**BEFORE**

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In the Matter of the Review of The Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company’s Compliance with R.C. 4928.17 and the Ohio Adm. Code Chapter 4901:1-37. | )  )  )  )  ) | Case No. 17-974-EL-UNC |

**NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF   
MOTION TO COMPEL**

**BY**

**THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

The Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”) notifies the PUCO and the parties that, effective today, it is withdrawing its motion for the PUCO to compel FirstEnergy to respond to OCC’s discovery (about the PUCO audit of FirstEnergy). Recently FirstEnergy responded to the OCC’s first (and only) set of discovery by sending the majority of the requested responses. This was eight months after the Consumers’ Counsel sent the nine requests for discovery (contained in the first set) to FirstEnergy to obtain information for consumer protection regarding the PUCO audit of FirstEnergy. That’s about seven months later than the PUCO’s rule allows for responses -- "within twenty days.”[[1]](#footnote-2)

The issue in this case, FirstEnergy’s corporate separation between its competitive and monopoly businesses, is important to customers. As noted by the PUCO Staff, there is the potential for utilities to use competitive information unfairly, which could have a direct impact on the market and be detrimental to marketers and consumers.[[2]](#footnote-3)

It has been nearly forty years since the PUCO promulgated the current form of its rules of practice. But there can still be too much delay in obtaining information from public utilities.[[3]](#footnote-4) This problem needs to be solved, in the interest of a fair process for consumers in cases about utility rates and service.
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