



RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308

2009 FEB -3 AM 10: 12

330-384-4580 Fax: 330-384-3875

Kathy J. Kolich Senior Attorney

PUCO

Via Federal Express and Facsimile (614-466-0313)

February 2, 2009

Ms. Renee J. Jenkins
Director, Administration Department
Secretary to the Commission
Docketing Division
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Dear Ms. Jenkins:

Re: Answer of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and

The Toledo Edison Company

Nucor Steel Marion, Inc. v. The Ohio Edison Company

Case No. 09-46-EL-CSS

Enclosed for filing, please find the original and twelve (12) copies of the Answer regarding the above-referenced case. Please file the enclosed Answer, time-stamping the two extras and returning them to the undersigned in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this matter.

Very truly yours,

Karty & Kall

kag

Enclosures

cc: Parties of Record

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.

Technician Ann Date Processed 2/3/09

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Nucor Steel Marion, Inc.)	
)	
Complainant,)	
vs.)	CASE NO. 09-46-EL-CSS
)	
The Ohio Edison Company, et al)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ANSWER OF THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY AND THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

Respondents The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI") and The Toledo Edison Company ("TE") submit their Answer to the Complaint filed in the instant action and say that:

- 1. They generally deny all allegations set forth in the Complaint and Attachment A included therewith on the grounds that:
 - a. With regard to allegations related to Ohio Edison Company, they are without sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations;
 - b. With regard to documents referred to in the Complaint, the documents speak for themselves, thus requiring no response; and
 - c. With regard to Complainant's legal arguments, they call for a legal conclusion, thus requiring no response.

FIRST DEFENSE

2. For its first defense, CEI and TE aver that the Complaint, as it pertains to either of them, is unlawful and beyond the scope of R.C. 4905.26.

SECOND DEFENSE

3. For its second defense, CEI and TE aver that Complainant fails to state reasonable grounds upon which to sustain a complaint against either of them.

THIRD DEFENSE

4. For its third defense, CEI and TE aver that because Complainant is not a customer of either CEI or TE, Complainant lacks the standing necessary to bring a complaint against either company.

FOURTH DEFENSE

5. For its fourth defense, CEI and TE incorporate by reference any other defense set forth in the Answer of Ohio Edison Company, which is being filed concurrent herewith.

WHEREFORE having fully answered the Complaint, and for reasons more fully discussed in their Motion to Dismiss being filed concurrent herewith, Respondents, CEI and Toledo Edison Company, respectfully request that each be dismissed as a party to this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy J. Kolich (Reg. No. 0038855)

Senior Attorney

FirstEnergy Service Company

76 South Main Street

Akron, Ohio 44308

Phone: 330-384-4580

Fax: 330-384-3875

kjkolich@firstenergycorp.com

On behalf of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The

Toledo Edison Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Answer of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company was served upon Garrett A. Stone and Michael K. Lavanga, Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C., 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W., 8th Floor, West Tower, Washington, D.C. 20007, by regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, and by electronic mail to gas@bbrslaw.com and mkl@bbrslaw.com, this 2nd day of February, 2009.

Kathy J. Kolich, Esquire