FILE

09-272-GA-CSS

3 pages

Mark Svinkin
13821 Cedar Rd. #205
Cleveland, ON 44118

July 15, 2009

Ms. Reneé J. Jenkins
Secretary
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

PUCO Case No. 09-272-GA-CSS

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

I am sending you **COMPLAINTANT RESPONSE TO THE ENTRY** entered in the Journal on July 07, 2009.

Please enter this Document in the Journal and inform me about that.

Sincerely,

Mark Svinkin

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

MARK SVINKIN,

Complainant,

v. **Case No. 09-272-GA-CSS**

THE DOMINION EAST OHIO COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO,

Respondent.

COMPLAINTANT RESPONSE TO THE ENTRY
Entered in the Journal on July 07, 2009

These are comments and additions to the Attorney Examiner findings.

(2a) On May 1, 2009, Complainant filed a response to Dominion's answer. Complainant argues that statements made in the Answer are untrue. Unfortunately, PUCO and DEO completely ignored Complainant's arguments.

(3) Information about a settlement conference is not complete. A settlement conference in this matter was held on May 14, 2009. Complainant expected objective exchange of opinions. However, Complainant's arguments were not answered and completely ignored. Mr. D. Bulgrin, PUCO Presiding Examiner, was not eager to provide the settlement conference. At the beginning, he suggested setting the time for a hearing of this matter, and then Mr. D. Bulgrin aggressively defended DEO actions. Under such unfavorable conditions, it was impossible to reach a mutually agreeable resolution of the complaint. DEO has to pay for overcharge and fraud.

(9) Complainant wrote in his email of May 01, 2009 to Ms. G. See, Attorney Examiner, "I have to bring your attention to the fact that Dominion East Ohio made obstacles for me to receive information regarding meter testing from American Meter Company. Obviously, DEO tries to hide objective information. I believe that DEO actions violate the Law. Does PUCO provide permit to utility companies to perform such illegal actions against customers?" Unfortunately, Complainant has received no answer.

(10) On July 14, 2009, Complainant received a copy of Direct Testimony of Charles C. Resnik on behalf of Dominion East Ohio. This Testimony contains a lot of Resnik's false statements made under the oath. PUCO filed this document as DEO Exhibit 1. It seems that such PUCO action is illegal.

(11) Complainant's request to receive access to Dominion database was denied.

(12) According to Complainant experience, attorney examiners from the PUCO Legal Department demonstrated a prejudice against the complaint and completely ignored *Complainant's arguments. PUCO attorneys depend on utility companies. Therefore,* they cannot impartially and objectively consider the complaint, and it does not make sense for Complainant to attend a hearing scheduled for July 20, 2009.

A copy of this entry be served upon PUCO, Complainant, Dominion and its counsel and all other interested persons of record.

Mark Svinkin
Complainant

Entered in the Journal

_____

_____

Reneé J. Jenkins
Secretary