BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

_ _ _

Ron Mosley,

:

Complainant,

VS.

: Claim No. 11-1494-EL-CSS

The Dayton Power and Light: Company, :

:

Respondent.

_ _ _

before Mr. L. Douglas Jennings, Attorney Examiner, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Room 11-C, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:06 a.m. on Thursday, November 21, 2013.

_ _ _

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

_ _ _

```
2
 1
      APPEARANCES:
              Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter
 2
              By Mr. Andrew J. Sonderman
              Capitol Square, Suite 1800
 3
              65 East State Street
 4
              Columbus, Ohio 43215-4294
 5
                    On behalf of the Respondent.
 6
      ALSO PRESENT:
 7
              Mr. Ron Mosley
              Ms. Kolleen Buman
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

		3
1	INDEX TO WITNESSES	
2		
3	Witness	Page
4	Kolleen Buman Direct Examination by Mr. Sonderman	45
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Mosley	49
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Thursday Morning Session,
November 21, 2013.

2.0

2.1

- - -

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Let's go on the record. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has scheduled for this date and time a hearing in the complaint of Ron Mosley versus The Dayton Power and Light Company. My name is Doug Jennings. I'm an Attorney Examiner, and I've been assigned to preside over the hearing at this time.

At this point in the proceeding, I'll request that the parties enter an appearance on the record. Let's begin with Mr. Mosley.

MR. MOSLEY: My name is Ron Mosley,
M-O-S-L-E-Y, 900 WillowBrook Court, W-I-L-L-O-W,
capital B-, R-O-O-K, Court, Riverside, Ohio
45424-8022.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you. May I have an appearance on behalf of Dayton Power and Light.

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, thank you.

My name is Andrew Sonderman with the law firm of

Kegler Brown Hill + Ritter, Capitol Square,

Suite 1800, 65 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio

43215.

I submitted my additional appearance in this proceeding on November 19; and I'm here to represent Dayton Power and Light, the respondent.

2.0

2.1

I will briefly go over the history of this proceeding. The first hearing was held on September 22, 2011, a hearing in which Mr. Mosley appeared and began to offer testimony that had not been seen by Dayton Power and Light. At that hearing, I adjourned the proceeding to get the parties to engage in discovery.

The hearing was reconvened on February 12, 2013. At that hearing Mr. Mosley did not appear. Subsequently, the Commission issued an opinion, an order, on July 10, 2013, in which it found that the complainant failed to sustain his burden of proof partly due to his failure to appear at the hearing.

On July 29, 2013, Mr. Mosley filed a letter with the Commission which was construed as an application for rehearing in which it appeared that he made the argument that he did not receive notice of the hearing. Upon review of the Commission's documenting information system, it appeared that a service notice was not issued and it was likely that

Mr. Mosley, in fact, did not receive notice of the entry scheduling the hearing. Therefore, the Commission, on August 21, 2013, issued an entry on rehearing, allowing Mr. Mosley to present evidence.

2.0

2.1

The entry on rehearing also indicated that Mr. Mosley would be barred from introducing documentary evidence that should have been provided pursuant to DP&L's discovery request unless such documentary evidence was provided to DP&L at least 30 days prior to the hearing. That order will apply to this proceeding.

On September 26, 2013, I issued an entry scheduling the hearing for this date; and also I reiterated the Commission's order regarding evidence being barred that had not been provided in discovery.

At this point I'll give the parties the opportunity to make an opening statement. Let's begin with Mr. Mosley.

MR. MOSLEY: Yes. Thank you, sir. I plan on introducing the fact that DP&L overcharged me and put on charges from a place I used to live, and I had already paid them off. Also I got testimony from the last time that we was here from a Ms. Brown that I would like to introduce back into this because I had some questions I had wanted to ask on that.

And I'd like to also introduce a complaint I had against the Public Utilities back in 1997 that was issued that should have been taken care of on this, and we wouldn't have to go through all this. This was signed by the lawyer for Dayton Power and Light back in '97.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

Mr. Sonderman.

2.0

2.1

MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

10 It is all right if I sit at counsel table?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Yes.

MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you.

With respect to the discovery issue, I just want to state for the record that at the conclusion of the hearing in September of 2011, September 22, it was the understanding that the purpose of that continuation was to provide for the completion of discovery. At that point we had received no documents from Mr. Mosley, no responses to our interrogatories to Mr. Mosley.

I can tell you that from the date of that continuance granted at the September 22 hearing, we have had no communications from Mr. Mosley.

And I'm sorry for mispronouncing your name earlier, Mr. Mosley.

We have received no documents from Mr. Mosley.

2.0

2.1

In addition, I would point out that our discovery requests that have not been responded to, included a request for all production of all writings that you may use or rely on at any hearing or in any other depositions in this matter. We have received nothing in that regard.

We asked in an interrogatory, state the total amount of your bills that you are disputing in this case, including the amounts already paid by you to DP&L and the amounts billed by DP&L but not paid by you. We have not received a response to that question.

My point is, your Honor, in addition to documents not having been provided, we have not received any information as we're entitled to have received with respect to the theory of his complaint. You will be hearing me respectfully object to the extent that we are hearing matters for the first time today in the hearing room that we should have been provided with and had the opportunity to review and understand during the continuance that was granted for that explicit purpose.

We believe that the opinion and order in

this case was appropriately entered and that as a result of this rehearing application, which was based exclusively on Mr. Mosley's contention that he didn't receive the hearing notice for the second hearing in February, that he has raised no issues in that application for rehearing, which is the scope of this proceeding today, that cast any doubt with respect to the decision that was already made in the opinion order in the case that was entered.

2.0

2.1

As I mentioned to you, Lisa Brown, who was our witness and presented her prepared testimony in the earlier phase of the case, is no longer with the company. She's gone back to school to get her R.N. degree. So our witness today, should we get to that and decide to put her on after we've heard what Mr. Mosley has to say as a part of his case to support his burden of proof, is Ms. Kolleen Buman, B-U-M-A-N.

Did I pronounce that right?

MS. BUMAN: Buman.

MR. SONDERMAN: Buman. I'm sorry. Who now holds that position and is prepared to adopt the testimony at the second day of the case as well as the direct.

I would request, however, your Honor,

```
that because Mr. Mosley had the opportunity and took
 1
 2
       that opportunity to cross-examine Ms. Brown on the
 3
       testimony that was adduced at the September hearing,
 4
       that he doesn't get another bite at the apple with
 5
       respect to that testimony, that he's already had his
 6
       opportunity to cross-examine that witness. So we
 7
       believe it would be inappropriate for him to
 8
       cross-examine that same testimony at this proceeding.
 9
                   Thank you, your Honor.
10
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you.
11
      Mr. Mosley.
12
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes.
13
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: You can step
14
       to the witness stand, and I'll swear you in.
15
                   (Witness sworn.)
16
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
                                                 Thank you.
17
       Please be seated.
18
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, may I go off
19
       the record for just a moment?
2.0
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
2.1
                   (Discussion was held off the record.)
22
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Back on the
23
       record.
```

Mr. Mosley, you may begin with your

24

25

testimony.

MR. MOSLEY: Yes, sir. Just giving the phone time to go off.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I've been dealing with Dayton Power and Light for quite a bit. This was done November the 19th, 1997, the issues that deal with bills, meter issues, deposit issues involving the respondent's account. The lawyer there signed this paper and took care of all the issues that was supposed to have been taken care of just like they wasn't supposed to charge me late fees when there was no late fees.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Now, Mr. Mosley, before you continue, what are you referring to?

MR. MOSLEY: This here. I'll give you a copy of it, and you can read it; and you'll see what it says. And you'll also see the lawyer's name.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: This is off the record.

(Discussion was held off the record.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Let's go back on the record.

Mr. Mosley is referring to a joint motion to dismiss with prejudice filed in Case

No. 97-1515-EL-CSS that was filed on or about June 25, 1998.

2.0

2.1

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm sorry for the interruption. Please continue.

MR. MOSLEY: Okay. I'm disputing the whole thing about the \$5,497.51 that DP&L says I owe.

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, I have to interpose an objection.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Excuse me.

MR. SONDERMAN: I do have to interpose an objection here. Mr. Mosley has submitted a joint motion with respect to, I presume, issues that were before the Commission at that time. We don't have the terms of that settlement here, nor do I think the terms of that settlement have any bearing on the issues in this case.

So because it's irrelevant, because it has not been provided to us previously in response to our discovery request on what the basis that he was going to rely on would be at this hearing, I think that this evidence cannot be submitted in this case. I think it is prohibited by the Commission's order earlier entered.

MR. MOSLEY: I would have to object to

that because this is already on record, so it's nothing new. That's been on record here since 1997.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'll allow Mr. Mosley to offer further testimony and hopefully establish some relevance for this document.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, everything that I brought that I'm bringing up today was brought up in '97. I got charged; and I got a list of all the charges on this paper here, which I would like to introduce as exhibits.

This is all -- some of this is from when we was here the first time, so it was nothing really new. Except for the last one I just put in was December the 1st, '13, for the bill that's coming up. So that's the only thing that's new on here.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: What year is that?

THE WITNESS: This year, 12/1/13, which I'll be paying on the 1st. That's the only thing new on here, and that's where they overcharged me \$77.62 plus \$5 plus \$39.13. And the total comes to \$1,627 -- my mistake. \$1,733.39.

Now, I got to say something about this because this that I introduced to you, I used to live at 4322 Riverside Drive.

```
ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: By "this,"
 1
 2
      you're referring to the joint motion to dismiss?
 3
                   MR. MOSLEY: No. I'm referring to this
      one that I just gave you. (Indicating.)
 4
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Is that
 5
 6
      captioned joint motion to dismiss?
 7
                   MR. MOSLEY: Huh-uh, not that one. This
 8
      is the one I just showed you. That's it.
9
       (Indicating.)
10
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
                                                Are you
      referring to the joint motion to dismiss?
11
12
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yeah, with prejudice because
13
      you know what the prejudice means?
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Yes.
14
15
                   MR. MOSLEY: Okay. Now, during the time
16
       I used to live at 4322 Riverside Drive, I didn't owe
17
      anything when I left there. They took and added
18
      $106.13 to where I'm living at 900 Willow Brook
19
      Court. I had to go back through some papers to
2.0
      actually see where they did it. It shows up on two
2.1
      papers from DP&L.
22
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: When was
      that?
23
24
                  MR. MOSLEY: Excuse me. 11/10/03.
25
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: That's when
```

you moved to the new address?

2.0

2.1

MR. MOSLEY: I was at Willow Brook Court before that, but they transferred; and it's stated right on here. They transferred \$106.13 from 4322 Riverside Drive, which I didn't owe anything. It was zero.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, with all respect, Mr. Mosley is referring to documents. He was instructed by the Commission in its order on rehearing that we were to be provided with any documents that he was going to refer to or rely on in his testimony.

Now, this is the first time that we've had any indication of this support for his complaint, which does appear to me to be from a prior period that was resolved by a joint motion to dismiss with prejudice earlier. So it's got some relevance issues.

It's also documents that Mr. Mosley is not permitted to bring before this Commission because of his failure to comply with the order of the Commission to provide discovery. This can't go on.

MR. MOSLEY: I have to object to that because, see, this wasn't in this first issue. This

is the issue now. That was in '97. This is in 2000. So that has nothing to do with what I'm bringing to court now.

2.0

2.1

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, the point is that he may have wanted to support his complaint in this proceeding with this documentation; but he was ordered to provide it to us 30 days prior to this hearing. He has not done so, and it cannot be heard consistent with the Commission's order.

MR. MOSLEY: Anything that DP&L is crooked about can be heard.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, as I told you both off the record --

MR. MOSLEY: I know.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- and on the record, I will be enforcing the Commission's order. You are introducing documents that have not been provided to Dayton Power and Light.

MR. MOSLEY: Dayton Power and Light should have had the documents. Now, I showed you who the lawyer was on this document, Timothy Rice, which is probably over him. And he probably works for him.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,
I'm going to grant the objection.

MR. MOSLEY: Even though he worked for

```
the same people?
```

2.0

2.1

2.4

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: As Counsel indicated, I think there are issues of relevance; and the Commission's order expressly indicated that if a document has not been provided to DP&L pursuant to discovery, it cannot be introduced at this hearing.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I got one question. Is this a public record, this document?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: It's a public record.

MR. MOSLEY: This a public record. So if this is a public record, then he has no objection to this because he could have got everything he needed from the public records.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,

I have given you an opportunity to establish some -
MR. MOSLEY: Am I right or wrong?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm giving

you an opportunity to establish relevance for that document to this case.

MR. MOSLEY: That's what I'm doing.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I have not heard it yet.

MR. MOSLEY: And I haven't finished.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I will allow

```
you to continue but --
```

MR. MOSLEY: Thank you.

3 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- if you

4 miss the mark --

2.0

2.1

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, basically I'm trying to get this over with as soon as I can because I do have things I got to do; and I'm kind of getting tired of coming to court with DP&L for this stuff.

But I got papers here that was all in all these bills that they said they can't find nothing about.

Plus they brought in a Ms. Brown; and I wanted to talk to her about some of the stuff that she had on there, which they said she's not here no longer. So now I can't question her about this because she's not here.

And I got -- I got something against DP&L that brought on these two -- nine -- ten pages that they brought in, that Ms. Brown brought in. So I can't question her about it because she's no longer here.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,

I believe you're referring to exhibits that have been

marked --

MR. MOSLEY: Yes.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- that are

```
from the prior proceeding?
 1
 2
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes.
 3
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Which
      exhibit was it? A, B, or C?
 4
 5
                   MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I'll have to
 6
      give this to you because she didn't put no number on
 7
      it.
 8
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
                                               T ' ] ]
9
      indicate for the record that Mr. Mosley is referring
10
      to Exhibit A from the February 12 hearing.
11
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, I believe it
12
      was testified to at the September 22 hearing; but it
13
      wasn't admitted until the February hearing. I think
14
      that's correct. Let me double check that.
15
                   MR. MOSLEY: No. You're wrong.
                                                    It was
16
      September. September 20. It was introduced at
17
      9:14:52 a.m.
18
                   MR. SONDERMAN: It was -- Exhibit A was
19
      identified at the hearing on September 22. It was
2.0
      admitted at the conclusion of Ms. Brown's testimony
2.1
      on February 12, your Honor, but we agree that we're
22
      talking about the same testimony, the same exhibit.
23
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Yes.
```

and supplemented in the February hearing.

Counsel, I believe you're correct; it was introduced

24

25

```
MR. SONDERMAN: That is correct.
 1
 2
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.
 3
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Mr. Mosley, this is just
      what was at the February 22 hearing.
 4
 5
                   MR. MOSLEY: Well, I've got September 20
 6
      on here.
 7
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: For the
 8
      record the complainant is referring to what has been
9
      marked as Respondent's Exhibit A.
10
                   MR. MOSLEY: Right.
11
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Please
12
      continue.
13
                   MR. MOSLEY: Okay. Now, your Honor,
14
      Mrs. Brown at the time said that I owed $2,606.85.
15
      That's from her own answer to 40 on the questions by
16
      the lawyer, her lawyer. And that was -- he went up
17
      to 43, and I never got a chance to talk to her
18
      because we had to leave.
19
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Excuse me.
2.0
      Are you referring to page 43 of the transcript?
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes. Well, according to
2.1
22
      Answer 43 on the transcript. I can show you the
23
      whole transcript, if you'd like.
24
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
                                               Can you
25
      refer me to the page and line number?
```

MR. MOSLEY: Well, they don't put no 1 2 pages on here. They just got questions from 1 to 43, 3 the testimony of Lisa Brown. ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Oh, okay. 4 5 MR. MOSLEY: And it just goes all the way 6 up to 43. 7 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay. 8 the record reflect that Mr. Mosley is referring to 9 what has been marked as Respondent's Exhibit C, the 10 testimony of direct testimony of Lisa Brown. And, Mr. Mosley, you're referring to line 11 12 41; is that correct? 13 MR. MOSLEY: Yes. 14 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: And the 15 amount you've indicated? 16 MR. MOSLEY: On this was \$2,606.85, which 17 would have been No. 41 on the questions. That was 18 her answer to 40. 19 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay. 2.0 MR. MOSLEY: And then on 42, they asked 2.1 her, Does this conclude your testimony? And on 43 22 she said yes. And I never got a chance to question 23 her. 24 MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, Ms. Buman is 25 here and is adopting Ms. Brown's testimony. So if he

has questions with respect to that testimony, the direct testimony, which was admitted at the February hearing, we're happy to make her available for her.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. MOSLEY: And I have to object to that because the things that I needed to ask, she wasn't at the company at the time; so she couldn't answer the questions I was going to ask.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,
Counsel has indicated he will make his witness
available to answer any questions that you may
directed at Ms. Brown and that she would able to
answer those questions.

MR. MOSLEY: Well, she couldn't answer the certain questions that I was going to ask because she wasn't with Dayton Power and Light, but Ms. Brown was. So the question I was going to ask her, she can't answer.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Well, I will give you the opportunity to ask the question.

Counsel is willing to make the witness available to you.

MR. MOSLEY: That would be considered hearsay testimony.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Please

```
continue with your testimony.
```

2.0

2.1

MR. MOSLEY: Thank you. Now, as I was saying, I got that. And here's another bill that states where they took where I used to live at 4322 Riverside Drive.

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, may I see the bill he's referring to?

MR. MOSLEY: Yes.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Yes.

MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you. I'm just looking for -- your Honor, this is from that period of 2003.

MR. MOSLEY: Do you see the address?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Please continue.

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to renew my objection. I'm not going to object every time we hear this; but anytime he shows a bill in this proceeding that we have not seen, that he has not provided to us, it is not being submitted consistent with the Commission's order; and he really cannot be permitted to testify about it.

 $\label{eq:attorney} \mbox{ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,} \\ \mbox{has that bill been submitted to } --$

MR. MOSLEY: Yes.

```
1
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- Dayton
 2
      Power and Light?
 3
                   MR. MOSLEY: This is -- this is the
      public record. When we was here, all of this was
 4
 5
      submitted here. I got a whole list of 30-some
 6
      exhibitions that they got. So it's not that they
 7
      didn't get it. They did get it. They just -- well,
 8
      I'll just say they just didn't want to go get them.
9
                   MR. SONDERMAN: May I ask him a question,
10
      your Honor?
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
11
12
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Mr. Mosley, those bills
13
      that you're referring to, that stack, were those
14
      provided in the proceeding that you're talking about
15
      that was resolved in that joint motion for dismissal
16
      with prejudice?
17
                   MR. MOSLEY: No, it wasn't. It was on
18
      our proceeding, the ones that me and you are doing
19
      now and the ones before you came here, the other
2.0
      lawyer.
2.1
                   MR. SONDERMAN: So when did you provide
22
      any bills after the filing of this case to Dayton
23
      Power and Light?
24
                   MR. MOSLEY: The last time I was here.
25
       It's got -- it's got the exhibitions that was labeled
```

each number on it all the way up to 30 that you said you only got 11. The only thing I never got a chance to get a chance to do during the proceeding was these pictures because we had to adjourn. I had pictures that I wanted to put in for exhibits, but we didn't get a chance to because we had to leave at the time. They had to stop.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Have those been provided to Dayton Power and Light?

MR. MOSLEY: Never got a chance to.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. MOSLEY: Because, like I said, these was going to be introduced that first time.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. MOSLEY: And this has got to do with Arick Mittler on 3/23/11.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, because those pictures and documents were not submitted to Dayton Power and Light pursuant to their request for discovery, I'm going to have to exclude them.

MR. MOSLEY: These -- this is nothing new. I introduced them when I was here. I just never got a chance to put them in for exhibit. They was already introduced. This person was introduced.

I just never got a chance to because the proceeding was ended. So there's nothing.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: The proceeding was ended to give you an opportunity to provide documents to Dayton Power and Light.

MR. MOSLEY: Well, the proceedings -- I never got a chance to question Ms. Brown or anything because the proceedings had to end at that time because we was here, I guess, so long and the proceedings had to end; but all of this was here the first time that I came. It's nothing new.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I understand that.

MR. MOSLEY: And only thing about these pictures is this person that works for DP&L actually came and destroyed a meter at my house.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,
I believe you were discussing your bill and
contesting the amount.

MR. MOSLEY: Yeah. And I'm also discussing the fact that this person took a working meter; and I stood there and watched him destroy it, break it, and then put a new one on. I stood right there and took the pictures when he done it.

MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, to be clear,

there is nothing in that box that has been provided to Dayton Power and Light Company. No pictures. No bills. The only thing we've received -- and it wasn't because they were provided to us in discovery; it was because they were identified as exhibits -- were his Exhibits 1 through 11 that were identified at the September 22 hearing. And those were attached to the transcript.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. SONDERMAN: But that's all we have received, and I simply can't say it more plainly than that. The rest of this is brand new, and we've not seen it.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, the lady, that's the stenographer, she marked these as exhibits. Each one of these exhibits that I got, she marked them herself. It was over 30-some-odd DP&L bills that was marked.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Let's go off the record for a moment.

(Discussion was held off the record.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Let's take a five-minute break.

(Recess taken.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Let's go

```
28
      back on the record.
 1
 2
                   (Testimony read.)
 3
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay. Thank
 4
      you.
 5
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, if I may, I
 6
      was looking at the transcript of the September 22
 7
      hearing. And commencing at page 16, that's where
 8
      these Exhibits 1 through 11 were identified; and then
9
      he asked questions from them continuing on through
10
      several pages. I believe that continued to page 23.
11
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,
12
      do you have --
13
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes.
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- copies of
14
15
      Exhibits 1 through 11?
16
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yeah, I do; and I got them
17
      marked too. They're all marked. Right now I'm up to
      34 -- 35.
18
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr.
19
2.0
      Sonderman, insofar as the scope of your objection,
2.1
      would it be correct to say that it would extend to
22
      any document outside of what has been provided?
23
                   MR. SONDERMAN: That's correct, your
24
      Honor.
25
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: 1 through
```

```
29
       11?
 1
 2
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Obviously we have
 3
       relevance issues with this, but those will be brought
       up separately.
 4
 5
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
                                                Okay.
 6
      Mr. Mosley --
 7
                   MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor.
 8
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- with
 9
       respect to Mr. Sonderman's objection --
10
                   MR. MOSLEY: I have.
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Wait.
11
12
       the September 22 hearing, there were electric bills
       introduced by you?
13
14
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes.
15
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: And Dayton
16
       Power and Light has --
17
                   MR. MOSLEY: 11 is what he said.
18
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- seen
       those bills?
19
2.0
                   MR. MOSLEY: All of these was --
2.1
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: But to the
22
       extent that you introduce documentary evidence
       outside of those bills, I am going to have to enforce
23
24
       the Commission's order and bar them from being
25
       introduced here.
```

```
MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, this here is
 1
 2
      Exhibit 35; and he's saying there was no more than
 3
       11.
 4
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
 5
      Exhibit 35 --
                   MR. MOSLEY: This is Exhibit 35 right
 6
 7
      here.
 8
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Was it
9
       introduced --
10
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes.
11
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- at the
12
       September 22 hearing?
13
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yes, it was. All of these
14
             I'm just giving you the last one of 35.
15
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, if I may, at
16
      page 24 of the September 22 exhibit -- I beg your
17
      pardon. At page 23 you'll see that complainant's
      Exhibit 11 was identified on the record there. It
18
19
      was the bill of April 20, 2005.
2.0
                   At that point Mr. Strines, on behalf of
2.1
      Dayton Power and Light, suggested, and ultimately it
22
      was accepted by the Attorney Examiner, that we put
```

24

25

```
she testified to those dates.
```

So my point is that other than the 11 exhibits that Mr. Mosley talked about up through page 23, none of the others were ever even spoken of on the record in the case and were not provided to us.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, all documentary evidence that falls outside --

MR. MOSLEY: Everything -- everything --

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Any

documentary evidence that falls outside of the scope of what has been already submitted I'm going to have

to prohibit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. MOSLEY: Now, how many do you have on there? Because I've got 35.

16 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I have
17 Electric Bills 1 through 11.

MR. MOSLEY: Right. So if I got proof that shows 35, who's wrong?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, anything that goes beyond the 1 through 11 --

MR. MOSLEY: Right.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- I am going to exclude.

MR. MOSLEY: But, see, the thing is if

you exclude it, that wouldn't be right because it was already here on this exhibit you just talked about.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm going to follow the Commission's order.

MR. MOSLEY: This here is brought on here at the Commission. This was done here. 35 complaints. This was done here. It's not nothing I put together like you're suggesting. This was done here, and it should be on the record.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Did you provide a copy of that to Dayton Power and Light?

MR. MOSLEY: This was put here on record, so he got a copy of it. If they didn't get a copy, that's not my fault. That's theirs.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: So you did not provide a copy of that to Dayton Power and Light?

MR. MOSLEY: It was provided here just like everything else was provided here. It's on the record.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm going to sustain the objection, and then that documentary evidence will be barred from this proceeding.

MR. MOSLEY: Well, the thing about it, you didn't bar it the first time. So why would you bar it now?

```
ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I've issued
 1
 2
      a ruling.
 3
                   MR. MOSLEY: But the thing is this --
 4
      this record -- I'll tell you what. Is this on the
      record?
 5
 6
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Yes, it is.
 7
                   MR. MOSLEY: Okay. I'll ask for these
 8
      proceedings to be put on hold until I get another
9
      lawyer to come here.
10
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm not
11
      going to adjourn the proceedings. The respondent is
12
      here and ready.
13
                   MR. MOSLEY: Yeah, but --
14
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: And there
15
      has been more than a generous opportunity to provide
16
      discovery.
                   MR. MOSLEY: There's also other things
17
18
      that's going on at this proceeding that I ain't too
      comfortable with.
19
2.0
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: If you have
2.1
      no further testimony --
22
                   MR. MOSLEY: I got plenty of testimony.
23
      So in other words, I'd like to get in touch with the
24
      government about this; and I also would like to have
25
      the government bring a lawyer in here with me for
```

```
these hearings. Then I'll let him send DP&L
everything that they think they need; but up to 31,
they should already have.
```

Now, all of this is not new because it's on public record. All the way up to 35 that I got here, it's on public record. Most of this stuff I got was from public records. If you go on public records, everything that he's saying he don't have is there. Now if I can do it, how come he can't?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Do you have anything further?

12 MR. MOSLEY: That they owe me?

13 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Any further 14

testimony?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

MR. MOSLEY: That they overcharged me? ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Do you have any further testimony?

MR. MOSLEY: Yeah, but you're saying I can't use it. I got plenty of testimony against I even got their own workers.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Well, because you did not respond to discovery, you're restricted --

MR. MOSLEY: I never got.

25 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- you're restricted in terms of the documents.

MR. MOSLEY: I never got any of that stuff of what they're talking about, so I don't even know what he's talking about because everything else is on public records here.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. MOSLEY: Now, I'm not just sprouting something. You know as well as I do that the proceedings on this was public record. So if I can get it from public records, he can get it from public records since it was already introduced.

So I'm not wrong; but if I'm being cut-throated by a DP&L lawyer that's saying he don't have it, that's not my fault. That's his. So I would like to get the government on it then.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: So you have no further testimony?

MR. MOSLEY: I said I did. I got further testimony. Now, what the Commission is going to let me say, that's on you. I would like to talk about the destruction of property. Now, it's a federal law against that.

MR. SONDERMAN: Objection, your Honor, not relevant to a complaint on the service billings.

2.0

2.1

MR. MOSLEY: Yes, it is. Yes, it is, because, see, when you destroy property and everything, you also broke a federal law.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,
I do not believe you alleged that in your complaint.

MR. MOSLEY: Okay. Remember when we had the hearing back in September? All this was being introduced then. It just didn't get the numbers, but this was being talked about then. It just never got the exhibit numbers put on it, but it was being talked about in that hearing then.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, if you have no further testimony, you will be given an opportunity, as indicated by Counsel, to challenge the billings of Dayton Power and Light through cross-examination.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I'm wanting to introduce these here. This is important. Not only did they break the law, it's a federal offense for what was done. I know the date and the time and the person who did it that works for DP&L. I got his name. I got the date, and I got the time. I got the pictures that shows the evidence where they broke one meter and put on another meter.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Has that

information been provided to Dayton Power and Light?

MR. MOSLEY: That information was told to

Dayton Power and Light, but it never got a chance for

them to get a copy of these pictures.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Then I will have to exclude that.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I only got one thing I wanted to say. I'm going to keep these proceedings going against DP&L. And since it's going to be on record and everything, I'd like to introduce this to the government because, see, the PUCO is also supposed to take care of companies like this. And for them to sit around and think they're above the law, I don't appreciate it.

I sit here. I give my honest opinion and my honest proof of what I think of DP&L. What's the sense of putting your hands up if we can't get the truth out? What's the sense of these proceedings if you can't introduce the truth?

This ain't from me. This is from them.

I ain't introducing nothing new they ain't got. This is theirs. Nothing here has my name on it. It has DP&L on it. Nothing's got my name on it except when they send the bills to me, but it's DP&L. So I'm not introducing nothing that they don't already have a

record of because if they ain't got a record of this, how in the world are they going to come by and say what I owe them?

2.0

2.1

I'm going to tell you like it is. Since we got all this truth going, I think DP&L is crooks. And I think not only are they doing it to me they're doing it to a lot of other people. I may be one person, but I'm going to fight DP&L until the day I die because I think they crooks because you're going to -- you can add stuff on to my account just because you're DP&L? You can break stuff because you're

It's more than just me that's got to pay these bills. Maybe I'm the only one that looks at them, but I've been trying to get people to start looking at their stuff. And I'm going to keep doing it until they all see what's going on with DP&L.

It looks like I may have to go to the newspapers and stuff too besides the government because I'm doing something that's legit. This is my life they fooling with.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, this is your opportunity to present relevant testimony in support of your complaint.

MR. MOSLEY: That's what I'm doing.

```
ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: So if you
could restrict your comments and testimony to that,
that would expedite this proceeding.
           MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, that's what I
was trying to do then. And I want this on record
that Arick Mittler -- his name is A-R-I-C-K.
the first name. Mittler, M-I-T-T-L-E-R.
           MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, objection.
You've already ruled with respect to this issue and
those papers, none of which were provided to us.
           ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Objection
sustained.
           Mr. Mosley, is there anything further in
support of your complaint?
           MR. MOSLEY: Well, your Honor, yes, there
is. 3/2/04, $4.34. 4/8/04, $2.99.
           MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, I'll object.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

mr. Sonderman: Your Honor, 1-11 object.

MR. MOSLEY: 12/1/04 --

MR. SONDERMAN: This is a document --

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Excuse me,

Mr. Mosley. Mr. Sonderman is raising an objection.

MR. SONDERMAN: Mr. Mosley is referring to a document. It appears to be handwritten notes, a compilation of figures, notwithstanding the fact that he received -- clearly received the order entry on

```
rehearing that told him he had to respond with any
 1
 2
      documents he intended to rely on at this proceeding.
 3
      He has not done that with this, and now he expects to
      testify from it. It's inconsistent with the
 4
 5
      Commission's order, and he cannot do so. I object.
 6
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Objection --
 7
                   MR. MOSLEY: He's got it wrong. He's got
 8
      it wrong on the objection.
9
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS:
                                                The
10
      objection is sustained. I'm not going to allow it.
                   MR. MOSLEY: Well, I'm going to have to
11
12
      object to that.
13
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,
14
      I issued a ruling.
                   MR. MOSLEY: I just wrote these up.
15
16
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I've issued
17
      my ruling.
18
                   MR. MOSLEY: So in other words, I just
19
      wrote these up two days ago.
2.0
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Have you
2.1
      provided those figures to Dayton Power and Light?
22
                   MR. MOSLEY: If you want a copy of this,
      you can have a copy of this.
23
24
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Have vou
25
      provided this previously?
```

MR. MOSLEY: I just gave it two days ago. 1 2 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Then it. 3 cannot be used here. MR. MOSLEY: Okay. I'll go along with 4 5 that because it's on the record. There's one thing 6 I'm going to put on the record again. I dispute 7 owing DP&L \$5,497.51. And that's -- and I do have 8 proof that they overcharged me even after I paid them 9 \$1,733.39. And, your Honor, since I can't say 10 nothing else, I'm going to leave it at that for right 11 12 now. 1.3 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay. 14 MR. MOSLEY: And I will be back again. ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay. 15 16 there's nothing further, please have a seat; and 17 Mr. Sonderman can present his case. 18 MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor -- is it 19 something I said? 2.0 THE WITNESS: Yeah. The lights even know 2.1 when DP&L ain't right. 22 MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, I think we've 23 all tried to be patient with these proceedings. 24 would point out that the burden of proof in this

proceeding is not Dayton Power and Light's. It's the

25

complainant's here under the precedence of this Commission, and it's recognized in the courts that it's the complainant's burden of proof. The complainant simply has not sustained his burden of proof in this proceeding.

2.0

2.1

He failed to comply with the orders of the Commission that we be provided with documentary evidence. We've heard allegations but not supported by anything that is probative testimony.

The rehearing application, as it was accepted by the Commission, informed him clearly of what the rules of the road were going to be; and we've seen what the result of that has been.

Although I have a witness here today who could testify, I don't believe it's incumbent on me to present that witness because there's nothing to rebut in the way of probative evidence that has been presented by the complainant.

If the Attorney Examiner wants me to present this witness and make her available for cross-examination, I will do so; but I don't believe I need to do so given the state of the record in this case. I would rest otherwise.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.
Because Mr. Mosley was not present at the prior

proceeding through no fault of his own, through lack of notice, I would request that DP&L make its witness available so that he can ask questions or cross-examine as he would have had he been present at the prior proceeding.

2.0

2.1

MR. SONDERMAN: Fine, your Honor. Can we limit that to the testimony that he was not present for? In other words, the direct testimony was not admitted during the September 22 hearing. So that's fair game.

MR. MOSLEY: I object.

MR. SONDERMAN: And the testimony that Ms. Brown --

MR. MOSLEY: I object.

MR. SONDERMAN: And the testimony that
Ms. Brown gave at the February hearing where he was
not in attendance. My point is, your Honor, that he
did cross-examine Lisa Brown --

MR. MOSLEY: I object again.

MR. SONDERMAN: -- at the hearing on September 22. So to give him another opportunity, another bite at that apple, is not appropriate.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: There were supplemental billings presented at the February 12 hearing, if my recollection is correct --

```
1
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, we --
 2
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- where
 3
      Ms. Brown supplemented her billing statement to
 4
       include billings to date.
 5
                   MR. SONDERMAN: That's correct, your
 6
              And we certainly are prepared to have
 7
      Ms. Buman testify with respect to that update.
 8
       Anything that was presented at the February 22 -- I'm
 9
       sorry, February 12 hearing or Ms. Brown's direct.
10
                   I mean, the billing statement, if he
       wants to talk to her about the billing statement,
11
12
       we're fine with that.
13
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.
14
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Okay. If he wants to
15
       present bills going back to whenever that have not
16
       been provided to us, then we do have a problem with
17
       that.
18
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay.
19
       will allow Mr. Mosley to cross-examine Ms. Buman,
2.0
       adopting Ms. Brown's testimony and billings.
2.1
                   MR. SONDERMAN: Well, your Honor, DP&L
22
       then would call Kolleen Buman to the stand.
                   ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Please raise
23
24
       your right hand.
25
                   (Witness sworn.)
```

1 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you. 2 Please be seated. 3 4 KOLLEEN BUMAN 5 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 By Mr. Sonderman: 9 Would you please state your full name and 10 your business address for the record, please. Kolleen Buman. I work at Dayton Power at 11 12 Light at 1900 Dryden Road, Dayton, Ohio. 13 0. Now, Ms. Buman, how long have you been an 14 employee of Dayton Power and Light? 15 I've worked at Dayton Power and Light Α. 16 four years and ten months. 17 All right. What is your current position Ο. 18 with Dayton Power and Light? I work at Dayton Power and Light in the 19 2.0 PUCO office. We are a liaison between the PUCO and 2.1 Dayton Power and Light. 22 Would it be correct that you deal with 0. customer complaints, both formal and informal, in 23 vour liaison role with the Commission? 24

25

Α.

We do.

- Q. Now, is that the same role that Ms. Lisa Brown had before leaving the company to go back to school?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

- Q. Ms. Buman, have you had the opportunity to review the direct testimony that was filed in this proceeding by Ms. Brown?
 - A. I have, yes.
- Q. Have you reviewed the testimony that was provided by Ms. Brown on February 12 of 2013 --
 - A. I did.
 - Q. -- in the transcript in this proceeding?
- 13 A. I did, yes.
 - MR. MOSLEY: I object. He keeps saying February. That's not the date when this proceeding was. So why does he keep saying February?
- 17 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: There was a 18 February hearing.
- MR. MOSLEY: Yeah, but not for the proceeding that we're talking about.
- 21 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Yes, there
 22 was.
- MR. MOSLEY: I'm going to object to that.
- 24 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Objection
- 25 overruled.

- Q. (By Mr. Sonderman) Ms. Buman, I believe my question was: Did you have the opportunity to review the transcript of the proceeding of the February 12 hearing which has been identified as Volume II and filed in the docket in this proceeding?
 - A. Yes, I did.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Now, do you believe, to the best of your information and belief -- I'm sorry. The exhibits that were associated with the February 12 proceeding, did you review those exhibits?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Now, looking at those exhibits and the prepared direct testimony of Ms. Brown and the oral testimony provided at the February 12 hearing, did you have any corrections or note any incompleteness in that testimony that you'd like to bring to the attention of the proceeding today?
 - A. No.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the questions that were asked in the direct testimony and in the testimony on February 12, would your answers be the same as set forth in that testimony and in the exhibits therein?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Is it your intention to adopt the direct

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

testimony of Lisa Brown and the oral testimony on February 12, 2013, as your own testimony in this proceeding?

A. Yes, it is.

2.0

2.1

MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you. Your Honor, with that, Ms. Buman is tendered for cross-examination.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you.

Mr. Mosley.

MR. MOSLEY: Yes. I just brought out a paper that has something to do with those proceedings, and it was dated 9/26/2013. So I'm still kind of -- I'm still trying to figure out this February thing, and that's not when it was dated for.

I don't know. He keeps talking about February. That was over with. The proceedings that I've been talking about was dated afterwards. This is also from the PUCO. I have the dates here, which I would like to introduce.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Do you have a question for Ms. Buman?

MR. MOSLEY: Well, I want to introduce this to you because this is from you too.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Do you have a question?

49 MR. MOSLEY: Yes, sir, I got a question. 1 2 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION By Mr. Mosley: 4 5 When did you start on these proceedings? I've worked with Lisa --6 7 No. That's not what I asked you. When Q. 8 did you start on these proceedings? 9 MR. SONDERMAN: Excuse me, your Honor. 10 I'm going to ask that Mr. Mosley give my witness the opportunity to respond to his questions. 11 12 MR. MOSLEY: That's a yes-or-no answer. 13 MR. SONDERMAN: Sir, my witness is 14 entitled to respond to your question. You are --15 MR. MOSLEY: That's a yes-or-no answer. 16 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, 17 I will allow her to continue to answer. Please allow 18 for her to complete her answer. 19 MR. MOSLEY: It's a yes-or-no answer, 2.0 your Honor. 2.1 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: You can 22 press afterwards, but allow her to respond. 23 MR. MOSLEY: I thought it was me asking 24 the questions. 25 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: You will be

```
allowed to do so.
```

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

2 MR. MOSLEY: That's what I was doing.

3 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Allow her to

4 finish her answer.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, in a court of law, you can only answer what was asked you. That was all I asked. I didn't ask her to explain anything. What I gave her was an answer -- was a question, and all she needs to say is yes or no.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: If you're dissatisfied with the answer, you may ask again.

MR. MOSLEY: I never got it.

Q. (By Mr. Mosley) So when did you start these proceedings for this case?

MR. SONDERMAN: I'm going to object to the form of the question. What are you asking, sir?

MR. MOSLEY: I'm not finished. I'm not finished.

- Q. (By Mr. Mosley) Did you start with these proceedings? When did you start going through the questions for this proceeding?
 - A. A date? Is that what you're --
 - O. Yes.
 - A. Do you want a date?
- 25 Q. Yes.

51 2011. 1 Α. 2 Ο. 2011? 3 Correct. Α. 4 That's when you started on this; right? Q. 5 That's when you started on those proceedings? 2011? I'm very familiar with it. 6 Α. 7 That's not what I asked. Q. 8 Α. You asked for a date. 9 That's not what I asked. Ο. 10 Α. I gave you a date. I asked when you started on these 11 Ο. 12 proceedings. You said 2011. 13 MR. SONDERMAN: That's correct. And 14 she's answered the question, sir. 15 MR. MOSLEY: Well, that was all I wanted 16 to find out on that. 17 (By Mr. Mosley) Now, you read 18 Mrs. Brown's comments; right? 19 Yes, I have. Α. 2.0 Q. Okay. 2.1 MR. SONDERMAN: Your Honor, I've just 22 given her a copy of the direct testimony of 23 Ms. Brown. 24 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you.

(By Mr. Mosley) So, in other words, you

25

Q.

```
know what Ms. Brown was working on; right?
```

A. Yes, I do, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. When did you familiarize yourself with the complaint against me?
 - A. I don't have an exact date.

MR. SONDERMAN: I object. There's no complaint against you pending, sir.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Sustained.

MR. MOSLEY: That is not what I just said. I said when was she familiar with the complaint filed against me? And now this is from Ms. Lisa Brown. (Indicating.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: The objection is sustained. DP&L has not filed a complaint against you.

MR. MOSLEY: No, but, see, the thing is I object to what he just said because this come out of the direct testimony from Ms. Brown. Now, if he wants to object, bring Ms. Brown in.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Do you wish to refer to the line number of the testimony?

MR. MOSLEY: Yes. It's in No. 10.

THE WITNESS: And I'm very familiar with it. So yes. The answer is yes. I'm familiar with the case.

```
Q. (By Mr. Mosley) You know, you just said
the same thing. You just gave the same answer that
Ms. Brown did after you looked at it. That's not
your answer; that's the answer Ms. Brown gave. So I
have to object to the fact that you don't know
nothing about this case.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Objection
overruled.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, since I figure
she don't know nothing about this case, I don't have
no more questions for her at this time.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Okay. I
believe that concludes the hearing, if there's no
further --
```

2.0

2.1

MR. SONDERMAN: Nothing further, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I got one thing I'd like to introduce in these proceedings.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley, you've had an opportunity to do that; and --

MR. MOSLEY: Well --

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: -- it's not an appropriate time at this point.

MR. MOSLEY: I didn't say I was completely finished. I said at that time I was, so

I'd like to come back to the stand.

2.0

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm sorry. That's not the way it works.

MR. MOSLEY: You know, why is y'all's hearings and stuff different than a court of law? Why is the hearings here different than a court of law? because everything I'm stating is legal in a court of law.

at this point, I'll grant both parties an opportunity to make a closing argument, if they wish. It will begin with you.

MR. MOSLEY: Well, my closing argument is going to be what it's always been. I don't owe DP&L nothing. As a matter of fact, they owe me. Now, I got all the proof there is against DP&L. So I'm going to bring these proceedings probably to the public, like maybe the newspapers, maybe the government, because regulations state also that y'all are supposed to control DP&L.

DP&L is a little bit out of whack when it comes to us. I'm a citizen. Like there's thousands of other citizens out there that's probably going through the same stuff.

And when I seen something wrong, I went

off it because that's the way I am. Because if I see something wrong, especially when it comes to messing with me and my money that I got to pay, I'm going to say something about it. I've been going after DP&L for years, and they've been getting away with crap for years.

2.1

I even had their lawyer know and was proven to the lawyer and he agreed to take all that stuff off of me, all them bills. And for me to go through something that their lawyer said I wouldn't have to go through again, I'm going right back through the same stuff again that he signed hisself.

And the lawyer was named Timothy Rice for DP&L. Now, I got proof that I don't owe DP&L. And then I got proof also that was left here, 35 exhibits that I know of that they should have known of. Only thing they can introduce is 11. That ain't proving nothing because I got 35 of them.

So, your Honor, even if you go and give it to DP&L, I'm going to file again. But only this time, I'm going to bring a little bit more help to these proceedings, as is my right.

Thank you.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you. Mr. Sonderman.

MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
We're here today because of the document that was submitted by Mr. Mosley and received at the Commission on July 29 of this year, in which the Commission construed as an application for rehearing. In that application for rehearing, he suggested that he had proof of DP&L's illegal acts.

He had indicated that he was not on PIPP but "DP&L kept saying I was." He indicated that a witness had been called by DP&L that had nothing to do with his complaint.

Then he went on to say he was going to bring the matter to the attention of other folks in the government.

Your Honor --

2.0

2.1

MR. MOSLEY: I didn't hear that. I didn't hear that, that last part you just said.

MR. SONDERMAN: I said I believe then he indicated he was going to bring this to the attention of others in the government.

MR. MOSLEY: That's right.

MR. SONDERMAN: Now, your Honor, the point is: There's nothing that's been presented today that supports any of those contentions in his evidence.

For that reason I believe that the opinion and order that dismissed this case with prejudice was appropriate and supported by probative evidence that we put on, the evidence on behalf of DP&L, and that the rehearing should be denied and that the opinion and order should be the final order in this case.

Thank you.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Thank you.

MR. MOSLEY: Your Honor, I have one thing

to say.

12 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: I'm sorry,

13 Mr. --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

MR. MOSLEY: Do you know what the word

"prejudice" means under that?

16 ATTORNEY EXAMINER JENNINGS: Mr. Mosley,

this hearing is concluded. Thank you.

18 (The hearing was concluded at

19 11:30 a.m.)

20

21

17

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Thursday, November 21, 2013, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Margaret A. Marsh, Registered Professional Reporter.

10 (73940-MM)

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/5/2013 11:50:05 AM

in

Case No(s). 11-1494-EL-CSS

Summary: Transcript in the matter of Ron Mosley v The Dayton Power and Light Company hearing held on 11/21/13 electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Marsh, Margaret