, 12-2402-EL-ATA

Summary: Reply Joint Reply to Memorandum Contra Motion to Strike by Signatory Parties electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Grady, Maureen R. Ms.