```
1
         BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
2
3
    In the Matter of:
    Almaz Ghebremariam,
4
5
             Complainant,
6
                               : Case No. 10-1260-EL-CSS
       VS.
7
    Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.,
             Respondent.
8
9
10
11
12
                          PROCEEDINGS
13
    before Daniel L. Fullin, Attorney Examiner, at the
14
    Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad
15
    Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 11:58
    a.m. on Monday, October 31, 2011.
16
17
                            VOLUME I
18
19
20
21
2.2
                     ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
               222 East Town Street, Second Floor
23
                   Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
                (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
24
                      Fax - (614) 224-5724
25
```

		2
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	Almaz Ghebremariam 1707 Howard Taft Road Cingingation Obio 45206	
3	Cincinnati, Ohio 45206	
4	Pro Se	
5	Eberly McMahon, LLC By Mr. Robert A. McMahon 2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100	
7	Cincinnati, Ohio 45206	
8	On behalf of the Duke Energy Ohio	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

•			3
1	INDEX		
2			
3	WITNESS	PAGE	
4	Almaz Ghebremariam	8	
5	Direct Testimony	0	
6	EXHIBITS		
7			
8	COMPLAINANT EXHIBITS	IDFD ADMTD	
9	Floor 1		
10	1 - DE-Ohio bill due 7/6/09	22 72	
11	2 - Disconnect Notice, due 8/4/09	23 72	
12	3 - Disconnect Notice, due 10/2/09	28 72	
13	4 - Disconnect Notice, due 10/2/09	37 72	
14	5 - Disconnect Notice, due 11/4/09	38 72	
15	6 - DE-Ohio bill due 11/5/09	39 72	
16	7 - Disconnect Notice, due 9/4/09	39 72	
17	8 - DE-Ohio Summary Information	43 72	
18	Floor 2		
19	9 - DE-Ohio bill due 7/6/09	49 72	
20	10- Final bill due 8/4/09	50 72	
21	11- DE-Ohio bill due 7/6/09	50 72	
22	12- Reminder Notice, due 8/4/09	51 72	
23	13- Disconnect Notice, due 9/2/09	51 72	
24	14- Disconnect Notice, due 10/2/09	52 72	
25	15- Disconnect Notice, due 11/2/09	52 72	

·				4
1	COMPLAINANT EXHIBITS	IDFD	ADMTD	
2	16- Corrected Bill, prepared 6/3/10	53	72	
3	17- Letter from J. Rainear, 8/26/09	57	72	
4	18- Letter from J. Rainear, 10/27/09	57	72	
5	19- Letter from A. Ghebremariam, 2/7/11	58	72	
6	20- Electric Billing History, 8/7/09	60	72	
7	21- (Withdrawn)			
8	22- Electric Billing History, 12/4/09	63	72	
9	23- Letter from J. Rainear	65	72	
10	Floor 3			
11	24- DE-Ohio bill due 7/6/09	73	75	
12	25- Final Bill, due 7/31/09	73	75	
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1 Monday Morning Session, October 31, 2011. 2 3 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This is the 4 5 hearing in the case before the Commission, 6 No. 10-1260-EL-CSS, which is the complaint of Almaz Ghebremariam versus Duke Energy Ohio Inc. 7 8 My name is Daniel L. Fullin. I'm the 9 attorney-examiner assigned to hear this case. I note the hearing was scheduled for 10:00 o'clock today, 10 which is October 31, 2011, but the Complainant called 11 12 at 9:30 and said she was having delay in travel and so she just arrived, and we are beginning this 13 14 hearing two hours late at about noon on the same 15 date. 16 I'm going to ask for Ms. Ghebremariam to 17 state her name for the record. 18 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: My name is Almaz 19 Ghebremariam, 1707 Howard Taft Road, Cincinnati, 20 Ohio. 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you. 2.2 May I have an appearance on behalf of 23 Duke Energy. 24 MR. McMAHON: Good morning, Bob McMahon on behalf of Duke Energy, and with me is Erin 25

Lariccia.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Before I start, I will give a brief description of how I intend to proceed today.

Ms. Ghebremariam, you are the Complainant, and so you have the burden of proof in establishing your case. The purpose of today's hearing is to establish the record that the Commission will use in making their decision in this case, so I want you to know that the things that have already been filed in the case are not on the record now, so whatever you want the Commission to use in deciding the case should be presented at today's hearing.

And because you have the burden of proof, you will go forward and you will present all the evidence that you want to present, and when you're done with your presentation, you will be subject to cross-examination, which means you will be questioned by the attorney for the company, who has the right and ability to question you.

I'll be making rulings about whether what is presented can be included in the record or won't be included in the record, whether it will be considered in evidence in the case, or if you make

```
some objections, I will make a ruling an objection, and if he makes an objection, you will have a chance to respond before I make my ruling.
```

2.2

I'm just describing the nature of this proceeding and letting you know that, you know, you will be going first, and when you're done, I may ask you questions or he may ask you questions. Then when we are done with that questioning, then you will basically rest, and that will be your presentation of the case.

Then he will have his turn, and most likely, he will be putting on a witness that will be presenting the prefiled testimony that was filed about ten days ago.

Did you get a copy of that?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Talking about this?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, the prefiled testimony filed on October 21. You should have gotten it around October 21.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is the only one I got.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What is it? So it's the direct testimony.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: That is the direct testimony? Okay.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. When the company has the chance to present its case, they will put on that witness who will present her testimony, and when she is done presenting it, you will have a chance to ask her questions about her testimony and then I can ask questions, too.

That's how we will basically proceed today. You will get the first turn and, they will get the second turn, and at the end of both parties putting on their case, I will give you a chance, if you want, to try to give a closing statement that basically tries to argue your case one more time and let the Commission know what it is you think you have shown and what you want the Commission to do, and they will get a chance to make a closing statement, too.

So with that, I'd like to get started. Before you start giving your testimony, I'll swear you in so this will be sworn testimony.

- - -

ALMAZ GHEBREMARIAM,

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You may proceed.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is the document from Duke Energy that I got about a week ago, and there was another document, also that was similar to it but different calculations, and it has been overwhelming to go through this with the limited time that I have.

2.2

I tried the best I could to go through it. It's very complicated. A lot of numbers have been repeated over and over again. The numbers that have given a credit had been repeated over and again, the current gas charges as well.

Let's say starting -- the document started with 7/1, which is Floor 1, 271 West McMicken Floor 1. What I did is because of the different buildings, the one building, 271 McMicken is the first floor. There is a second floor and a third floor.

I purchased this building May 22nd or May 23rd of 2009, and when I did purchase this building, my argument that I had with the owner was — with not only the owner but any owner — to make sure that there was a working electric in the house and also there is working plumbing in the house. This is a real estate argument I have with all of my homes. I want to make sure both those

always are in working condition.

In this case this lady, Sandra Welsh, she had a lady who worked for her and she put some of her property under her name, which is under Ms. Smith, so I did not even know at the time I went to settlement the name of the owner was different because all I know was Sandra was the one who was selling me the building. But then I find out through real estate agent that because she has so many buildings, she does that. She gave it to somebody.

So, anyway, at that time I was living to Virginia. We have a settlement coming soon, but I have to go to Virginia, making sure my real estate agent is going to do the work through and what needs to be done when I'm gone.

Therefore, we agreed, and I left. It was only for a few days, about maybe ten days or so, and Sandra Welsh and my real estate agent had called me to let me know that they want to put the electric in my name. This is before I purchased the building.

So I told them that's not going to happen. I did not want the electric to be in my name, and that was very clear. It took at least a couple of days for them to call me. At least they called me four or five times, and it was a three-way

call. My agent wants me to know what she's saying and I want all of us to know exactly what we're saying so it was three-way call.

2.2

So we made it very clear that I did not want the electric to be in my name; therefore, she wants me then to -- well, she insisted for some reason, but I was never told there was some issues located in the building with the electric. So it really never occurred to me in my mind. I just said I don't want it to be in my name.

And according to what I know, the building was not in a good condition, the condition of it, so I wasn't really going to do work on the building at that time because I already -- I'm already remodeling two homes at the same time. So my plan was for that house to stay; therefore, there is no reason for me to have electric or anything because I didn't have plans right away to do the work in that house.

so with this argument I have with real estate agent, and she understood. And she called me again. She said that, "Why don't you just put it in? You're going to buy the house only within the next two or three weeks, so that did not -- whether I buy it or not, it's going to be in your name."

```
After long discussion, she said that

Okay, it's going to be in my name, and again it was a three-way call. And I said —

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think maybe you should explain who the three people were.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: There was Sandra

Welsh, and it was Jerry Hisham.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So it was you, your real estate agent, and the owner of the building?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes, the owner of building. I didn't know at the time there was another person, the owner. Her name was Smith. So, anyway, the discussion we had was with Sandra Welsh and Jerry.
```

And then she said, "In order for us to walk through and walk through for the settlement," she said, "You need electric." And I said, "Yeah."

Well, she knows it's her responsibility because she owned the house. It is the responsibility of the seller to turn on water or plumbing, if that's an argument, in order to do through the walk-through. That it is the very important for any building.

So the next day again they called me, and

she said, "Okay, then, I will do all those in my name, and I have few people that I know." She was talking about how many people she knows. So she said that's going to be in her name.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Who is "she"?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Sandra Welsh, sorry.

But she told me she called one person, for some reason. She said she knows about this case, and so I want you to call her, and so on and so on. I don't remember the name. I might have it somewhere. When I move my office from Vine Street, and so much stuff had happened at that time.

But she gave me a name and gave me a phone number. By that name, by that phone number, I called that lady. She did not pick up the phone. I left her a message.

Then she called me again. I said, "Well, okay, then I called." It was a three-way calling, and at that time we discussed -- she asked me -- everything according to me, what Jerry is telling me or what Sandra was telling me everything is okay. She just wants me to make sure there will be electric so I have to not worry about really rushing coming back to Cincinnati before the settlement.

So I was then relying on this lady. I

said, "What does she want from me?" She said, "Well, she wants information from you because you will be buying the house soon. It's not going to be in your name, but she wants information from me."

I am very trustworthy person. That's the way I am; therefore, I did not even thought anything else. I just said, "Okay, so what do you want?" She asked me my name. I gave her my name and all of that, and then at the end, she asked me for deposit, a deposit of 210 or 200 something, over \$200.

That's when I knew then I was tricked. I said, "No, I am not going to give you a deposit. I did not give my credit card information." They're saying that I gave them my credit card information, and that is not true. If they do have my credit card information, according to what I see here, they're saying I gave the credit card information. I did not. I refused.

Once she asked me for a deposit, I knew it was going to be under my name; therefore, I refused. Right away I told her, "You need to cancel all the information I gave, which is my name, everything." And she assured me she would cancel.

This is a big company. This is a representative. I have to trust them. I don't have

to argue with her. I have to trust her, and I did trust her. Therefore, that was done with me and Sandra Welsh, she turned on the lights and the plumbing system was on. That's how I knew until I got a bill, and the bill wasn't coming to me.

2.2

I was here remodeling two homes the whole time. The whole bill was coming to the Virginia address; therefore, I was not aware there was any bill coming for this building, and that's the truth.

So I have so much to do, so much work, so much other stuff going on. Then I went to Virginia, and here is all my mail, and I find out there was a —— but I didn't even find out really right away. I find out when I got here, and that is because before that, there was a 1908 Vine Street and there was also 1707 Howard Taft Road, electric on already. They already had my information. They already know my information because before that I already had electric.

When I asked electric, according to my memory, when I asked electric, I tell them honestly. I just -- I just moved to Cincinnati, and this and that. When I asked electric, they want to know if I'm an owner. They need to see a settlement document, whatever, see the deed or something. If I

```
was renting, they want to see a lease. This is how they ask me. This is how I got electric in two homes.
```

So if that is how I got electric in two homes, which is really they ask those questions, well, they should have done that to Sandra Welsh, too.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The two homes you are talking about --

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: The two homes previously I already had light.

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You mentioned

Vine Street.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yeah, the Vine Street and 1707 William Howard Taft.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: So by that time they already -- as a matter of fact, I faxed them the information they asked me from Jerry Hisham's office because I didn't have a fax. That is how I did it. I faxed them. That it is I got the light.

There is no way I am going to give really information or take somebody else's before I even have secured the building to put it in my name. I am not a fool. I would not do that. But it happened,

```
and it happened because either the representative,
that she knows Sandra Welsh, or Duke Energy did
whatever they do, whatever they do to --

MR. McMAHON: Objection, lack of
```

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ McMAHON: Objection, lack of foundation. Move to strike.

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I'm trying to explain.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll allow her to

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: According to what I know, Sandra Welsh, she said she knows people. She knows people.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, hearsay.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, I'll strike that as hearsay.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: So in this case this is what happened. We had a walk-through. I wasn't even at the walk-through. Jerry Hisham was at the walk-through. I didn't pay him until the day of the settlement, which was on the 3rd in the morning. I didn't get a chance to even go to the walk-through in the building. Jerry did the walk-through for me. I had to go straight to the settlement that day, and I made the settlement.

So Sandra Welsh did not give me a key -- she gave me to front but I didn't have a key for the

basement at that time. I have no way of knowing -- I do know that according to -- by the way, it was only going to be turned on for like a week or less than ten days, and according to what I know, it was after that she's not going to be an owner of that building, it's going to be turned off. So this is my understanding, so I didn't really worry about it saying that it's going to be in my name. It's her problem, not mine.

This is what I know from that. This is related to bills after this. There was gas service. There was electric to Floor 1, Floor 2, Floor 3, and Apartment 3, and then it started — let's say, for example, here it started 99.95. That is what I see on 271 McMicken, Floor 1. The previous bill shows zero, but forward shows 99.95, and that is for May 13 through June 8, 2009. That is the second bill.

also, \$100.92. This is how it started. But different papers and different documents shows differently. It is all not the same, so because of this I am having a trouble understanding why they are so different. There is something always fluctuating with the numbers.

What I did, because they repeat a lot of

```
numbers over and over again, the gas charge, the electric charge transfer from one building to another building, it's extremely confusing. So I what did is whatever I had with the copies that I have is where I'm going to go right now.
```

And I'm going to start with, I receive also -- every time I'm starting with a month. For example, for the first month, the bills that I have, I would also present as an exhibit.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You want that to be an exhibit?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: As exhibit.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have copy for me and a copy --

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: The only problem with my -- I have to go yesterday. It took two to three hours to copy all of this at Staples so I only have one copy.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So you have one copy.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: That's all I have.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have one

for me?

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I have my original and I have one copy.

```
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If you're entering it as an exhibit, then you have to leave it with me.
```

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And before you begin testifying using this exhibit, you should show it to counsel to give him a chance to look at it.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I have no problem. I am so sorry.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I mean, even now before you start talking about it, you have to give him a chance to look at it.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay. Sure.

This is, for example, for 271 --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have to give him a chance to look at it before you start talking about it. That will be the same for anything else you want to enter as an exhibit.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ideally, you would have brought a copy and let him have a copy, but since you didn't do that, you can show it to him, and if he wants to see it again, he can look at it again.

I think before you even hand it to him to

```
21
1
     look at, I will go ahead and mark it as a proposed
2
    exhibit.
3
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is for 271 West
4
    McMicken, Floor 1.
5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Bring it up here.
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is the first
6
7
    bill.
8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So this is a
9
    two-page document, one side with printing on it.
    Looks like -- oh, you have it marked as Exhibit A.
10
    So I will mark that as Complainant's Exhibit A, and I
11
12
    will let Mr. McMahon take a look at it.
13
                 MR. McMAHON: It would easier to make
    them numbers.
14
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. We can make
16
     it Exhibit 1.
17
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What's the date
18
19
```

on the bill? Let's go by, say, the due date. I think that's what you have on there so the testimony will be consistent.

MR. McMAHON: July 6, 2009.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's the due

24 date?

20

21

2.2

23

25 MR. McMAHON: Correct.

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So I will
 2
    mark as Complainant's Exhibit No. 1 the bill due for
    July 6, 2009.
 3
 4
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now you can begin
 6
    whatever you wanted to do to present that exhibit.
 7
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is the first bill
 8
     for 271 West McMicken, Floor 1, and this is the gas
 9
     charge which is 99.95, the current electric charge is
     $100.92, and current amount due is $200.87.
10
11
                 I have a note -- we're going to discuss
12
    this more.
13
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
14
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: But the reading -- the
15
    reading is not -- let's take, for example, the
16
    electric starting reading at that time. The electric
17
    got started was 1663, and --
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Is that on the
18
19
    bill?
20
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On the bill it shows
21
     1663.
2.2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER:
                                         I see. Okay.
23
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: And at the end of the
24
    reading, which it was read May, May 20 something,
25
     2010, it was 1742.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Does that appear on the bill?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. It can only show when it started, and we will discuss. I needed to mention about 1663 for electric and then started for gas is 8842.

Okay, so the difference between the 1663 and then when it was — when I already complained on phone call and we agreed to read it again on 2010, the reading for that particular electric was 1742, a difference of 79, which is the usage, but in here on the electric, it started with 1663, and it ended 662, and that's why that bill went very, very high.

There is a conflict with the meter reading to begin with and at the end. We are talking about this month right now. It's going to escalate, to escalate, to escalate.

Okay. Then the second bill -- this is the second Exhibit 2.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are marking this as Complainant's Exhibit 2. It seems to be the bill with the due date August 4.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This bill is June 8 to

```
1 July 8, 2009 and due date July 4, 2010.
```

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I don't think that's what we just marked.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I'm sorry, you're right. It's August 4, 2009.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. The due date is August 4, 2009.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: June 8 to July 8. By this time, even though the meter reading fluctuates, it started with -- we are talking about electric now -- with 662 right here. It's ending at 886, only for this month. That amount went up to --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It seems to me what you're telling me what shows on the bill, the usage is 886?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. The usage for this month, according to the bill, according to this bill, is 886.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: As I understand it, I could be wrong, but you're telling me that's the amount of usage during the month. That's what the bill reflects.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes, this is the amount of bill.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's not the

```
same as the meter reading. The meter reading is one number. Then you add 886 to that meter reading and you get a different number.
```

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Right, the meter reading I'm talking about the differences. When the meter reading is 2325 and then minus 2211, 886. So the meter reading is here on --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And the difference between those two is 886.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Right. Uh-huh.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: If we started on the same floor for the same electric, which is 104124210, we started on 1663 and ending at 2325 at the end of the month for the first month, usage of 662. But then the next month started with 2326, and then it escalated as an estimated to 886 usage.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: When I look at Exhibit A, the meter reading started at 1663. You used 662, and that ended at 2325.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Right.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Then you go to the next bill, the starting is 2325 just like the ending of the previous month. I see the starting date for the August 4 bill, the ending --

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Right, the ending, it fluctuates. The ending is 2325 E, and then another 886.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Right.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: My point here is this is for a vacant building a building, a building that has been vacant since 2006, according to information I have from the City. The vacant was a violation, to stay vacant. The City of Cincinnati can order.

So when I purchased it, I didn't know about that because she didn't disclose it, but it was to stay vacant, meaning that nobody can live in the house, meaning that nobody should live, no electric, not even plumbing.

But she was able to manage to get plumbing. It was not problem to get electric; therefore, maybe she repaired it, the electric, because she want to sell it but then at that time I didn't know.

So the house, it was vacant. It was to stay vacant. It still is vacant. Right now I'm starting to work in the building, but because I didn't have electric for over a year, even though I have an order from the City to do work on the building, I had so much difficulties doing repair to

```
make it compliable by the City because I didn't have electric. The electric has been cut off. I have this issue, and it was delayed.
```

And that delay has caused me a lot of formalities, a lot of court days. I tried the best I could to manage it by hiring people who have a breaker operator, you know, machines, whatever they got, in order to cut whatever we need to cut, or painting or whatever we have to do.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, relevance.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is how I'm

managing it.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll allow the testimony.

I would like to tell you that the purpose of this case is to figure out what it is that involves Duke Energy and you, and you are telling me a lot of other things, I want you to focus on the relationship you have with Duke and what you are complaining about.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I understand that.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: But I'm trying to make

24 | a point --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll give you

```
some room to make your point.
```

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: -- about how difficult it is for me to purchase a building that was to stay vacant and I cannot bring it back to normal because without electric, there is nothing I can do. It was very difficult. That is what I try to show.

The third bill is going to be due date September 8, 2009 for the month of July 8 and August 6. By this time --

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you going to be trying to submit that as an exhibit?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's mark it and take a look at it.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. McMAHON: I guess from a housekeeping standpoint, we've attached all of these bills to our direct testimony. Again, I don't want to tell the Complainant how to conduct her case, but so far the two or three exhibits she's identified, they're identical to what has already been attached to our prefiled testimony, but for some handwritten notes on them, which I would object to once she offers them into evidence, but we are talking about the exact same bills.

2 this. Again, I'm not really trying to tell you how 3 to put on your case. Is there some reason why you want to use your copies, which you didn't bring 4 5 enough copies to share? Why don't you take a look at 6 Exhibit A of the direct testimony of the company 7 witness, and see if you would agree, that those are the same bills that you're trying admit, and then 9 maybe we can just refer to those instead of having your introduce each one, because that takes a lot of 10 11 time. 12 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I have no problem with 13 that. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Would you 14 15 be willing to do that with the other bills that are 16 there? 17 And this is based on the assumption that 18 you will present the testimony later on. 19 MR. McMAHON: Correct.

1

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let me ask you

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: After you have had a chance to look at them, would you agree that the bills that they submitted on -- just the exhibits, and there are more than maybe I can identify -- but they have several different exhibits that are all the bills that they claim that they sent

```
If you had a chance to look at them, would you
 1
 2
    be willing to just use those as the exhibits when we
 3
    refer to when you want to refer to the bills?
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: What I see here is
 4
     this is the only time, after how many, you know,
 5
 6
    times that I asked for these bills because I was
 7
    having difficulty because I didn't have them all that
 8
     came as a copy from the bill, the first time.
 9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I'm asking
    you, they have submitted various bills. You said
10
11
    you've seen some of these. You may have asked for
     them earlier, but you saw them for the first time
12
13
    when they filed them ten days ago.
14
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: No, no, no. I didn't
15
     see them the first time.
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You may have had
17
    your own copies.
18
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM:
                                    Yes.
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: For the purpose
20
     of just trying to move things a little quicker --
21
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM:
                                   Right.
2.2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: -- would you
23
    willing to work from their exhibits rather than
24
    having you come up and introduce your own?
```

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Give me -- there is

25

something that is important that I need to present more than the bill, so 867 -- let's see here. I'd rather have my own copies.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. We will continue the way we've been going. You need to bring them up, have them marked, look at them, and we'll move from there. It will just add a little bit of delay to the case, but I'm willing to do that if you have a preference to do that.

I'm kind of wondering are there some bills you would agree to work with and others you want to present yourself? We are going to have these bills introduced anyway when it is their turn. They are proposed as exhibits.

I was hoping that both parties could agree that these exhibits represent the bills that you received from Duke, and then if you have some that are different or some other type of information, you can present those, but you would agree to the bills that they've submitted as accurate reflections of the bills that they sent you.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: What I'm trying to show, this is only for 271 West McMicken. It has not been transferred yet. The problem is going to be created when the transfer started.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are the transfers reflected on the bills?

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes, the transfer is going to be reflected on the bills.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So let's keep going the way you're going. You know, I just can't understand why you're saying you have some bills that are different from what they're submitting, but if that's what you are trying to tell me, then I will let you show me.

MR. McMAHON: For the record, while I'll deal with this on cross-examination, the evidence will show that we did produce bills multiple times to the Complainant, including in discovery, by correspondence dated January 13, 2011.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I didn't know for sure.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: The point is the bills were all created from estimates, and those estimates are very high estimates. And this is for the particular building. Most of the estimates are added up from one month to one month, and at the end, at least for this particular building, ended up to be \$867.80, according to what I have. This is the last bill I have, which is November 4 due date,

November 4, 2009.

2.2

And all of this are estimates. And this is for a building that has no gas, and the building that only has no gas, but it did not even match with the reading, the first meter reading to the end meter reading when we had complaints and then a phone call. It was a reading and it does not even match

According to what I know, when the -- in the middle before the formal complaint with the customer service, the reading was done from -- there was no reading done in the building, according to what -- it was only what they did from outside, is how the service was turned on. That is what -- that is what she stated in the e-mail. She e-mailed that to Sharon -- what is her name that changed to in the middle of this? So there was no reading done on the gas, nor was reading done on the electric.

But they started, you know -- they also put it in my name, so I'm going through this only because the bill came in my name. Other than that, I'm not responsible for this bill.

First of all, I did not allow it.

Second, it should not be even used, my name, for

Sandra Welsh's bill; and third, no reading was done.

The reading conflicts completely.

But I'm just going through this just to show how it was escalated, how it was escalated to this point, and why Duke Energy did not recognize the problem when they knew, when she admitted herself it wasn't right; when there was a time that I asked for the tapes, the representative she talked to me in December 2009. She said she will hear the tape first, and then I was asking for a copy of the tape. Finally she said after she heard it, she said that I have to go to court to get it.

2.2

So after that, there was no -- there was no tape, I was told, no tape. So I thought the tape would help us at that time. I didn't know we were going to go through this up to now, what we were going through right now. I thought that would be solved, but it didn't.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What was the tape you are talking about?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: There was a tape, according to Duke Energy, when customer service called for any reason, they tape it. That is what I was told.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So this tape would have revealed the conversation -
MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

```
THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: -- that took place when you, at least allegedly, ordered or canceled the electric.
```

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: That is why I really wanted that so bad because that would have solved all our problems. For some reason, the lady said, "I will hear it first." She heard it, and then she didn't call me.

I called back. I called back. I said,

"What happened? Are you going to send it to me?"

She said, "Sorry, this is property of

Duke Energy."

So I insisted. I insisted not only for them, but I complained to PUCO many times. I even stated in my letter why -- what happened to the tape? I need those tapes so we can hear what was said that day. If I was mistaken, if somebody else was mistaken, how it was handled, I just want to know, but I couldn't get no tape.

Finally, she told me I could go to court to get it. I have to subpoena it, meaning that I have to subpoena Duke Energy. It was this bad. And I'm only a customer. I don't deserve it.

Okay. After this \$887.80, this is for 271, Floor 1, which is a commercial building.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Which?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Commercial building.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Pardon?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: 271 McMicken, Floor 1.

Floor 1 is a commercial building.

2.2

So what they did is at one time they realized there was no electric given -- I mean, that was given, and there was one time where it was given, but then they were only asking for delivery service, which is for electric and for gas delivery service, which is 100 and something dollars.

If there was no gas, which I have a question about, and a credit was given at that time, a credit was given for all of this escalated bill, which is \$858.08, at least I'm talking about after September -- after October 2nd, 2009.

So why ask again for delivery service and refuse to cooperate with me just to get a light -- get a light service in that house until about a couple of months ago, which is -- that's a different story.

Those are the points I need to make. This bill, what I want to do is $-\!\!-\!\!$ I know they already have theirs.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, I'm not

```
37
     trying to cut you off. If you want to introduce your
 1
 2
     own exhibit, I'll allow that.
 3
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. This is No. 4, I
 4
     quess.
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You can bring
 6
    them up as you choose to present them.
 7
                 I am marking this as Complainant's
 8
    Exhibit 4.
 9
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
10
                 MR. McMAHON: Was there an Exhibit 3?
11
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It was the
12
     September 8 bill. This due date is October 2.
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: So everything up to
13
    now that we see on this October 2nd, 2009, I want to
14
15
     look on the deposit amount due. According to --
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What is the due
17
    date on Exhibit 4?
                 MR. McMAHON: October 2nd, 2009.
18
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER:
                                         Thank you.
20
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On October 2nd, 2009,
21
    which is due date, the amount of the gas and electric
2.2
    service escalated to 858.08, and every single penny
23
    of it is estimated. There was not even one wattage
24
    used in that building. It was estimated, all of it.
```

This estimated, about 858, which is at that time, at

```
1
     this particular time, they were asking for a
2
    deposit -- now, I remember -- she was saying 210, and
3
    that's how I see now, 210. She was asking me 210
     after I gave her information. I was mad at her. I
4
5
     gave the information asking me that I would be the
     owner soon; therefore, I refused to give it to her.
6
7
     If I agreed to give it to put the electric in my
8
    name, she was requesting 210 that day, which is on
9
    May 13 and May 12. I disagreed. The tape would help
    prove that.
10
                 And now, after how many months, from May
11
12
    to October, Duke Energy, since it is under my name
     they put it under my name, they're asking $210 after
13
14
    how many months. Right here, they put it with the
15
    October 2, 2009 bill. That made it up to $858.08.
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: In the bill with
17
    the due date November 4, 2009, I am marking it
    Defendant's Exhibit 5.
18
19
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
```

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: So on November 4, 2009, this is the last bill I have for this particular floor, it is \$867.80, plus each time there is a late fee for the high bill. This is something I didn't have.

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking as

```
Complainant's Exhibit 6 the bill with a due date of
 1
 2
    November 5th, 2009.
 3
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
 4
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is just to show
 5
     the bill was escalating to a higher amount, then the
 6
    higher amount right here is going to create a lot of
    problems to all of the buildings.
 7
 8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking as
 9
     Complainant's Exhibit No. 7 labeled as a
10
     disconnection notice, it shows the due date of
11
     September 4th, 2009, the amount due of $355.70.
12
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
13
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On Floor 1 there is an
     electric -- that's for gas, they're claiming, but
14
15
     there was no electric in the building that I know of.
16
    But at this particular building on due date
17
     September 4, 2009, if I'm not wrong, I think this is
     for gas because this is going to be transferred
18
19
     somewhere in one of the buildings. I recognize the
20
     amount. I'm going to show it to you, but I'm not
21
     exactly sure. We have to go a little bit more. I
     can't remember exactly if it was for gas or electric.
2.2
23
                 For some reason I think I missed June,
24
     July 6, 2009 supposed to be in the middle.
25
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think the date
```

due on July 6 was Exhibit 1.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay. July 6, 2010.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Oh, July 6, 2010.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: You want me to put as

5 Exhibit 1?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: No, no. I'm sorry. July 6, 2009 was a bill that you already introduced as Exhibit 1, but you are talking about a year later. It might be a different exhibit.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Right, because we were talking a due date for July for Floor 1. Let me see here to match it. Well, I think to put as an exhibit because it is part of Floor 1, but for some reason, that's the only one I have. The bills were going to Virginia, so that doesn't mean I have all bills. I just have what I have, and I'm working with what I have.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, I'm not trying to keep you from looking at what you need to look at. When you're ready, I would like you to bring up -- I have Complainant's Exhibit 5, 6 and 7 but I would like to have up here for any of the parties that want to look at Complainant's Exhibits 1 through 4 also, so they're all up here so I can keep track of where they are.

```
MR. McMAHON: She has them all.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I know. I'm

3 asking her to bring them up.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

If you don't mind, bring up Complainant's Exhibit 1 through 4 and lay them like this so we can keep track of them. If you need them back, you can look at them.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: No, this is yours, you're right.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm just trying to keep track. That would be helpful.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes, I have the original.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now I'm all caught up on the exhibits and they're available for you to look at.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: We are at Exhibit 7

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The next exhibit, if you introduce one, is Exhibit 8. Exhibit 7 was the disconnection notice.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This time Duke Energy have a different way to prepare the bill. They can prepare the bill the way it is right now with all the information here, which is an exact duplicate

probably of the bill or a spreadsheet like what they have done, which is maybe five, six months ago.

2.2

But there's also another way for them to prepare this. Simply the easy way, without adding -- which is what I was asking the whole time -- without adding the estimates, without adding the late fees or exaggerated bills, which really created so much confusion.

So at one time I was able to get a copy from a different department, which looks much more easier to look at, and this just shows you without anything else exactly the -- let's say for 11/5/09, which is November 5, 2009, when the bill started -- no, no, this is the end of bill, so June 8, '09 when the bill started, it shows 7.89.

It also shows in the spreadsheet. It also shows here somewhere, but you have to look at it. You have to really go dig and see. You have to see how many numbers, exaggerated numbers first, and going back and forth, and minus and plus, and then you get lost in the middle.

But this is a very simple and easy way to see exactly what was the charge in that particular building. This will make it much more easier.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you

```
1
     introducing that as an exhibit?
2
                MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. Okay, this will
3
    make our life much, much easier. This will summarize
4
     every detail. All of it was summarized.
5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You have this
6
    marked as Exhibit 9, but I'm going to mark it
7
    Complainant's Exhibit 8.
8
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I'm sorry, 8.
9
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
10
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This appears to
    be a letter from Duke, Duke's letter. It's dated
11
12
    April 7, 2011, and it is some kind of a -- I'll let
13
    him see this first.
14
                MS. GHEBREMARIAM: So this --
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Wait a minute.
16
    He's taking a look at it.
```

On it says, "Information regarding your account is listed below". It pertains to the Floor 1 McMicken account dated April 7, 2011. We will at least identify the exhibit. It also, I would point out, is four pages.

Do you need it?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: No, it's yours.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now you can go

25 | ahead and continue.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: So all of this that we were talking about how -- I mean, how it was estimated, how late fees was, how it was calculated and all of this up to 896, so even more, because there was no service, there was no watts used completely in that building, according to my information there wasn't even electric on in that building, but they said there was, therefore, and then the reading -- well, they have the reading first, and then we have the reading at the end, which is on the date -- right now I have the correct information to the date, conflicts completely. It shows there was no service. There was no wattage used either for gas or for electric.

2.2

When Duke Energy realized that there was no service or there was no wattage used after the reading was done, then they want for the delivery service. So at this time they start charging delivery service of \$7.89 let's say in June and then on July 9, 9.64, so it was about the same, less than \$10 and they end up with \$65.92. They say it's for electric.

And then the next page will be for gas that when there was no gas in the building, plus -- yeah, there was no gas in it, but there were

estimates. There were estimates for one month and another month that escalated to \$877.55 on June 29, '09, and then, again, after the reading done, the actual reading done, that was probably ordered by PUCO last year, now they are asking delivery charge, which is 57.46 on June 8 of '09 and \$49.47 on June 29, 2009.

So when I went to the store, the service for the first floor, at least I was begging many times to the customer service, which is on that Linn Street, and asking her, I do not want to pay for something I'm disputing, but at least can I just do something about you turning on the service.

Well, she wants me to pay the 57 plus -which is -- let me see how much. She wants me to pay
\$106.93 for the delivery charge for gas and
\$55.92 for electric charge. And then I realize there
was also late charge that made it 188 and something,
181.88.

But then I realize that it was sent to a collection agency. So if I am with PUCO complaining and here we are, you know, I have no service, they, you know, overpowered me to get the lights to even work in my building, I have no choice but to wait; therefore, they're going to send it to collection

agency?

So collection agency started calling me almost 8:00 9:00, you know, in the evening. So, you know, one time I was really mad, and I say, "Do not call me at this hour at 9:00 o'clock." Then I find out it was this amount of money for the first floor.

But then I got a letter, and so I also want to present that letter. Then I wrote them a letter telling them, at least politely, that we were in dispute, but at least they send it to collection agency.

On Floor 1 that's the argument I'm going to have. We have a conclusion that there is at least 180-something that is what they are asking me to pay now, not all the escalated. But still I'm arguing with that because, first of all, it should not be in my name. Somebody put it in my name. No permission was given whatsoever.

Second, I really lost too much all of these months to go through what I'm going through without a light in the building, including delay in opening my business.

Now we can go to Floor 2.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So that's all -- not that you can't bring up something later if

```
1
     it comes to your mind, but that's all your testimony
     concerning the Floor 1 at McMicken Avenue?
 2
 3
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM:
                                    Yes.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you.
 4
 5
    And those are all the exhibits that pertain to that?
 6
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM:
                                   Yes.
 7
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, thank you.
 8
                 So the next property we will talk about
 9
     is?
10
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: 271 McMicken Avenue,
11
    Floor 2.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We just talked
    about Floor 1, and then we will talk about Floor 2;
13
     is that what we are saying?
14
15
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes, if I have the
16
    papers.
17
                 MR. McMAHON: Do you mind if we take a
     lunch break for a half hour? We've been sitting here
18
19
    for three and a half hours.
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. Let's take
21
     a break and get back at -- is it okay if we get back
2.2
    at 2:00 o'clock?
23
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               Yes.
24
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will take a
25
     40-minute break for lunch.
```

48 1 MR. McMAHON: Okay. Thank you. 2 THE WITNESS: I apologize. 3 4 (At 1:20 p.m.a lunch recess was taken 5 until 2:00 p.m.) 6 7 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the 8 record. 9 Ms. Ghebremariam, you are still 10 testifying. 11 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay. Thank you. 12 Right now we are going to go to 271 McMicken, Floor No. 2. 13 14 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Floor No. 2, 15 okay. 16 MR. McMAHON: Just to be clear, there are 17 two accounts on that floor. Are you talking electric 18 or gas at this point? 19 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This one I'm talking 20 gas. 21 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Which one of 22 yours is corresponding so I can follow along. 23 MR. McMAHON: The gas exhibit in Duke's 24 testimony is Exhibit E. 25 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I'm

```
marking this exhibit as Complainant's Exhibit 9.
 1
 2
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Are we going to
    continue it?
 3
 4
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The record will
 5
     show you have gone on, but I will number all your
 6
     exhibits.
 7
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               This is page 2 of 2.
 8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. This is
    only page 2 of 2. Is there a page 1?
 9
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Let's see, yes, you're
10
11
    right. Let me give you this one.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have the
13
     other page?
14
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking the
16
    two-page exhibit which is the bill with the due date
17
     July 6, 2009 in the amount of $33.84, I'm marking it
    at Complainant's Exhibit 9.
18
19
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
20
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is 33.84 service
21
     for due date July 6, 2009, and here the meter reading
2.2
     shows 3468 at that time start, and the second would
23
    be -- hold on, give me one minute.
24
                 This is the only bill I have, Exhibit 10.
25
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Complainant's
```

Exhibit 10 is the final bill, August 4 due date. The final amount is \$436.16.

2.2

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This particular bill shows \$33.84, and it's a gas bill, and then it was a credit of \$33.84 and it was estimated that charge of \$243.12, and then there was another 192.53 for June 8 to June 29. That added up to \$436.16. This is for Floor No. 2.

If I find anything for gas, I will see if there is anything but so far I only see two for electric -- well, electric, but even though they were one bill for June and July, at least one bill, it would be more than one month. So we have to proceed to electric charge for the same building for Floor No. 2.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. This is —— I'm marking as Complainant's Exhibit 11 a Duke Energy bill, due date July 6, 2009. The amount due is 88.06 for Floor 2, 271 McMicken. It shows the electric meter reading.

I'll state for the record when I read the transcript the exhibit seems to be the same as the first in the Company's Exhibit C.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

```
1
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On Exhibit 11, the
 2
    meter reading started 75282, and it was estimated.
 3
                 On August 4, 2009, electric for June 8 to
     July 8 is 145.55, plus the previous bill, 88.06, plus
 4
 5
     1.32 made it 89.38. And then there was a transfer
     from account No. 02800016-27. This $26.16 is not my
 6
    account. This account came from somebody, a previous
 7
    tenant, but it is not my account.
 9
                 I should have given you this first before
    I said all of this.
10
11
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking
12
    Complainant's Exhibit No. 12, which is the bill she
     just spoke of, the August 4, 2009 bill for Floor 2 at
13
    McMicken for the electric bill.
14
15
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
16
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Exhibit 13.
17
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right.
    Exhibit 13 is a disconnect notice for Floor 2,
18
19
     electric bill, due date September 2, 2009 in the
20
    amount of 397.46.
21
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
22
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Can I see that
    exhibit?
23
24
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes. You want
25
     13?
```

```
1
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is for electric
2
    again for Floor No. 2, due date, September 2, 2009.
3
     The charges, electric charges, were all estimates,
4
     397.46.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking
5
6
    Complainant's Exhibit No. 14, a disconnection notice
7
    with a due date October 2, 2009, in the amount of
8
     546.44 pertaining to Floor 2.
9
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Again, there is
10
11
    nothing different in here. It is all about, again,
12
    an exaggerated bill, which is a very high estimate.
13
     It is 546.44. That's what she transferred to other
     accounts, which will create a lot of confusion, so
14
15
    that's what I tried to pull.
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Complainant's
17
    Exhibit 15, which I'm marking, is a disconnect
    notice, due date November 2nd, 2009, amount due,
18
19
     $682.60.
20
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
21
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Just to show the
22
    different numbers that are put on statements and that
23
     I see, one example, for example, current electric
24
    charge for September 4 to October 6 shows 127.96
```

stated estimated, but in another statement bill,

```
1
    which I am going to get, I have a statement bill
 2
    which shows another for the same September
 3
     4-October 6 might show $250. Then the actual bill
 4
    will show another, which is different bill, which is
     21.45.
 5
                 So for the same months, the same probably
 6
 7
     service or estimate, sometimes it shows more than two
     or three different numbers, and that creates also a
 9
     lot of problems with the billing system.
                 MR. McMAHON: Objection, move to strike,
10
11
     lack of foundation.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'll allow it.
13
                 I am marking Complainant's Exhibit 16,
    which is a corrected bill for an amount due of zero
14
15
    dollars, zero cents for Floor 2. I don't see a date
16
     on it. There's no due date on it, maybe because
17
     there's nothing due.
                 MR. McMAHON: I believe if you look
18
19
    halfway down it says "bill prepared June 3, 2010."
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I'm trying
21
     to identify it when I read the transcript.
2.2
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               Right.
23
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
24
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is on October 6
     to November 5. It should be 2010, I hope, because at
25
```

that time I'm already complaining to PUCO; therefore, we have to do a reading. When the reading was done, the 75015, the first reading we have here conflicts with the reading we have that day, which is on May 24, 2010.

2.2

For this particular case, Erin and I think Sharon, I'm not sure of her name, the representative, they discussed it and Erin promised she's going to give a credit for everything that shows on 271 McMicken.

At that moment, this bill, as you can see, credit is given. It might look like a credit is given, but if you see carefully here on the transfer from and then transfer from another account 0280016-29, for example, and then all of this transfers, they are going to be transferred again to another building that you're going to see soon, so even though it may look like this right here, it's going to come back again as a bill.

Even though also it shows zero here, when I called to customer department at that time, I know we discussed about 1908 Vine Street because it was disconnected. I had a disconnection notice, even though — even though Erin said that this would be a zero balance because of the new reading that we had,

and as you can see the new reading, 75015 is the old reading and 75135 for the new reading.

2.2

But with all this, the amount of 709, close to 1,000 if you add it all together, therefore, there was no service given. There was nothing used, but just the amounts were escalated because 75015 the reading to 75135, usage only goes to 120, that's it, but for 120 there were so many bills, of the past all of the exhibits from 9 to 15.

And then when I called the customer service, the customer service have no information about a discussion that I was discussing with Erin, at least we e-mailed to each other at one time, but it wasn't verbal, but we e-mailed each other at one time. And I think the e-mail was e-mailed between Erin and Sharon in the customer service was e-mailed back to me.

At that point, you said there was no reading done. The reading was — there was no reading done but the electric was connected from the outside, from the wires outside. That is what I know.

And Erin promised me, and probably not me directly but also promised to the PUCO, she was telling them, even though it shows this particular

```
bill as zero, the customer service bill shows as it is my charge completely. So each time I called the customer service, they would say you have 1,000 something dollars to pay. If you do not pay this, the 1908 Vine Street will be disconnected.
```

2.2

So at that moment I was saying, "What about this? What about this zero?" That's what she said, you know, it was all done. No, I was told I have to pay the whole amount. And the worst is they didn't even know nothing about it. They know nothing about this bill; not only one customer service, but many of them.

So I called -- I was desperate. I was angry. I don't know where to go, what to do. I need my electric on in 1908 Vine Street; therefore I called Sean. I left a couple of messages. She emailed me back, and I think she e-mailed somebody, Erin or somebody, but, anyway, 1908 Vine Street will be disconnected because this amount of money that we see here as zero is going to be transferred to 1908 Vine Street.

We are at Exhibit No. 16?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 17.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: 17. This is Exhibit 17, a disconnection notice for \$350. I'm not exactly

```
sure but the $350 could be the gas that we have just two bills. That is disconnection.
```

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We will mark this exhibit. It's a letter from Customer Service, JR Rainear to Almaz dated August 26, 2009.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking as Complainant's Exhibit No. 18, again another letter from J.R. Rainear to Complainant dated October 27, 2009.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On this letter, the one that we saw zero balance on 271 McMicken, Floor 2, right now they're requesting me to pay \$758.15, plus a security deposit for \$210.

This one will be now added to another bill, the 158.15, plus the 210. It's going to be \$968.03. This bill is going to show all the bills in the end will be coming back. It will duplicated more than one, more than two. So at this time, I have this bill. I have the disconnection. And then the 900 dollars. This is very, very important because it's going to come back again.

I have also like these two papers. \$188.26 is the bill that came, according to my

1 understanding, from 271 McMicken, first floor.

2 | That's a commercial building. And the \$188.26 on

3 June 23, 2010, according to my understanding, this we

4 | were discussing, this came from the gas delivery

5 charge and electric delivery charge after they

6 realized that there was no service. There was

7 | nothing in that building, and they ended up asking me

8 | 180 -- at least I don't have to pay all of the

9 estimates, but at least they have this, so I didn't.

Anyway, so for this, even though I am in complaint, \$188.26 went to a collection agency, and

12 this is what I got. I got called, so I have to write

13 them, and that letter came to me from every day

14 | calling me.

21

25

15 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking this

16 as Complainant's Exhibit No. 19. It appears to be a

17 letter written by Ms. Ghebremariam dated the 7th of

18 February, 2011. It has a case caption on the top and

19 it's two--page exhibit, the second page, the first

20 line says Amount Due Inquiry.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I didn't bring the

23 actual letter from the collection agency. For some

24 reason they kept sending it to Virginia.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You said you sent

```
it to the collection agency?
```

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. The collection agency, they were sending it to Virginia.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It's not the letter, but it has a same language as the one -MS. GHEBREMARIAM: No. No. They were sending the bill, the collection agency they were sending the bill to --

about this exhibit, is the language that was included in the letter, you don't have a copy of the letter, but you have a copy of the language of the letter that you're submitting in this exhibit that you sent to the collection agency along with the attachment, the second page.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What's the name of the collection agency, if you know? Oh, here it is, probably. It's referring to CBCS Company. Is that it?

Absolutely.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I think so, yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. You

drafted that language on that exhibit? That's your

letter, you wrote it, right?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

60 1 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You're saying 2 that's the same as the language that you sent in the 3 letter? 4 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. 5 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. 6 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is Exhibit 19. 7 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We already have a 8 19. It will be 20. 9 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I'm sorry, Exhibit 20. 10 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking as 11 Complainant's Exhibit 20, I'm trying to identify what 12 Is it like a bill? Looks like an invoice. 13 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: It's kind of a summary that shows for three months. 14 15 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: In the middle 16 page it is marked Electric Billing History. 17 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Uh-huh. THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think that is 18 sufficient to identify it. I've marked it. 19 20 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 21 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This amount of 2.2 \$569.48 --23 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you need to

MR. McMAHON: Please.

24

25

look at it?

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you want to
2
    explain to me why you are submitting this exhibit?
3
                MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Right. This is for
    Floor 2 and for June 8, '09 and June 29. If you see
4
5
    this amount, just within June 8 to June 29 it is
6
              That is exaggerated, and this is an
    estimate, and it's too high.
7
8
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I don't see
    Duke's name on it. Is this something that came from
9
    Duke?
10
11
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. It's from Linn
12
    Street, L-I-N-N. They closed it now.
13
                 Going back to October 6-November 5, meter
    reading 75015 to 75135, usage only 120, even though
14
15
    it was given a credit, the amount of money estimated
16
     in all of that was about $1,646.70. It was that
17
    high.
18
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Marking as
19
    Complainant's Exhibit 21 a paper that in form looks a
20
     lot like Exhibit 20, but it shows in the middle of
21
    the page, a detailed Electric Billing History.
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
2.2
23
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I want to add it up so
24
     I can show how it was escalated to show how it
```

shouldn't be.

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
 2
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On the other one we
 3
     saw, which is for the same but for June 8, 2009 to
     June 29, 2009, there was $569.48 estimated.
 4
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: In the Gas
 6
    Billing History detail?
 7
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes -- and here, which
 8
    is similar or the same.
 9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: As the other
    exhibit, pertains to the electric detail.
10
11
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It's for
    different dates.
13
14
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay, $1,280.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are doing the
16
    calculation now so you can tell me. Is this the same
17
    as the other one?
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: A different
18
    calculation, different estimates.
19
20
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So this is a new
21
     exhibit?
2.2
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: It's a new exhibit.
23
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: This I am marking
24
    as Complainant's Exhibit No. 22, similar in format to
25
     20 and 21. This time it's electric billing history
```

between the dates of 11/5/09 going backwards to 6/08/09.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What are these documents. I can't understand. They don't seem to be bills. They're showing some kind of makeup of a billing history, but I find them very hard to understand. How did you get these? What are they? What do they mean to you?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: They mean a lot because that's the billing history instead of all the documents we have here, this shows very short, for, let's say, for like eight months, ten months, these are all the estimates. It will show you the estimates that were exaggerated, this is \$1,280.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So you're saying if I would compare these billing histories to the billing history that I see coming up in the prefiled testimony from the company, that comes to different results than they did?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is a summary, the way they do it, it shows you the estimates. It shows you the multi-pro.

MS. LARICCIA: It's the multi-prorating where they did a cancel rebill, so she's saying it

```
was charged. Then it was canceled out and rebilled, which it would be, if you are looking at the billing things, it would be on the corrected bill.
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: He's pointing out to me Exhibit 21 and 22 are really the same except for that on 22, you did the calculation that you asked for time to do, and I see what kind of calculator. You wrote on the exhibit in your own handwriting how you calculated how the billing history added up. So I will keep all three exhibits but that's the distinction between them.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: The Exhibit No. 20, if you see the amount net charge of the estimated, is \$192.53, 243.12, 33.84.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's on 20.

I'm saying that 21 and 22 have the same information except for your handwriting.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: They do? I gave you double?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think they're the same.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Now, it has 171.33 on both of them?

24 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes 177.33. So 25 the difference is on the second exhibit, 22, you

```
65
 1
     calculated the numbers together in handwriting and
 2
    added, and it came to 1,000 --
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: If you don't mind, I
 3
 4
    can get back the other one.
 5
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
                                                If you
     aren't submitting 21, you can have it back.
 6
 7
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM:
                                    Okay.
 8
                 MR. McMAHON: So 21 has been withdrawn?
 9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, withdrawn.
10
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: It's the same. I can
11
     see that now.
12
                 We are at what exhibit number now?
13
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 23.
14
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay.
15
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. I am
16
    marking as Complainant's Exhibit No. 23 a letter from
    J.R. Rainear to the Complainant dated September 23,
17
    2009.
18
19
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
20
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: This is the $494 that
21
     I was adding, the estimate.
2.2
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The letter is
23
    marked, "Subject: Disconnection Notice for Account
    No. 23300481-42-6."
24
25
                 MR. McMAHON: If it helps matters, that
```

is for the first floor commercial account.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It's the first floor commercial account, okay.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I think we are done with Floor No. 2, presenting evidence. My point is, that one sheet of paper that shows for months to months of use, that shows exaggerated bill, which is estimated bill, and then shows also the multi-prorating bill.

so anything that is higher bill estimated, it shows canceled. This is after -- it shows canceled here, but we have to go here -- we are going to get lost completely when it comes to this one. Therefore, the best for me, the way I look at it, which is very, very easy is to -- this is what the summary of all of these things that I have explained, all of this, this is what it is. The estimates are right there, the current, the multi-prorating are right there.

And all the numbers match? Are they correct? If you look very careful from one bill to another bill, they're not. Some bill might be 2145, and the other one might say higher or lower.

MR. McMAHON: I'll object.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: You have to really

```
understand from where that came. You have to look very carefully on the dates, carefully on estimates and try to match it all together very, very carefully, very time consuming.
```

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm going to allow the testimony in and note his objection and make a decision when reading the transcript rather than now.

(Discussion off record.)

tired. We are going to continue with today's hearing. It is 3:15. We will go until about 4:00 o'clock today, and we are not expecting to finish today. We will reschedule the hearing, have it continue, and we've agreed we will reconvene it November 17 at 10:00 o'clock, and I think I was stating on the record if there is a need to reschedule it, we will do so.

MS. LARICCIA: Thank you.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You may continue and we will stop pretty close to 4:00 o'clock.

I'll also note on the record you made a commitment to be on time. This will be your third trip to the building so no excuses about not being able to find it or parking.

```
MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I think we are completing the 271.
```

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Second floor -
MS. GHEBREMARIAM: 271 McMicken, Floor 2,
so we have to go to Floor 3.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm tempted to at this point ask if you want to submit these exhibits now and hear any objections and make a ruling on these exhibits rather than wait until you are done with all of them and do more later. I'm willing to wait, but I would sort of like to make a ruling on these now, unless either party would rather wait until later.

MR. McMAHON: I'm fine with handling it now.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Did you want to request each of these exhibits you proffered be admitted into evidence?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you have objections to say any of them.

MR. McMAHON: I guess my only objection would be to the extent there is handwriting on any of the exhibits, other than the identifying exhibit number, on a number of those exhibits, including, for

example, Exhibit 20, there's all sorts of handwriting on the back, almost a whole page of handwriting, and none of that handwriting has been authenticated, testified to.

2.2

So I would say the exhibits to the extent that they purport to be documents prepared by Duke, bills, notices, letters, I don't have any objection to the typed content, but everything else, any handwriting, I object to.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Can we make one exception for I think it was 22 where — that was where one of them got withdrawn and the reason for submitting 22 was it also contained her calculation of the figures there, so that her handwriting shows 1,280.22.

MR. McMAHON: That's the one with all the writing on the back.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Were you submitting this for the purpose that he's talking about and you really weren't trying to get the Commission to consider the handwriting that's on here?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Some of this, the writing on the back really was I was doing something, I didn't have papers around me, and I'm calculating

and trying to understand myself to really understand how it came up to be that way. It wasn't really something that -- it's the same thing. The numbers are the same things that I took from the bill.

2.2

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you submitting these for the purpose of what was on the exhibits before you wrote on them?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: To the one in the front, there was only one or two I didn't have a paper around me that I probably added up -- like the same thing I gave to you, but I added up how this came out to be this, how that came out to be that. That wasn't submitted as an evidence. Anything else that was writing and stuff like that, wasn't really an evidence.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What I would like to do would be to admit it without -- to the extent you want the Commission to consider anything that's in handwriting here, that you would bring it up -- MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Do you mind if I look

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Do you mind if I look at them?

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You may look at them. You would bring it out in your oral testimony rather than have us rely on the exhibits.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Take your time now, take a look at it.

2.2

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: For example, the first page on this one I said gas started on 8842, ending reading of 9484. This would be something we are going to go also, you know, go back and look, but sometimes it's good to bring it first. That way it will help at the end so when we are going to discuss how it happened.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You intend to bring this up later?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.

admit the exhibits the way they are, but not for the purpose of having the Commission consider the handwriting that's on there, but they could consider anything — you could have the exhibits back when you begin to talk about the things on there. You could have them in the front of you when you are testifying, but the Commission won't be considering it from the page of your exhibit. It will considering it from your oral testimony.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes. That was the intent. Some of it, you know, on the back may not be but the one on the front is something to help me.

```
1
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, I will let
 2
     you have those back when you want to go over and talk
     about what you are trying to establish with these
 3
 4
     exhibits. If that were to meet the qualifications of
 5
    your objection, that's the way I will rule.
                 I will admit all 23 exhibits at this time
 6
 7
     subject to that ruling.
 8
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               Thank you.
 9
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER:
                                         Thank you.
10
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
11
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go ahead
12
     and move on to the next property, I think is what we
13
     are planning on doing.
14
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: We are going to go to
15
    No. 3, 271 McMicken, Apartment No. 3.
16
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Apartment 3 at
17
    McMicken.
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: 271 McMicken.
18
19
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Which of the
20
    company exhibits is that?
21
                 MR. McMAHON: Exhibit G in the Duke
22
    Energy's prefiled testimony.
23
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER:
                                         Thank you.
24
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Continue on with the
25
     exhibit, the same?
```

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are on Exhibit 24. I'm marking Complainant's Exhibit No. 24, which appears to be a bill for Floor No. 3, says Floor 3R for McMicken, due date July 6, 2009 in the amount of \$38.15.

2.2

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: On this bill started May 13 to June 8. The due date was July 6, 2009. It's just the first bill for gas, \$38.15.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm marking

Complainant's Exhibit No. 25, which is another bill

with a due date of -- actually, it says Final Bill.

The due date is July 31, 2009 in the amount of \$44.89

covering the third floor.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: It's the same thing. It shows the gas bill for June 8 to June 29. \$38.15 plus 57 cents late fee, and then it goes back again \$38.15 credit.

Why is it credited and then out of the second or current bill, that I didn't understand, but that is how it is done. So at the end it shows \$44.89. That is what the bill is for that particular floor right now, a very short bill, but it's not electric. For some reason, in this building if there

was electric in the building, this is also the second floor, which are all attached, the first floor is commercial. Above the commercial there is a first floor above it and then above it there is a third floor.

2.2

So I don't understand why there would be electric and gas in all the other places but there would not be no electric in that particular, you know, apartment. I don't understand it, and I don't understand it because I wasn't the one that asked for it. If I was the one that asked for it, I probably would put it all together because I have to renovate the house.

But for some reason -- I didn't look at very carefully until recently. I said, "Wait a minute. There was no electric. It was gas only."

So that conflicts with what was said about I ordered it. I didn't.

But, anyway, the bill is \$44.89 and that is outstanding right now, actually. That's it for 271, third floor. Like I said, no electric.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Third floor?

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Uh-huh.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: If this is the extent of the exhibits you intend to present for the

```
1
     third floor, again, I would like to rule on the
2
    admissibility of these exhibits.
3
                 MR. McMAHON:
                               24 and 25?
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes.
4
5
                 MR. McMAHON: No objections.
                                                 They will
6
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.
7
    be admitted into evidence at this time.
8
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
9
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Then we go to 271
    McMicken, fourth floor.
10
11
                 What time is it now?
12
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: 3:30.
13
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: The real problem is
    going to come up when you consider things from
14
15
    McMicken to 1908 Vine Street, from Vine Street to
16
    William Howard Taft.
17
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: What I think I
    hear you saying, you would rather start that the next
18
19
    time rather than start it today.
20
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Yes.
21
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I don't have any
2.2
    problem with that.
23
                 MR. McMAHON: I'm fine with it. I quess
24
     I would also ask going forward that the Complainant
```

come back next time with adequate copies, and with

all, due respect, that she be prepared a little bit better so we can proceed in a little more efficient manner.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I would request that you do provide one copy for them and one copy for me, and you can go ahead and mark them ahead of time.

And also, I mean, I know that you're not a lawyer. This isn't what you do for the living, but if you could kind of be more ready to just get it out there because we've spent a long time just getting a few exhibits marked, maybe more than a few, but really that's all we have accomplished, and you had a long time to get that done. I think if you could be more efficient, we would all appreciate it, including you.

MR. McMAHON: Since we are not coming back for two-plus weeks, perhaps Ms. Ghebremariam would have more time to look at our prefiled testimony and see if she might be able to use the same exhibits going forward from the Vine Street and Howard Taft properties so we're not duplicating things. If it's not possible, that's fine, but that may simplify the process as well.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, most of

the time we spent on exhibits getting them in the record, it was the same as was already submitted. If you take a look -- I'm not requesting that you use any exhibits that is theirs, not yours. Go ahead and bring your own exhibits, but if you could, it would save a lot of trouble if you could just agree on, This is the bill I want to take. This is the bill. If we could, that be helpful. I am encouraging that also.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay. I apologize for not bringing the copies, seriously. There are so many situations going on right now, I don't even have a printer. I have to buy a printer.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Well, again, that's all the more reason if you find an exhibit you want to mark that is already part of their testimony, you could offer it as a joint exhibit, if both parties agree this is the bill for this particular, for example.

MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Okay.

THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So that would save you copying time, because if it's an exhibit they already have in their prefiled, I wouldn't ask you to make copies of that. If it's some other kind of document, then I would ask you to make extra

```
78
     copies for the other side and for me.
 1
 2
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: I apologize.
                 THE ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Anything else?
 3
                 We will adjourn for today. We will
 4
    reconvene on November 17, 10:00 a.m.
 5
 6
                 Thank you.
                 MR. McMAHON: Thank you.
 7
                 MS. GHEBREMARIAM: Thank you.
 8
                 (The hearing adjourned at 3:35 p.m.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
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 Monday, October 31, 2011, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Rosemary Foster Anderson, Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires April 5, 2014.

11 (RFA-8794)

the State of Ohio.

es April 5, 2014.

- - -

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/15/2011 3:48:43 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-1260-GE-CSS

Summary: Transcript Transcript of Almaz Ghebremariam vs. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. hearing held on 10/31/11 electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Anderson, Rosemary Foster Mrs.