

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Increase in Gas)	Case No. 12-1685-GA-AIR
Rates.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	Case No. 12-1686-GA-ATA
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Tariff Approval.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval of an)	Case No. 12-1687-GA-ALT
Alternative Rate Plan for Gas Distribution)	
Service.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to)	Case No. 12-1688-GA-AAM
Change Accounting Methods.)	

**MOTION TO STRIKE DUKE’S REPLY
BY
OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS’ COUNSEL**

The Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”) moves the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission” or “PUCO”) to strike the following pleading that Duke Energy of Ohio, Inc. (“Duke” or “the Utility”) filed on April 26, 2013: Reply to the Staff Memorandum Contra Duke Motion to Clarify and the OCC Memorandum Contra Duke Motion to Clarify and Duke Motion to Strike. This OCC Motion to Strike¹ is made because Duke violated Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-12(C) when it replied to two memoranda contra (from OCC and the PUCO Staff, respectively) after Duke requested an expedited ruling on its Motion. Rule 12 prohibits the movant from filing a reply memorandum when the movant sought an expedited ruling on its original motion. This Motion to

¹ This Motion to Strike is made consistent with the Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-12.

Strike should be granted for the reasons more fully explained in the attached
Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer, Counsel of Record

Joseph P. Serio

Edmund Berger

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: Sauer – (614) 466-1312

Telephone: Serio – (614) 466-9565

Telephone: Berger – (614) 466-1292

sauer@occ.state.oh.us

serio@occ.state.oh.us

berger@occ.state.oh.us

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Increase in Gas)	Case No. 12-1685-GA-AIR
Rates.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	Case No. 12-1686-GA-ATA
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Tariff Approval.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval of an)	Case No. 12-1687-GA-ALT
Alternative Rate Plan for Gas Distribution)	
Service.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to)	Case No. 12-1688-GA-AAM
Change Accounting Methods.)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 16, 2013 Duke filed a Motion To Clarify The Scope of These Proceedings (“Duke Motion ton Clarify”) and a Motion of Duke Energy of Ohio, Inc., To Strike The Testimony of James R. Campbell (“Duke Motion to Strike”) (together “Duke Motions”). Both Duke Motions asked for an expedited ruling.² On April 19, 2013, the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission” or “PUCO”) (“Staff”), filed a Memorandum Contra Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.’s Motion to Clarify the Scope of These Proceedings (“Staff Memo contra”). On April 23, 2013, OCC filed a Memorandum Contra Duke’s Motion to Clarify The Scope of These Proceedings And Motion to Strike the OCC Testimony of James R. Campbell (“OCC Memo Contra”). The

² Duke Motion to Clarify at 2, 8. Duke Motion to Strike at 2, 8.

Staff and OCC Memorandum Contra were filed pursuant to 4901-1-12 (C) Ohio Admin. Code.

On April 26, 2013, Duke filed a Reply to Memoranda Contra Filed by Staff and OCC to the Motion to Clarify the Scope of the Proceedings and OCC's Memoranda Contra the Motion to Strike the Testimony of James R. Campbell ("Duke Reply"). The Duke Reply was filed despite the fact that 4901-1-12 (C) Ohio Admin. Code prohibits a Reply when a party requests expedited consideration.³ Duke's Reply is not permitted by the Commission rules and should be stricken from the record.

II. ARGUMENT

Duke's Reply should be stricken. Duke filed its Motion to Clarify and Motion to Strike and asked for expedited consideration.⁴ In those circumstances, where a party has requested expedited consideration and there has been no request for Reply Memorandum by the PUCO, the PUCO's rules preclude the filing of a Reply to subsequent Memoranda Contra. The Ohio Administrative Code specifically states:

Any motion may include a specific request for an expedited ruling.* * *, any party may file a memorandum contra within seven days after the service of the motion, or such other period as the commission, the legal director, the deputy legal director, or the attorney examiner requires. **No reply memoranda shall be filed in such cases unless specifically requested by the commission, the legal director, the deputy legal director, or the attorney examiner.**⁵

³ 4901-1-12 (C) states: "No reply memoranda shall be filed in such cases unless specifically requested by the commission, the legal director, the deputy legal director, or the attorney examiner."

⁴ Duke Motion to Clarify at 2, 8 (April 16, 2013). Duke Motion to Strike at 2, 8 (April 16, 2013).

⁵ Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-12(C) (emphasis added).

Neither the Commission or the legal director nor the deputy legal director nor the attorney examiner requested Duke to file a Reply. Thus, because there is no provision in the Commission's Rules for Duke's Reply pleading, the Commission should grant the Motion to Strike.

In a recent case, the movant (FirstEnergy) sought an expedited ruling on its motion for waivers of certain Commission Rules and asked for expedited treatment.⁶ On April 17, 2012, OCC and other interested parties filed a Joint Motion to Bifurcate Issues and a Joint Memorandum Contra to First Energy's Motion for Waiver.⁷ FirstEnergy then filed a reply to the memorandum contra opposing its motion for waivers.⁸ On April 23, 2012, OCC and other interested parties moved to strike FirstEnergy's Reply Pleading.⁹ PUCO relied on Rule 4901-1-12(C) to strike portions of the FirstEnergy Pleading that

⁶ *In the Matter of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, First Energy Motion and Memorandum in Support for Waiver of Rules and Request for Expedited Treatment (April 13, 2012).

⁷ *In the Matter of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Joint motion to Bifurcate Issues and Joint Memorandum Contra FirstEnergy's Motion for Waiver of Rules by the Environmental Law and Policy Center, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council, Northwest Ohio Aggregation Coalition and the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (April 17, 2012).

⁸ *In the Matter of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Memorandum contra the Joint Movants' Motion to Bifurcate and **Reply to Movants' Memoranda Contra the Motion for Waivers** (April 18, 2013).

⁹ *In the Matter of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Joint Motion to Strike and Memorandum in Support for FirstEnergy's Reply by the Environmental Law and Policy Center, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council, Northwest Ohio Aggregation Coalition, Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel and the Sierra Club (April 23, 2012).

constituted a reply to the Memorandum Contra filed by the OCC and other interested parties.¹⁰

In this proceeding, Duke's Reply is a violation of Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-12(C). Therefore, the Commission should follow its precedent and grant the Motion to Strike in this case.

III. CONCLUSION

Duke's Reply, filed April 26, 2013, violates Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-12(C). Duke had asked for an expedited ruling on its Motion to Clarify and Motion to Strike, and no additional pleadings outside of those permitted by the PUCO's rule were authorized or contemplated. Rule 12 does not allow for Duke's Reply. For the reasons set forth above, the Commission should grant the Motion to Strike Duke's Reply.

¹⁰ *In the Matter of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Entry at 5 (April 25, 2012).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer, Counsel of Record

Joseph P. Serio

Edmund Berger

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, OH 43215-3485

614-466-1312 (Telephone-Sauer)

614-466-7964 (Telephone-Etter)

614-466-1291 (Telephone-Yost)

sauer@occ.state.oh.us

serio@occ.state.oh.us

berger@occ.state.oh.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing pleading was served upon the persons listed below, electronically, this 26th day of April 2013.

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr
Joseph E. Olikar
Matthew R. Pritchard
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
21 East State Street, 17TH Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Thomas McNamee
Devin Parram
Attorneys General
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street 6th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Douglas E. Hart
441 Vine Street, Suite 4192
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Thomas J. O'Brien
Bricker & Eckler LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

Kimberly W. Bojko
Mallory M. Mohler
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 North High Street
Suite 1300
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Amy B. Spiller
Rocco O. D'Ascenzo
Jeanne W. Kingery
Elizabeth H. Watts
Duke Energy Business Services, LLC
139 East Fourth Street 1303 Main
P.O. Box 961
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960

A. Brian McIntosh
McIntosh & McIntosh
1136 Saint Gregory Street, Suite 100
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Mark S. Yurick
Zachary D. Kravitz
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
65 East State Street Suite 1000
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Vincent Parisi
Matthew White
Interstate Gas Supply Inc.
6100 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43016

M. Howard Petricoff
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 East Gay Street
PO Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

Andrew J. Sonderman
Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter LPA
Capitol Square, suite 1800
65 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Amy.spiller.com @duke-energy.com
Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com
Jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com
Rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
joliker@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com
Thomas.mcnamee@puc.state.oh.us
Devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us
brian@mcintoshlaw.com
dhart@douglasshart.com
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com
tobrien@bricker.com
myurick@taftlaw.com
zkravitz@taftlaw.com
bojko@carpenterlipps.com
mohler@carpenterlipps.com
vparisi@igsenergy.com
mswhite@igsenergy.com
mhpeticoff@vorys.com
smhoward@vorys.com
asonderman@keglerbrown

AEs: chris.pirik@puc.state.oh.us
Katie.stenman@puc.state.oh.us

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/26/2013 5:09:25 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-1685-GA-AIR, 12-1686-GA-ATA, 12-1687-GA-ALT, 12-1688-GA-AAM

Summary: Motion Motion to Strike Duke's Reply by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Patti Mallarnee on behalf of Sauer, Larry S.