BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

Donald Anderson,

:

Complainant,

•

VS.

: Case No. 16-256-EL-CSS

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., :

:

Respondent. :

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. James Lynn, Attorney Examiner, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 9:53 a.m. on Friday, October 20, 2017.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481

- - -

```
2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
            Dr. Donald Anderson
 3
                  On his own behalf.
            Eberly McMahon Copetas LLC
 4
            By Mr. Robert A. McMahon
            2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100
 5
            Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
 6
                  On behalf of the Respondent.
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

				3
1		INDEX		
2				
3	Witne	SS		Page
4	Donald Anderson Direct Examination			0
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. McMahon			8 53
6	Melissa Coffman			<i>C</i> 1
7	Direct Examination by Mr. McMahon Cross-Examination by Dr. Anderson			64 69
8				
9	Ander	son Exhibit	Identified	Admitted
10	1	Corbly Property Documents	21	67
11	2	List of Employees, Titles, Dates, and Reason at the		
12		Property	49	67
13	3	Redbud Property Documents	51	67
14	4	Clovernoll Property Document	s 52	67
15	5	Ashbrook Property Documents	52	67
16	6	Kemper Property Documents	52	67
17	7	Sir Douglas Property Documen	ts 52	67
18				
19	DE-Ohio Exhibit Identified Admitted			Admitted
20	А	Direct Testimony of Melissa Coffman	65	67
21			03	0 7
22	MC-1A	List of Active/Inactive Accounts of Donald Anderson	67	69
23				
24				
25				

Friday Morning Session,

October 20, 2017.

3 | - -

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

EXAMINER LYNN: Let's go on the record at this time.

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has assigned for hearing at this time and place Case No. 16-256-EL-CSS, Donald Anderson versus Duke Energy Ohio. I am Jim Lynn, the Attorney Examiner assigned to hear this case, and at this time we'll have the appearances of the parties. We'll begin with Donald Anderson.

Mr. Anderson, if you would indicate your name and address, please.

DR. ANDERSON: I'm Donald Anderson. My address is 8700 East Kemper, Cincinnati, Ohio.

EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you. And for Duke?

MR. McMAHON: Good morning, your Honor.

Robert McMahon on behalf of the Duke Energy Ohio,

20 Inc., and with me is Melissa Coffman, the company's

21 representative for today's hearing.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Mr. Anderson, if you would like to come up to the witness stand and we will swear you in and we'll get underway.

(Witness sworn.)

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Mr. Anderson, please go ahead.

2.1

DR. ANDERSON: Okay. The Duke Energy has failed to supply the discovery material that you had ordered them to. They have supplied part of the old records but none of the recalculated records and not even all of the old records. They failed to show any of the calculations that they did for the calculations which probably would have appeared on the new records, and so I'm moving that default judgment be entered against them.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Mr. McMahon.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor. I guess I would start off and say Mr. Anderson's allegations are the first I'm hearing of this issue. We did, in fact -- quite frankly they're false. We received the Court's order in connection with what was treated as a motion to compel back in the spring. By correspondence dated March 10, which was delivered to Mr. Anderson on March 11, Duke Energy produced amended responses to the interrogatories and document requests as ordered by the Commission.

We also produced copies of all documents and information that the Commission ordered Duke to produce including monthly bills for the period

February 1, 2013, through February 1, 2016, for the properties located at 6259 Corbly, 1889 Ashbrook, 7111 Clovernoll, 85 Redbud, 8600 East Kemper, and 2474 Sir Douglas. We also produced relevant communications regarding Dr. Anderson's accounts during the relevant time period of February 1, 2013, through February 1, 2016, and a spreadsheet identifying the company's employees who took action on his accounts or visited the property at 85 Redbud during that same time period.

2.1

In addition, we produced a copy of my letter to the Commission regarding Duke Energy's compliance with the entry dated March 3, 2017, as you ordered us to do. Again, that was delivered to Mr. Anderson on March 11. I have heard nothing since. It is now October 20, the date of hearing. Mr. Anderson has never contacted me, has never contacted the Commission to my knowledge and complained about Duke Energy's production. He did not file a motion to compel at all.

And I would note that when this hearing was originally scheduled back in the spring,

Mr. Anderson submitted a request to continue and was dated March 21 and this is filed in the record in the docket and in that letter he acknowledges in writing,

among other things, that he had been out of town until yesterday which would have been March 20. "on arrival I received your reply to my discovery requests." And this is a letter directed to you, Mr. Lynn. "I also received at that time some discovery information from Duke Energy. I received additional information from Duke today." And he just asked for time to review that. He didn't ask for a continuance until -- we've heard nothing until today.

2.1

And just for the record, moving for default judgment is not a proper course of action or procedural remedy in connection with an alleged discovery dispute, especially when the Complainant failed to move to compel which would have been denied in any event. Thank you.

EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you. Mr. Anderson, we'll proceed with the information that was sent to you.

DR. ANDERSON: The information that was sent to me was incomplete. Did he send you a copy?

EXAMINER LYNN: Any matter of discovery is a matter of documents traded between the parties. What we'll do is this, we will proceed with the information that you have, look over the entire, you know, record of the -- of when the proceeding is

completed and, you know, reviewing the exhibits, testimony, and that kind of thing.

2.1

DONALD ANDERSON

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Well, the information is incomplete.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Basically it starts from the beginning; and Corbly the information they gave me was only for the gas records and did not go through 2016 nor did it show any of the corrected records. The amount they corrected was about -- was approximately roughly \$1,000, and I don't have the figure in front of me at the present time.

But this is Corbly's -- this is what they gave me and there is no electrical records at all for Corbly and Corbly is the critical starting one that caused the whole problem. And there's no -- there's no electrical portion on this at all and without the information we have there's no way to make a reasonable decision.

EXAMINER LYNN: Just a minute, please.

Hold on. Okay. First, you are starting out with Corbly. Is that something that -- are you indicating that the calculation was inaccurate for Corbly or the bill is accurate?

2.1

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Originally the bill -- they did an estimate and apparently Duke -- my -- it appears to me what Duke does when they can't contact somebody is they put a large fee on there that does not represent an estimate. In fact, the rebate they gave us was over \$1,000 and -- and, as such, you know, represents 20 to 30 months of our normal use on that property.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, before you go further will you be introducing this as an exhibit then?

THE WITNESS: Yes, this is -- this is -- EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- an exhibit because we don't have complete information without this. We are unable to proceed ahead with -- with a reasonable defense.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure then is this something that, you know, we need to show Duke a copy of this?

THE WITNESS: Duke has a copy of it.

They provided this. They can take a look at this if they would like but there is no electrical charges on here at all, and it does not go through -- it does not have any corrected statements for the -- you know, it would have to be corrected if they gave us the information through 2015.

EXAMINER LYNN: Back up a minute.

THE WITNESS: '16.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: For Corbly are you disputing -- is that -- I know the Duke billing can be both for electric and gas.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: The amount that you are disputing for Corbly, is that electric? Is it gas? Is it both?

THE WITNESS: I don't know. It's the total bill and the original bills had both gas and electric on them and those have no electric at all on them.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, if I may, I object. This isn't even testimony. He's -- if he is going to testify and get into the substantive elements of his claim, that is one thing, but he's essentially arguing a motion to compel during the

course of an evidentiary hearing. He did not file a motion to compel. And if and when these are introduced into the record, your Honor will see that these are all about an electric meter. They say — on its face the electric meter is identified by the number and Corbly — according to our records Corbly the gas has been off since April of '14 and the electric has been off since December of '12 so not — no, not off since '12. There's the charges reflected here for the electric meter for estimated usage because there was no access. So this complaint is about Redbud and Kemper Lane. It's actually about 8700 —

2.1

THE WITNESS: This complaint is about Corbly.

MR. McMAHON: The complaint filed in the docket, which has never been amended, states that the service account in dispute is 8700 East Kemper, and then in the body of the complaint there's a reference to 85 Redbud about what he believes to be old disputed charges that may have originated at Redbud. The Corbly address is never identified in the complaint. There are no allegations in the complaint. As your Honor knows, the Complainant's complaint dictates the parameters of the hearing

before the Commission. And Mr. Anderson has put before the Commission a complaint about East Kemper Road and 85 Redbud.

2.1

For purposes of discovery, your Honor ordered the production of information about other addresses that Mr. Anderson owes -- owns, I'm sorry, and we produced all those records. We can only produce what we have during the relevant time period.

EXAMINER LYNN: Let Mr. Anderson proceed. He does not have counsel, and I know that when I granted his motion to compel, there was reference in the entry about numerous addresses that Mr. Anderson was referring to. So I understand your point but given that he is not represented by counsel and there were references to more than one address; maybe they weren't all named. We will let him continue with this, and we'll examine everything when the hearing is over. Let the Commissioners take a look at the matter.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor.

Just to clarify, just to remind us for purposes of today's record, your Honor, in paragraph 13 of that order on the motion to compel is granted for the period from February 1, 2013, to February 1, 2016, and that is exactly what Duke Energy produced.

1 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. We'll take that 2 into account. 3 MR. McMAHON: Thank you. EXAMINER LYNN: 4 Sure. 5 THE WITNESS: That is not true. And on 6 this record -- in the Corbly property they have not 7 shown any of the corrections that they've done. 8 EXAMINER LYNN: When you say --9 THE WITNESS: They were -- correcting it 10 was electric and not gas that they have on this one 11 here. 12 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So that's --13 you're agreeing that that is --14 THE WITNESS: It was not my contention 15 originally, which I was in error when I looked at it, 16 was that it was -- that one of the -- that one of 17 them was missing, and I was in error in saying it was 18 the electric was missing. The gas is missing on that 19 one. 20 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So let's back up. 2.1 Basically then what you're saying is what you have 22 there and we'll -- and that entire stack of papers, 23 is that for Corbly, Mr. Anderson? 24 THE WITNESS: This particular one is all 25 for Corbly.

EXAMINER LYNN: Corbly, okay. And so then you're saying that from your perspective the amount indicated on the bill, and this is for electric --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2.1

originally.

EXAMINER LYNN: Electric only is

EXAMINER LYNN: Sure.

THE WITNESS: And then we'll get back to this. Originally when the complaint was filed, I didn't understand where it was coming from. And I didn't understand until we had the -- what do you call it, the first hearing?

EXAMINER LYNN: Oh, you mean the settlement conference.

THE WITNESS: The settlement conference is what it was. At that point in time it became -- I understood that it all bounced back from Corbly. Corbly was where the problem first started and then they started bouncing it to other properties and all -- over a period of time originally Corbly they

added on this crazy business, this crazy charge, which represents at least 20 to 30 months of charges because our basic charge was \$8.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: So what you're saying is that --

THE WITNESS: I guess it would be more than that. If you put the gas in, it would be about 20 to 30 months of charges they added on which is not an estimate.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So let me make sure we are getting this all straight for the record then. What your -- your position is that in this -- in these numerous billing issues which you referred to in the filings in the case that from your perspective all these billing issues began with Corbly --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: -- and --

THE WITNESS: That is where they started.

EXAMINER LYNN: -- inaccurate billing

there and are you saying also that --

THE WITNESS: I don't think it was an inaccurate billing. I think it's fraudulent.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Well --

THE WITNESS: An estimate should be based

16 1 on previous use by the individual on that particular 2 piece of property adjusted for weather conditions. 3 EXAMINER LYNN: So --THE WITNESS: And we had a long period of 4 5 time. You know, we've had this for years before 6 that, and they knew what our utilization was. 7 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. You're --8 THE WITNESS: They threw out a charge, a 9 large charge, onto that property. 10 EXAMINER LYNN: So, Mr. Anderson, you are saying for Corbly --11 12 THE WITNESS: For Corbly the electric 13 portion of it was \$800 that they threw on. 14 EXAMINER LYNN: When you -- okay. I had 15 a few questions in mind. So you're saying for Corbly then you believe that the amount of the bill or that 16 17 you're saying the estimate was --18 THE WITNESS: It was not an estimate. It 19 was a fraudulent number that they put on probably to 20 try to get people's attention. 2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So --

22 MR. McMAHON: Objection. Calls for

23 speculation.

24 EXAMINER LYNN: Well --

25 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is speculation.

17 1 MR. McMAHON: Thank you. 2 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, we'll take note of 3 that. THE WITNESS: And it's said to be 4 5 speculation. 6 EXAMINER LYNN: So you're saying -- just 7 a minute. 8 THE WITNESS: Mr. Lynn can set that aside 9 because he's an attorney. 10 EXAMINER LYNN: So you're indicating this 11 \$800 that appears on the Corbly bill you feel was --12 there's no basis for it is what you're saying. 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. It was -- there was no basis for it because it's not based -- it's not an 14 estimate because an estimate is supposed to be based 15 16 on previous utilization at the house by that person, and the estimates in this one, the electric portion 17 18 of it here was -- we were using probably 8, 9 dollars 19 a month. 20 EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, what --2.1 what month does that \$800 first appear on? Again, 22 this will help --23 THE WITNESS: I don't think it 24 completely -- I'm using their records here, what they 25 have here, because this is incomplete because there

```
is no gas on it.
```

1

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

2.1

22

23

2 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Off the record 3 just a minute.

(Discussion off the record.)

5 EXAMINER LYNN: Back on the record.

Thank you.

THE WITNESS: They say July -- well, we have no idea whatsoever because on this particular -- on the records they are giving me here -- well, let's go back. They are incomplete because all of a sudden it says it's a reminder notice, and all of a sudden they have -- well, they've changed in here. I'm mistaken on this particular one. It was gas, and I'm looking at Redbud right now, so I've got to pull out the other one.

16 EXAMINER LYNN: All right. So your 17 comments up until now --

18 THE WITNESS: They're the same.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, but let's get straight for the record what property you're referring to. So that initial bundle of bills that you held up was actually for -- not for Corbly, I quess.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

25 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Well, the first records they show -- and this is gas only. Like I said, I am correcting back to what I originally said. They've only given me gas for Corbly. They have not given me the electric for Corbly.

EXAMINER LYNN: And you're indicating -THE WITNESS: You have the same one, but
I'll give it to you to look at.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, are you saying then that for Corbly you received both electric and gas service at that address?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: I see. And so you're indicating that the information that Duke provided to you, and this apparently is billing for gas, you're saying that the amount -- the dollar amount is incorrect, and am I right that you're saying also that there's this \$800 that appears on one of the bills that you have -- you feel there was no basis for that.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. All right.

THE WITNESS: When I get it back, I'll

tell you what the figure was.

EXAMINER LYNN: Fine.

Mr. McMahon, I just wanted to make sure you had a chance to see that and is that something you already happen to have in your possession today?

MR. McMAHON: I didn't bring all of these with me today but these are things that we produced to Mr. Anderson.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

2.1

MR. McMAHON: And if I may, Mr. Anderson appears to be complaining about the company's failure to produce records regarding the electric account at 6259 Corbly going back to prior periods and what our record — the company's records reflect the electric was disconnected in December of 2012. Your Honor ordered the relevant time period for production of documents was February 1, '13, through February 1, '16, which is what we produced.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right.

MR. McMAHON: So we did not go back and produce the extended lifetime of Mr. Anderson's history on various accounts. We complied with your Honor's order.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, as I said, we'll take into account the information you have with you, Mr. Anderson. And, you know, you are indicating then that you believe this is -- this is a -- if you want

to start with that exhibit, we can call that Anderson Exhibit 1.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

2.1

22

23

24

EXAMINER LYNN: And you're saying that that exhibit which apparently is -- is for gas only you feel the amount of the billing is inaccurate and that there is -- what's the amount that you were disputing in particular? You said it was maybe 800? It was maybe some other amount?

THE WITNESS: Well, let's see when they are carrying it all from the beginning and it keeps building from 870 -- \$860.42 originally here.

EXAMINER LYNN: And what date -- what's the date of that bill?

THE WITNESS: That was February 14, 2013.

16 EXAMINER LYNN: I see. Okay. So that

17 was -- okay. So that was on there.

THE WITNESS: And then they build it up to \$1,722.

20 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: It says disconnect notice, but they never disconnected it after -- they kept on -- on this record here, so I don't have -- I have only these records.

25 EXAMINER LYNN: Right. I understand.

```
22
                 THE WITNESS: It kept saying disconnect
 1
 2
     every month apparently, but they failed to disconnect
     it.
 3
 4
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.
 5
                 THE WITNESS: And the only thing that was
 6
     running during that period of time was a pilot light.
 7
     So it's really spurious all over the place.
                 EXAMINER LYNN: So your claim is that
 8
 9
     property was vacant at the time?
10
                 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Just for -- again for --
11
12
                 THE WITNESS: It was vacant for the total
13
     period of time.
14
                 EXAMINER LYNN: And just for the record,
15
    what kind of a property is it? Commercial?
16
     Residential?
17
                 THE WITNESS: Residential.
18
                 EXAMINER LYNN: It's an apartment?
19
                 THE WITNESS: It's a home.
20
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.
2.1
                 THE WITNESS: It's a family home, single
22
     family home.
23
                 EXAMINER LYNN: That will help on the
24
     record. All right. So that would be -- we'll call
25
     that Anderson Exhibit 1. That's, you know, the
```

```
23
     bundle of documents you received in discovery.
 1
 2
                 THE WITNESS: There are two numbers
 3
     written on the front of there in my handwriting that
     I copied yesterday from -- from my iPhone that I had
 4
 5
     taken pictures of the meters, and the gas reading
 6
     doesn't even jive with their numbers at all.
 7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you.
 8
     Okay.
 9
                 THE WITNESS: So I don't know what their
10
     numbers are at all.
11
                 EXAMINER LYNN: At any rate your claim is
12
     the whole issue of the billing started with Corbly,
13
     okay? Now, was there -- what other thing would you
14
     like to mention? Anything? You know, what other
15
    properties or?
16
                 THE WITNESS: Well, it was bounced
17
     from -- the charges were bounced from that property
18
     apparently, and I wasn't -- I didn't understand this
19
     until the -- the hearing that we had prior to this.
20
                 EXAMINER LYNN: So the charges were
2.1
     bounced from Corbly to --
22
                 THE WITNESS: To a number of different
23
    properties.
24
                 EXAMINER LYNN: A number of other
25
     properties, okay.
```

THE WITNESS: Of which the discovery -the ones we asked for discovery on and then it
came -- it eventually came to Kemper.

EXAMINER LYNN: I see.

2.1

THE WITNESS: And Sir Douglas.

EXAMINER LYNN: So you're indicating that what began with Corbly over time it filtered down to two properties, Kemper and Sir Douglas.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: And were the charges -- what went on at the Kemper bill and what went on the Sir Douglas was electric or gas?

THE WITNESS: I believe that's what they did. The problem is all the individual properties are separate trusts. They are not even the same entities. So the figures shouldn't have been bouncing from one to the other.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, okay. Now, you mentioned the trusts, and I know that was, you know, stated in your complaint. Are you saying that a trust -- a different trust apparently is involved with these other properties?

THE WITNESS: Each of the properties has its own trust.

25 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And let's clarify

for the record what those properties are. I'm going to show you something that is contained in an exhibit that Duke will be introducing later. MC-1 is part of Ms. Coffman's testimony. I wanted you to take a look at this list. Read down the list and see if these are all properties that you are referring to that have their own trust. That's MC-1. That's part of the exhibit that Duke, I'm sure, will be introducing later. I wanted to know of that entire list, some of them are open accounts, some are not, do each of those properties have their own trust?

2.1

THE WITNESS: All of them have trusts except for Sir Douglas.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And Sir Douglas -- my wife does not live with me, and Sir Douglas is the home that she lives in.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So this is Exhibit MC-1 and there is a list of -- let's see, there's 12 properties. You're saying only Sir Douglas does not have its own trust. So you're saying each of these other properties has --

THE WITNESS: Separate legal entity.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And does that

25 legal entity own the properties I'm assuming?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And does -- do

these trusts for the other properties, they own these

properties but was there any action on your part over

time to -- to be -- to have the billing in the name

of the trust as well?

THE WITNESS: I was not asked to -- at all. When we signed up for them, we were not asked. I asked for the properties to be -- to be put on there. They -- in previous testimony Duke has said that they don't ask about whether the properties are separate entities.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, you are asking -you asked that -- am I correct that you asked that
the properties be billed to a trust -- each of these
different trusts?

THE WITNESS: The only thing I asked they be billed and sent -- and the bills sent to the P.O. Box.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Let me make sure I'm understanding you.

THE WITNESS: They never asked what entity it was billing for. They asked who I was, and I would say I was Donald Anderson.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

```
THE WITNESS: But they failed to ask who
 1
 2
     was the owner of the property.
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So a trust owns
 3
 4
     these --
 5
                 THE WITNESS: Each individual one except
 6
     for Sir Douglas.
 7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: There are apparently 11
 8
     separate; am I correct?
9
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
10
                 EXAMINER LYNN: There are 12 properties
     here, 11 separate trusts, and you're saying that
11
12
     they -- each of these properties is owned by a trust,
13
    but -- but the billing actually did not go to the
14
     trust. That is, the trust was not --
15
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, it did go to the
16
    trust. The trust is Post Office Box 342, Loveland,
17
     Ohio. That's the business mailing.
18
                 EXAMINER LYNN: It does not come to -- to
19
     the properties.
20
                 THE WITNESS: The only ones that come to
2.1
     the properties is 8700 East Kemper and 2474 Sir
22
     Douglas.
23
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. I am looking, for
24
     example, this is on Anderson Exhibit 1 which is your
25
    bills concerning Corbly. Let's see now, service
```

address has, you know, your name on it and mail payments to Post Office Box 1326, Charlotte, North Carolina.

THE WITNESS: What is that?

MR. McMAHON: That's Duke Energy's

mailing address, your Honor.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: My mistake. My mistake.

MR. McMAHON: Above there.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. My mistake. Let's back up a minute here. Okay. So you're indicating that a trust owns each of these properties, and you're saying that -- how are you saying -- how are you trying to clarify that the bills should go in the name of the trust? Help me out on that again.

THE WITNESS: Each of the -- they're business properties.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And they go to the business properties other than -- other than Sir Douglas and 8700 East Kemper go to the post office box. That was the business address for them. We were never asked whether they were entities or not and apparently from what -- the testimony I've heard in the past Duke does not ask for -- ask the customer who owns them.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, your Honor.

There's been no other testimony about anyone other than Mr. Anderson in this hearing.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr.?

MR. McMAHON: Anderson.

5 THE WITNESS: He can ask that later on if

6 he wants.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

these -- the various trusts, is each of them say in the name of the property like this is the Corbly trust? This is the Sir Douglas? That kind of thing? Again, just for my own information, better fully get details on the record, the names of these trusts, are they -- you know, what are they called? I mean, is it in the name of each property, for example?

THE WITNESS: Well, you know, the trusts

THE WITNESS: Well, you know, the trusts are named for the trustee.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And the trustee -
THE WITNESS: The trust documents then

19 | are separate.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, then this is, again just to better fully detail --

THE WITNESS: The trust is separated into two pieces as you guys -- I am sure you're familiar being an attorney.

25 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, but --

```
30
                 THE WITNESS: The beneficiary and the
 1
 2
     trustee.
 3
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Trustee, correct. And
     for each of these properties for which there is a
 4
 5
     trust, who was the trustee, Mr. Anderson?
 6
                 THE WITNESS: I was the trustee for them.
 7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: You were the trustee,
 8
     okay. So --
 9
                 THE WITNESS: Legally they're separate
10
    business entities.
11
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. But your -- at any
12
     rate apparently then your goal was to have the
13
    bill -- your intent -- let me start over.
14
                 Was your intent to have we'll call it a
15
     customer of record who should actually be paying the
16
    bill or who the bill was sent to or who was
17
     responsible for paying it? Was it your intent to
18
    have the customer of record be each of these
19
     different trusts?
20
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
2.1
                 EXAMINER LYNN: I see.
22
                 THE WITNESS: That's why we set up
23
     trusts.
24
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And you're
     indicating that at the time you started service at
25
```

these various properties there was -- when you -when you say completed documents who the customer of
record would be, was there anything you completed
that indicated that the customer of record should be
the trust?

THE WITNESS: I never completed any documents at all.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

2.1

2.2

EXAMINER LYNN: You did it all by telephone.

10 THE WITNESS: It's all by telephone.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Do you recall when you started up service at these different addresses how the conversation went, you know, with the service representative?

THE WITNESS: I would call up the representative and say we would like to have service at this address.

18 EXAMINER LYNN: Sure.

THE WITNESS: As I said before, they would ask me what my name was. I would tell them my name.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

23 THE WITNESS: They did not ask who the owners were as I've stated now three times.

25 EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, you know,

the billing issue apparently, you know, went on for a period of time. You know, your -- this matter that started you're saying with Corbly and ended up at Sir Douglas and what was the other address?

THE WITNESS: Pardon?

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: You said the issues started with Corbly and ended up eventually filtering down to Sir Douglas and there was some other address you mentioned.

THE WITNESS: And 8700 East Kemper.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And over -- what's your estimate about over how long a period of time that went on?

THE WITNESS: I have $\operatorname{--}$ I was not aware of all of it going on until we had the first hearing.

16 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, maybe I should
17 state --

THE WITNESS: I did not understand what was going on during that time.

EXAMINER LYNN: I guess --

THE WITNESS: The history with Duke

Energy has been very rough in that they are not

pleasant to deal with. They have used vulgarities on
the phone --

MR. McMAHON: Objection, relevance.

```
1
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, I understand.
 2
                 THE WITNESS: So for trying --
 3
                 EXAMINER LYNN: I know that was in your
 4
     complaints.
 5
                 THE WITNESS: It's relevant because it
 6
     makes it difficult to deal with them.
7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, here --
8
                 THE WITNESS: They have missed 19
9
     appointments and have shown -- 19 over a period of
10
     about 20 years, missed 19 appointments with the
11
    properties.
12
                 EXAMINER LYNN: I quess here is a
13
     question that came in my mind, Mr. Anderson. The
14
    bills -- although your intent apparently was to have
15
     the customer of record or the entity paying the bills
16
    be the trusts, the bills apparently over time were
17
     issued in your name; am I right about that even
18
     though your intent was to have the bills issued in
19
     some other name?
20
                 THE WITNESS: I believe they had my name
2.1
     on -- on the bills.
2.2
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And in that --
23
    then that leads to this question, your name was on
24
     the bills and who was paying the bills as did you get
25
     out your own checkbook every month?
```

34 1 THE WITNESS: No. I used a business 2 account. 3 EXAMINER LYNN: Well --THE WITNESS: They would bill each of the 4 5 trusts for that. 6 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So you mentioned 7 there was payment made by a business account. And 8 when you saw the bill --9 THE WITNESS: The checks were originally 10 Anderson Investments. 11 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. But at any rate I 12 will say the bookkeeper in a sense; am I right? 13 THE WITNESS: Sure. 14 EXAMINER LYNN: So when the bills came in 15 and, you know, you were paying the bills for the various properties, did you -- did you notice that 16 17 the bill was -- the name on the service address was 18 your name instead of a trust? Did that --THE WITNESS: It didn't affect me. 19 20 EXAMINER LYNN: But I guess what I'm 2.1 asking is I know your intent was to have these bills 2.2 issued to the trust and the trust paying, you know, for the utilities. 23 24 THE WITNESS: The trust did pay them. 25 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. But I guess what

I'm asking is your name, not the name of the trusts, was on these bills, and at any point in time did you -- did you think, hey, this isn't right? This wasn't what I intended?

2.1

THE WITNESS: No. I'm not a lawyer.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, but you didn't contact Duke and say, hey, this is my name on here; it should --

THE WITNESS: I don't think it's my responsibility to manage Duke.

just trying to get it clear for the record. Okay.

Let's see, what else would you like to add? I

appreciate, you know, your answering all these

questions. It helps clarify things for the record

but was there any -- and you'll have a chance to take

the witness stand later certainly but what other

issues or matters did you want to bring up as far as

any exhibits you have or?

THE WITNESS: Well, we're really short because they have not -- they have not complied with discovery. We do not understand at all what the billings are between them nor their deal. They just gave -- when they eventually read Corbly, they just gave us a number and subtracted it from them. All

the properties we paid until they got crazy numbers. 1 2 And then when we got crazy numbers when they transferred or bounced it from one to the other, we 3 stopped paying on them because they were crazy 4 5 numbers. So that's where they bounced it from one. 6 I can speculate on what all the rest of the charges 7 are because apparently the rebate for Corbly was much more than was ever billed for there. I think most of 8 9 it I'm speculating.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, move to strike. He's admitting that he is speculating.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, what would you -- what's your perspective on the matter?

THE WITNESS: My perspective is that probably the remainder of the bills are late charges and feel that those late charges should have been removed and all -- all the properties should have been recalculated with the corrected figures and I don't believe that's been done. But I don't know that because they have not provided me with the discovery material that you had ordered them to do.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, let's see, the discovery material was received by you in March, I believe. I ordered it. I agreed with your motion to compel in March. It was sent to you in March.

And I assume, you know, you were able to take some time to review that.

2.1

THE WITNESS: I have been extremely busy during that period of time, and to be very honest, I started looking at it two days ago. And at that point in time two days ago, I discovered it's just nonsense. They haven't -- they haven't produced the discovery information that you ordered them to do.

EXAMINER LYNN: What do you think -- what was missing in particular, Mr. Anderson?

THE WITNESS: Well, the electrical for Redbud, all the figures, no recalculations, and you had them to do these through 2016, so 2016 they should have had recalculations on each of the properties, and it should have been in a separate bundle.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, did you bring --

 $$\operatorname{THE}$ WITNESS: That's what we asked for when we asked for discovery.

EXAMINER LYNN: Did you bring with you today all the items that you did receive from Duke when I ordered the motion, I agreed with your motion to compel?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes. This is what I got

```
1
     plus there's one more over there.
2
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. All right.
 3
                 THE WITNESS: I would be glad to give you
     them all, enter them all --
 4
 5
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Sure.
                 THE WITNESS: -- as testimony.
 6
7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: So that's all that was
8
    produced then.
9
                 THE WITNESS: Well, there was --
10
                 EXAMINER LYNN: You said you have one
11
     more.
12
                 THE WITNESS: There's some statements
13
     that was a second bundle that he talked about which
14
    basically was just verbiage about what they were --
15
    had done and so on and so forth, and their records
16
     when we examined them, we will get to that in a
17
     little bit, were incomplete because I want to talk
18
     about Redbud.
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Where would you
19
20
     like to go next then with your testimony?
2.1
                 THE WITNESS: Well, Redbud was a
22
    particular problem. We've had -- well, we've had
23
    problems with them in readings and inaccurate things
24
     going on. I'm going to go a little tangential on one
25
     that does not -- is not in dispute for today, but it
```

illustrates what the type of -- what was the quality of their -- what was going on.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson.

THE WITNESS: That was Kay Drive and I will be tangential. You can strike it if you think --

EXAMINER LYNN: Kay Drive is actually one of the ones that's listed as your active accounts on MC-1, but you're saying --

THE WITNESS: In Kay Drive we had a situation probably two or three years ago, and I'm not sure on the exact one in time, in which we got a bill that was -- it wasn't occupied at that point in time and it was kind of -- it was higher, much higher than it had been before and so I paid that bill and then the next month we got another bill and so I said this doesn't look right. So I went out and read the meter, and apparently the meter was lower than the first charge, much lower than the first charge. And I called up Duke, and they corrected the problem.

But I would -- you know, the meter reader obviously hadn't been reading the meter.

EXAMINER LYNN: Was that bill that you felt was higher than it should have been, was that an actual read or?

THE WITNESS: That was supposed -- it was an actual read.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Actual read.

THE WITNESS: They were not estimates.

And I think this is the problem and we'll get into Redbud because I think we have a similar problem there that's going on and I don't think the records -- their records reflect what was going on, do not reflect what was going on there.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

in reading and, in fact, they had a problem with Duke in the past and they were doing estimates when they were — when it was transferring from a tenant to me and I didn't think that was appropriate because we use much lower utilization than a resident. And so we came to the agreement that they would put remote readers in our properties and they did that at Redbud. In fact, I spent two days going around with their crews putting them in at the various properties, and they did that at Redbud.

And after about a year after they put that in, I got a notice of disconnect because they couldn't read the meter, so I said, hey, there is a meter there and why hasn't -- they put me in contact

with the meter reading department that was in that area in the Hamilton area and she told me, oh, we have the reader to do that in our office and they never told me they wanted to do that, so I don't think one hand necessarily knows what the other hand has done.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, I'll stop you right there. The property you are referring to is Redbud.

10 THE WITNESS: 85 Redbud.

EXAMINER LYNN: And you're saying that you had -- there was a remote reader installed there or something?

14 THE WITNESS: Yes.

15 EXAMINER LYNN: And by remote --

16 THE WITNESS: It was an electric only

17 property.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

EXAMINER LYNN: On that one by remote reader you mean that someone wouldn't have to physically walk on the property.

THE WITNESS: No. It was put in the house and transmitted from outside. They could read it from outside.

EXAMINER LYNN: They being the company office.

THE WITNESS: Duke, Duke Energy and their employees, could read it from outside.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

2.1

THE WITNESS: Well, this happened and so they read and that was fine. About a year later we got the same thing back, so the right hand didn't know what the left hand was doing, and so I said we weren't -- really didn't need the power at that point in time, at that point. I said, well, we will just take a look and see what's happening.

Well, they disconnected the power there. This went on for over a year and I kept paying the bills because they were -- even after the disconnect they charged me monthly bills. So I paid the 7 or 8 dollars for over a year until they transferred -- they transferred the electric bills to there.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: To that property.

EXAMINER LYNN: Let's back up. This is at Redbud. You're saying there was a disconnection at some point.

THE WITNESS: Well, there was -- there was two disconnections. There was a disconnection.

In fact, there was supposedly three. After the first time, the first time when they called, they had

disconnected it. And we called and they -- and that was when they -- we had the department head of the meter reading department in that area, she said, oh, she had that, and she went out. They had disconnected the power at the house which is in violation of their own policies because they are not supposed to disconnect at the house. They are supposed to disconnect them at the pole, and they pulled off the head off from the house in the process of doing that.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: All right.

THE WITNESS: That's the piece where the wire comes up and holds on, they disconnected at that time and broken it off. Well, they fixed it at that point in time. Then the second -- about a year later we had the same problem again, and they disconnected it at that point, but they continued charging us.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: I said I wonder how long they will have until they discover it. So I kept paying the \$8 a month. Sometime along the time they should discover this.

EXAMINER LYNN: So you kept paying even though you are saying it had been disconnected.

THE WITNESS: I wanted to see what would

```
happen and see if they would correct their own
1
2
     problem. Well, they didn't correct the problem.
     Then I get a dis -- then they transferred the bill
 3
     from -- along the way they bumped the bill over to
 4
 5
     Redbud, and I don't know the order in which they
 6
     bumped it over.
7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: The property --
                 THE WITNESS: It originated from Corbly.
8
9
                 EXAMINER LYNN:
                                 I see.
10
                 THE WITNESS: The problem that started
     the whole thing from Corbly, they got bumped over
11
12
     there.
13
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Went to Redbud, you're
14
     saying that bill was transferred to Redbud.
15
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, and the power had
16
     already been disconnected, so they threatened
17
     disconnection, and I said I'm not paying any more.
18
```

disconnection, and I said I'm not paying any more.

They bumped it over there and then I said I'm not paying any more and they threatened with disconnection and eventually supposedly sent a guy out to disconnect it. Well, it was already disconnected, and they should have discovered that.

I don't know what -- why they didn't do that.

But I think they have got employee problems because, you know, in the records that they

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

have sent to me, they do not -- they do not list that as the original disconnection, only the second -- they -- the last time when they said they disconnected after they transferred the bill, they said they disconnected, but it was already disconnected.

2.1

2.2

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So you mentioned Corbly. You mentioned Redbud. Are there any other properties you wanted to --

THE WITNESS: All the rest of the properties, they bounced from one to the other and I do not understand them because we do not have corrected bills. It looks to me, appears to me, my impression is that, as I said before, it appears to me that what we're really talking about when they corrected the bill, when they eventually after they first -- after the original meeting that we had at this institution with them is that they -- they subtracted off some sort of percentage of the bill from Corbly, but they didn't -- I don't think they removed the late charges nor did they do recalculations on all of them.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So let me -THE WITNESS: Kept getting knocked off,

25 probably knocked off the gas and electric from

```
Corbly.
```

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, where are you -- you've indicated again the problem began at Corbly, eventually ended up on the bills of two different properties; am I correct?

THE WITNESS: I think Sir Douglas and Kemper.

EXAMINER LYNN: And you're saying that -THE WITNESS: Subsequent to Kemper they
bounced it over now to McCormick.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. And you're saying that even though there was a credit received from Corbly you're saying that you feel the bills that you're still receiving for these properties, the two you just mentioned, you feel the amount on the bill, the dollar amount, is still too high because you're -- you feel there were --

THE WITNESS: I don't know where the \$2,000 came from or what they are looking for, 1,600, 2,000, and I'm not sure about Sir Douglas because I haven't talked to Carol in a while. I don't know if that's been cleared up or that's still there or what it is because I haven't talked to her in a while.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right.

THE WITNESS: They have also another

issue on it that we brought before. I think they are in violation of both state and federal law in that they've allowed -- they have not allowed Carol to put the property -- that property in her own name.

MR. McMAHON: Objection, relevance.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

2.1

THE WITNESS: It's in their documents that they have sent.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, I understand your objection. We'll overrule that. Again, he is not represented by counsel, but we'll take that into account.

THE WITNESS: Well, I would submit that the document that they sent where they -- the document in which they showed that so it is -- it's not -- it's not hearsay or anything. It is in one -- it's in their document that they sent, that they have sent to me. It's in the cover letter.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: In fact, it's on this sheet right here. If we need to, we'll admit it.

EXAMINER LYNN: Could I see that for a minute, Mr. Anderson?

THE WITNESS: Yes, but let me find the one and I'll hand it to you where it is there. Sin

```
1
     Douglas. So they may not have admitted it in the
 2
     appropriate way, but it's there if you want to play.
     We're looking for truths, aren't we? We're not
 3
     looking to dot the Is and cross the Ts.
 4
 5
                 EXAMINER LYNN: We will let Mr. McMahon
 6
     see this for a minute, please. We'll call this
 7
     Anderson Exhibit 2, I guess.
                 THE WITNESS: We'll do 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6?
 8
 9
                 MR. McMAHON: I'm sorry. What's the
10
     number, your Honor?
                 EXAMINER LYNN: We will call it Anderson
11
12
    Exhibit 2.
13
                 MR. McMAHON: Okay.
14
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, can I see
15
    that again, please?
16
                 THE WITNESS: If you look at Redbud down
17
     in here, you'll also see there's only one disconnect
18
     for Redbud.
19
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Thank you.
20
                 THE WITNESS: And that was at the time
2.1
     when they had transferred the money over.
22
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Anderson Exhibit 2 is one
23
     of the items that Duke sent to you when I granted
24
     your motion to compel discovery; am I right?
25
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
```

1 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. I'll mark that as 2 Anderson Exhibit 2. Okay. All right. And were 3 there any other, you know, properties you wanted to highlight or things you wanted to mention? 4 THE WITNESS: As I said before, I think 5 6 the business on all of them, the charges on them, I 7 don't understand the -- the charges, you can see late 8 charges being added on each property as time goes on. And we can admit all the rest of them --9 10 EXAMINER LYNN: Sure. 11 THE WITNESS: -- for that purpose --12 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. 13 THE WITNESS: -- if you want. If they 14 want to look at them, if you want to look at it, you 15 can. 16 EXAMINER LYNN: I think that would be 17 helpful to have in the record, yes. 18 MR. McMAHON: I don't need to see them. 19 EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. McMahon, you are 20 indicating these are documents you already have 2.1 because this is what you did in response to the 22 motion to compel. Okay. We'll go off the record a 23 little later, and we'll designate these exhibits.

All right. Mr. Anderson, if you have no

Thank you. There's a lot of them.

24

```
1 more comments at this time --
```

THE WITNESS: Well, I have one more issue that we've talked about before.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: I believe there's in Ohio the statute of limitations for collecting, and I think those are expired. Generally speaking the statute of limitations generally is two years but there are specific statutes of limitations for -- that have been described by the legislature for particular other issues, but when it's nothing else, it's two years so this went on -- this has been more than two years.

EXAMINER LYNN: About how long do you think this has gone on?

THE WITNESS: Oh, this has gone on since,
you can look on Corbly, since '13 --

18 EXAMINER LYNN: 2013.

19 THE WITNESS: -- or before.

20 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

21 THE WITNESS: The original dispute was in

22 | 2013.

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

EXAMINER LYNN: And that's when you called the Duke customer service representatives or something.

THE WITNESS: No. That's when they did the crazy billings on Corbly --

EXAMINER LYNN: I see. Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- which started rolling.

EXAMINER LYNN: Please stay there for a

moment.

2.1

Mr. McMahon, I'll turn the matter over to you for any questions you might have. And if you need a minute to pause and prepare questions, go ahead.

MR. McMAHON: Before I begin, your Honor, can we designate -- just because I may cross-examine Mr. Anderson regarding that last exhibit, that still needs to be numbered.

EXAMINER LYNN: Yes. We'll go off the record just for a minute. Thank you.

(Discussion off the record.)

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. We'll go back on the record.

For purposes of continuing with the hearing and some questions for Mr. Anderson, we'll designate some of the other documents he brought in today. There's a document for the service address at Redbud; we'll call that Anderson Exhibit 3. Let's see, for service at 7111 Clovernoll, that will be

- 1 Anderson Exhibit 4. For service at 1889 Ashbrook,
- 2 | that will be Anderson Exhibit 5. Service at 8700
- 3 | Kemper Road East, that will be Anderson Exhibit 6.
- 4 | Service at 2474 Sir Douglas Drive, that will be
- 5 | Anderson Exhibit 7. And I believe that would be the
- 6 extent of the exhibits. Thank you for bringing them
- 7 along. All right.
- 8 DR. ANDERSON: Makes for a lighter load
- 9 for me to go home with.
- 10 EXAMINER LYNN: Sure. That works for all
- 11 of us then.
- DR. ANDERSON: Not for you. You've got
- 13 | the heavy load.
- 14 EXAMINER LYNN: I can handle it. I have
- 15 | had cases with more paperwork, please believe.
- Mr. McMahon, were you able to follow all
- 17 | those numbers?
- MR. McMAHON: Yes, thank you.
- 19 EXAMINER LYNN: I am sure that will help
- 20 you with your questioning then. If you're ready to
- 21 go ahead, fine. If you need a minute to prepare,
- 22 | that's fine too.
- MR. McMAHON: I can proceed, your Honor.
- EXAMINER LYNN: Fine.
- MR. McMAHON: Would you like me to stand?

EXAMINER LYNN: It's quite all right if you sit.

MR. McMAHON: Okay. Thank you.

EXAMINER LYNN: Not a problem.

5

CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. McMahon:

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Q. Mr. Anderson, I'm going to try to be succinct here, and but we bounced around a little bit so.
 - A. That's okay.
- Q. One of the things that was asked of you by his Honor was -- the question was you did not contact Duke and tell them that any of your bills are in the wrong name, and you answered it's not your responsibility to manage Duke.
 - A. That was not what was asked me.
- Q. Okay. Let me be clear because I wanted to follow up because I don't think you answered the question. Let me just pose the question.
 - A. That was not what was asked.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask you this question, you never contacted Duke in response to any of your monthly bills on any of the properties identified as Exhibits 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and told Duke Energy that

the bills are in the name of the wrong customer, did
you?

A. They did not ask me if they were in the -- what names they were in.

2.1

- Q. If you could answer my question. It's a "yes" or "no" question.
- A. It is not -- necessarily can be answered as a "yes" or "no."

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, could you instruct the witness to answer, please?

know, what I was asking earlier was this, there were bills of these numerous properties issued and the bills were issued -- bills were issued in your name at whatever the service address might have been for the property. And the question that I asked earlier is -- and I will -- I'll ask it hopefully more clearly this time, was you indicated that, you know, you through the business entity you set up, was like Anderson Properties or whatever the name was.

THE WITNESS: Anderson Investments was the entity that served the trusts.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. You're indicating that when you received these different bills for the various properties and, you know, your name is

indicated as above the service address on the bills, my question was was it -- was this -- you've indicated your intent was to have the entity of record -- or customer of record for the various properties to be a trust that owned the properties, you know, different trusts for each property.

THE WITNESS: The court records show that.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Then my question was when these bills came in to you and your name was indicated above the service address, my question was did you contact Duke at any time and say, hey, this isn't right; you know, my -- my intent, my goal was to have the name of whatever the trust was for this property be the name, you know, for the address.

THE WITNESS: As I said before, I'm not an attorney and did not know that -- you know, of that. And I didn't think it was my duty to tell them what it is. We pay -- we pay -- as trustee, we pay legitimate bills for each of the properties.

EXAMINER LYNN: So you're --

THE WITNESS: But we don't pay illegitimate bills.

EXAMINER LYNN: Sure. You're the trustee. Your intent was to have for each of these

properties and you're saying there's a different trust --

THE WITNESS: Each of the properties is being operated as a separate trust.

EXAMINER LYNN: So each one has its own trust name.

THE WITNESS: But I did not -- I admit they didn't ask me, and I did not tell them, but I did not intend to hide it either.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. So your bill came in in your name, and you did pay it. You know, you paid until the point where you thought --

THE WITNESS: The -- the entity -- the Anderson Investments has always paid all legitimate bills.

16 EXAMINER LYNN: Sure.

2.1

THE WITNESS: We continue to pay all legitimate bills.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. I don't think that's in dispute. So when you made the payment through Anderson Investments, you did so even though the bill had your name on it instead of the name of whatever the trust might have been for that property.

THE WITNESS: We paid the bill that was charged to the property.

1 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And that's the way we felt paying for the trust.

EXAMINER LYNN: So you were paying on behalf of the trust.

6 THE WITNESS: On behalf of the trust.

EXAMINER LYNN: But at no point in time did you say, hey, this bill really should be issued in the name of, you know, the trust?

THE WITNESS: No. I didn't think of that at all.

12 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor.

14 EXAMINER LYNN: Your other questions,

15 Mr. McMahon.

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. McMAHON: Yes.

Q. (By Mr. McMahon) And, Mr. Anderson, isn't it true that Anderson Investments, which you've identified as your business entity, is, in fact, a sole proprietorship?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Okay. Owned by you.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And even as we sit here today, his
Honor said Exhibit MC-1, the document that will be --

that was included in the written testimony of Melissa Coffman and will be identified later, and you identified those active and closed accounts that you had or have with Duke Energy, correct?

2.1

2.2

- A. I have had accounts with all of these -- all these properties. The trusts have had -- I have not had -- the trusts have had -- I have had an account with one of the properties, and the trusts have had accounts with all the rest of them.
- Q. Okay. Even as we sit here today, since you filed this complaint on February 1, 2016, you have never contacted Duke Energy since February 1, 2016, and asked the company to change the customer of record on any of your active accounts, have you?
- A. No. And Duke Energy has been aware of that.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, just to clarify the record, you said you are -- for each of these different trusts that owns these various properties, you're the trustee for each one of those; am I right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. I just wanted to be sure for the record. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Some of them are a little

different entities. Some of them are Roger D., Roger Anderson, some are Roger Donald.

EXAMINER LYNN: So the trusts might have somewhat different names, but you're the trustee for each one of them.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. McMahon) And you -- since you filed your complaint, isn't it true that Duke Energy Ohio adjusted your prior bill at the Corbly property and transferred a credit of \$1,011.60 from that closed account to your account at the Kemper Road property, correct?
- A. I believe that's true, but I don't have it in front of me. It's close to that number.
- Q. And you answered your Honor's question you are the trustee of all of these trusts. These trusts do not have separate employer identification or tax identification numbers, do they?
 - A. No.
- Q. They all conduct business under your Social Security number?
- 23 A. Yes.

2.1

Q. And I believe -- I just want to make sure
I understand this testimony from earlier. You

confirmed that the Sir Douglas property is owned in your name personally, not in the name of any trust, correct?

A. I believe so.

2.1

MR. McMAHON: If I may have one minute? EXAMINER LYNN: We'll go off the record for a minute.

(Discussion off the record.)

EXAMINER LYNN: We'll go back on the record then.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor. I just have one more question, I believe, for Mr. Anderson.

- Q. Mr. Anderson, toward the end of your direct testimony, you made an allegation, and I'm paraphrasing, I apologize, something to the effect Duke Energy violated a law by not allowing the Sir Douglas Drive property to be -- account to be put in your wife's name.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any proof that your wife or anyone on her behalf contacted Duke Energy since February 1, 2016, to have service put in her name?
- A. Can I have -- well, on one of those sheets there you give the dates that you talked to

her.

1

5

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, hold on. This is

Anderson Exhibit 2, I believe that's what he is

referring to, Mr. Anderson.

- Q. So your proof is Anderson Exhibit 2?
- A. She talked to -- on January 27 and February 1 is what your records show.

8 EXAMINER LYNN: And Mr. Anderson's 9 reading from Anderson Exhibit 2.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. McMAHON: No further questions, your

12 Honor.

13 EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you.

14 Mr. Anderson, you can take your seat for the time

being and please take your water with you. You might

16 need it later. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Take my scraps of paper.

18 EXAMINER LYNN: Thanks for your

19 testimony. You are under oath. We may have further

questions, but for the time being we don't.

21 Mr. McMahon, you have a witness with you,

22 | I believe?

MR. McMAHON: I do, your Honor, but has

24 | the Complainant rested his case in chief?

25 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, Mr. --

1 DR. ANDERSON: I would like to ask 2 questions of ... 3 EXAMINER LYNN: You will get the 4 opportunity to ask Ms. Coffman questions. DR. ANDERSON: That would be part of 5 6 my -- that would be part -- I have not rested because 7 I am going to be asking her certain things about... EXAMINER LYNN: I think the issue was was 8 9 there any other direct testimony you wanted to make 10 at this point in time? 11 DR. ANDERSON: I don't think so because 12 we do not have the information which we hoped to 13 elicit to be able to speak in a reasonable manner 14 about what the charges are because they have not 15 given us that information. 16 EXAMINER LYNN: All right. 17 MR. McMAHON: In light of Mr. Anderson's 18 testimony today, your Honor, we would move to 19 dismiss. He has failed to state a cause of action 20 against the company. 2.1 DR. ANDERSON: Well, I would like to 22 subpoena her then. 23 MR. McMAHON: If I could finish, please. 24 EXAMINER LYNN: Just let Mr. McMahon 25 finish.

MR. McMAHON: Mr. Anderson has not put on any evidence that the company violated -- violated any rule, tariff, regulation of the Commission nor has he provided any evidence that the company failed to provide reasonable and adequate service to him at the subject properties at issue in this case nor has he put on any evidence that the company's billings were incorrect, fraudulent as he claims without any evidence or any other evidence to support his claims, your Honor.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. McMahon, we will take that into account. We will not rule on that motion at this time. As I've indicated earlier in the hearing, Mr. Anderson is representing himself and I'm sure doing the best he can as far as presenting a case. So we will not rule on that at this time.

MR. McMAHON: Okay.

EXAMINER LYNN: With that in mind I believe if you are ready to proceed with your witness, we will do so.

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, Duke Energy Ohio calls Melissa Coffman.

EXAMINER LYNN: Ms. Coffman, if you would come up to the stand, please.

Thank you. If you would raise your right

64 hand. 1 2 (Witness sworn.) 3 EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you. Please take 4 your seat. 5 And, Mr. McMahon, you may go ahead. MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor. 6 7 8 MELISSA COFFMAN being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 9 examined and testified as follows: 10 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 By Mr. McMahon: 13 Q. Could you state your name for the record, 14 please. Melissa Coffman. 15 Α. Q. And please give us your address, your 16 17 work address. 18 1000 East Main Street, Plainfield, Α. Indiana 46168. 19 20 Q. Okay. And you're employed by Duke 2.1 Energy? 22 I am. Α. 23 Q. And you're --24 MR. McMAHON: I'm sorry. Do you have a 25 copy of Ms. Coffman's written testimony? Would you

- 1 | like another copy?
- 2 EXAMINER LYNN: I do have -- I already
- 3 | have a copy, thank you, and you apparently have one
- 4 for Mr. Anderson.
- 5 MR. McMAHON: Yes, I am giving
- 6 Mr. Anderson another copy. It was also served on him
- 7 back in March when it was filed.
- 8 EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you.
- 9 Q. (By Mr. McMahon) Ms. Coffman, you have in
- 10 | front of you what's been marked previously as Duke
- 11 | Energy Ohio Exhibit A, the direct testimony of
- 12 | Melissa Coffman on behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.,
- 13 | correct?
- 14 A. I do, yes.
- 15 Q. You helped prepare this written
- 16 testimony, correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And you reviewed it back in March of
- 19 2017?
- 20 A. I did.
- 21 Q. And was this written testimony true and
- 22 | accurate as of March 17, 2017?
- 23 A. Yes.
- O. And does it remain true and accurate as
- 25 of today?

1 A. Correct. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

2.1

MR. McMAHON: I move for the admission of Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit A, your Honor.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, before I rule on that, Mr. Anderson, this -- this would have been sent to you previously for when the hearing was set for in March of 2017. You may have questions on it but do you have any objections to admitting that into evidence?

DR. ANDERSON: I don't believe so.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you.

And also just for the record too, Mr. Anderson, I

neglected to do this before you left the witness stand. Will you be making a motion that all of your

exhibits be admitted into evidence as well?

DR. ANDERSON: Yes.

17 EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you.

MR. McMAHON: I have no objection to

19 that, your Honor.

EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you, Mr. McMahon.

In that case Anderson Exhibits 1 through --

MR. McMAHON: 7, I believe, your Honor.

23 EXAMINER LYNN: You're correct. 1

24 through 7 will be admitted into evidence. And also

25 Duke -- Duke Energy Exhibit A will be admitted into

evidence as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

MR. McMAHON: Thank you, your Honor. I just have a couple of follow-ups since that testimony was filed back in March.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right.

MR. McMAHON: For the record I am handing Mr. Anderson a copy of Exhibit MC-1A.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right.

MR. McMAHON: I am also giving a copy to the witness and your Honor.

EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you.

- Q. Ms. Coffman, I've handed you what's been marked as MC-1A. Do you have that there in front of you?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Could you explain what this exhibit is, please.
 - A. This is a list of Mr. Anderson's active accounts in Ohio and also a list of the closed accounts as a record for Duke Energy.
 - Q. Okay. Just to clarify and help make the record, this exhibit is similar to Exhibit MC-1 that's included in your written testimony, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. But it's simply updated from March 14 of
 '17 to October 19 of 2017.

 A. Correct.

 Q. Okay. Thank you.
 - EXAMINER LYNN: And for the record MC-1A indicates Mr. Anderson's active accounts and closed accounts as of -- as of yesterday.

MR. McMAHON: Correct, your Honor.

EXAMINER LYNN: October 19, 2017.

DR. ANDERSON: Okay. There's a small error in it. 8700 East Kemper is listed as both.

13 EXAMINER LYNN: I believe --

It's an active account.

5

6

7

12

14

15

16

17

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

MR. McMAHON: Just to be clear, if you can look, there's a closed account number from Kemper Road and then there's an active different account number.

DR. ANDERSON: Okay.

EXAMINER LYNN: So the account at Kemper is now open then?

MR. McMAHON: Correct.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Thank you.

Q. (By Mr. McMahon) And the last question I have for Ms. Coffman just in light of Mr. Anderson's testimony, since February 1, has Carol Anderson ever

69 contacted Duke Anderson -- Energy, Duke to have the 1 property at Sir Douglas, that account, placed in her 2 3 name? A. No. 4 5 MR. McMAHON: No further questions, your 6 Honor, and I would move for the admission of Duke 7 Energy Exhibit MC-1A. 8 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Any objections to 9 that, Mr. Anderson? 10 DR. ANDERSON: No. EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. We'll admit Duke's 11 12 Exhibit MC-1A as well into evidence. 13 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 14 MR. McMAHON: Thank you. 15 EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. McMahon, did you have any more questions for your witness at this time? 16 17 MR. McMAHON: No, your Honor. 18 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Thank you. 19 Mr. Anderson. 20 2.1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 22 By Dr. Anderson: 23 Q. You could help me out a little bit on 24 this, if you would. Basically the paperwork states 25 you are supposed to know everything about all the

accounts, and you will give us that information. The information that we have received from Duke has stated some part of the information that was sent.

Can you tell me how you calculated -- re -- how you recalculated the charge -- the credits for us?

A. And which account are you --

2.1

- Q. On all the accounts from Corbly all the way up.
- A. Can you be specific? Which -- which recalculations are you speaking of?
- Q. The recalculation of the gas and electric charges for all of the properties when you -- when -- after you did the read -- after the readings were done for -- at Corbly, the gas and electric readings were done at Corbly.
- A. Okay. Correct. Yes, we did do an account adjustment.
 - O. Go ahead. That's not what I asked.
- A. Okay. Let me explain how -- how that worked. So, yes, we did go out to that property. We did obtain a meter read. We had our billing department make a correction, what we call an account adjustment, on the Corbly account. That adjustment was based upon the meter read that was taken that day which I apologize. I don't have that date in front

of me at the moment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. I could give you the date if it's important, but it's not important I don't think.
- A. Okay. But our billing department made that correction. It's based upon the meter read that was taken that day.
 - Q. Just for Corbly.
- A. We only did an account adjustment for Corbly.
- Q. Okay. Did you do -- did you do any recalculations on the other property and correct the late charges?
 - A. No, not that I'm aware of.
- 14 Q. Why not?
- 15 A. We were not asked to do that.
- 16 Q. Why --
- A. There were no corrections to be made on other accounts.
- Q. Since the late charges are -- the late charges are based on the amount that's due each month --
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. -- those should be recalculated, and you did not recalculate any of those.
- A. Well, late charges are charged to an

account when we have a balance that is unpaid. It is not based upon anything inaccurate with the account. If there was something inaccurate with the account, then we need to know that.

2.1

Q. Well, you are aware that because the charges bounced from each one of the properties that was added on, late charges were added on, and the basis of the balance and were -- well, basically added on monthly as the properties went on.

MR. McMAHON: Objection. Is that a question, your Honor?

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, it isn't a question, Mr. Anderson, but I do have a question of my own.

Ms. Coffman, you were saying then that Duke employees went out to Corbly and did an actual read.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: And made an adjustment to what was owed by Corbly -- at the Corbly account.

Now, did you also say that you were not asked to do such adjustments or actual reads at all the other accounts for Mr. Anderson? You made some remark weren't asked to do it or something.

THE WITNESS: That's correct. We have

not been asked to go out to other properties to have any other properties read -- the meters read, excuse me.

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: And was the party that asked you, was it Mr. Anderson himself or do you know?

THE WITNESS: For the Corbly property?

EXAMINER LYNN: For the Corbly.

THE WITNESS: For the Corbly property when we were here for the settlement conference, during that conference he mentioned the Corbly property.

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

EXAMINER LYNN: Actually whatever occurred in the settlement conference, we can't mention here at the hearing. Those are proceedings that --

MR. McMAHON: And the difficulty we have, if I may for the record, your Honor, is that without waiving that objection, what transpired with the Corbly account and the adjustment was a result of that meeting here at the Commission.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. I guess what --

DR. ANDERSON: I have no problem with

you -- if you would explain it further, if you want.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, what I was trying

to --

2.1

2.2

DR. ANDERSON: I think it's relevant to what's going on right now.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, what I was trying to puzzle out was this, you know, you asked about recalculations at these numerous accounts that you have.

DR. ANDERSON: Yes.

EXAMINER LYNN: And upon hearing that there was some recalculation for Corbly, I thought, well, what -- you know, what -- what triggered that. Apparently there was some settlement discussions that went on and there was a reading that went out, someone went out to read at Corbly.

DR. ANDERSON: They were -- because of the estimates, the so-called estimates, that had been done before was agreed that they would --

MR. McMAHON: Your Honor, object to any discussion during the course of the settlement conference.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, we'll just -- well, we'll leave it at this, that there was an actual read done at Corbly; and, Ms. Coffman, and you would agree

with that, I'm sure, an actual read done that was -that resulted in a correction of the bill.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2.1

2.2

EXAMINER LYNN: But there were -- nothing transpired from the time his complaint was filed that would have resulted in any visit and actual reads at some of these other properties I guess to correct bills that Mr. Anderson is disagreeing with.

THE WITNESS: That would be a true statement.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. McMAHON: And if this helps your Honor, it is on pages 18 and 19 of Ms. Coffman's written testimony.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Fine. Again, I was just trying to clarify if Mr. Anderson had objections to what was going on at numerous addresses, why there was a reading of one of them and not others.

DR. ANDERSON: The reading would not have to take place at the other ones. What needs to be done is there needs to be a recalculation of all the late charges and that apparently has not been done and I am kind of going into a summary and I guess there were no recalculations of any late charges for

all the properties. Once it was corrected, in fact, probably all the late charges would disappear.

- A. If you're -- if you're asking if the late fees have been removed from any other properties, no. I am going to say, no, that has not occurred.
- Q. And how were the late charges -- the question is how originally were the late charges calculated? Can you explain that to me?
 - A. Is your question --

2.1

Q. I am trying to wiggle in what I am looking for.

EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Anderson, is your question why were some of the late charges assessed?

DR. ANDERSON: Now how are they assessed and the next question why weren't they reaccessed? I believe the late charges, if my understanding is correct, is that they are adjust -- they are on the basis of a balance -- of a percentage of a balance that's due.

MR. McMAHON: Objection. Move to strike.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, Ms. Coffman, tell
us how -- on what basis late charges are determined
and is it a flat rate or, you know, what -- how is
that done?

THE WITNESS: Right.

77 1 EXAMINER LYNN: Help me out. 2 THE WITNESS: So a late fee is based upon 3 a balance that is owed on an account. 4 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. 5 THE WITNESS: So if there is a balance 6 that is owed by a certain due date and the company 7 does not receive that full payment, it is a percentage of what the actual amount is owed. 8 9 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. 10 THE WITNESS: And that determines the 11 late charge. 12 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Fine. Something I 13 was unaware of, how it was calculated. Thank you. 14 Okay. Mr. Anderson, what additional 15 questions might you have? 16 (By Dr. Anderson) Why was it not Ο. 17 recalculated since the amount was a lot less for all 18 the properties since the -- when they did the 19 readings, we got a correction of over \$1,000 and that 20 probably eliminated all the charges for Corbly. 2.1 EXAMINER LYNN: So, Mr. Anderson, then is 22 your question because there was a --23 DR. ANDERSON: Thank you for your help. 24 EXAMINER LYNN: Because there was a 25 recalculation of the bill at Corbly, then -- and that

credit was applied to some other bills as I
understand it, then are you asking, well, after there
is a correction made to Corbly --

DR. ANDERSON: Every bill should have to be recorrected, needs to be recorrected, and it hasn't been done.

EXAMINER LYNN: And you are asking Ms. Coffman why that didn't happen.

DR. ANDERSON: Yes.

- A. Well, again, there were no recalculations of any late fees because that was not necessary. The credit --
 - Q. The bills --

14 EXAMINER LYNN: Just a minute,

15 Mr. Anderson.

2.1

A. The credit from Corbly, from the Corbly property, I believe, was transferred to the Kemper Road account at that time because Kemper Road was active at that time. There were no other changes or cal -- recalculations made with any other accounts.

EXAMINER LYNN: And, Ms. Coffman, why was -- why was it not done to any of the other accounts? Is that because the other ones were closed or?

25 THE WITNESS: When I personally reviewed

the accounts, I looked through to see if we had other accounts that had any type of estimated reads, anything that looked out of place with the balance compared to the usage. I did not personally find other accounts that needed to be corrected or that we needed to have someone go back out to read the meters again.

EXAMINER LYNN: And this was after the Corbly adjustment was made.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

11 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

- Q. (By Dr. Anderson) Would the Corbly -because of the -- the Corbly was overcharged. I
 think that we -- you have given us a credit because
 it was overcharged.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Would that have created additional late charges when it was transferred to all the other properties?
- MR. McMAHON: Objection, presumes facts not in evidence.
- EXAMINER LYNN: Well, let's let

 Mr. Anderson's question stand. Would you repeat
- 25 | that, please?

DR. ANDERSON: We are looking for truths.

EXAMINER LYNN: What was your question

again then, Mr. Anderson?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.1

Q. Well, the -- the -- when the late charge -- when the credit was given to Corbly, that late -- that amount of money that was charged would have generated additional late charges as it went through all -- over the period of time when it was transferred from property to property. It would grow, grow exponentially.

EXAMINER LYNN: And then your question is?

- Q. I believe that, you know, where -- would it generate late charges as it went from one property to the other?
- A. There would be late charges on accounts if the balance that was owed at that time was not received in full.
- Q. Okay. Let me -- are you finished? I'll ask it another different way.
 - A. Okay. Go ahead.
- Q. For a \$1,000 late charge, if it went over a period of from 2013 to 2016, what would be the late charges for that?
- 25 A. I don't have that in front of me.

Q. You were supposed to be able to answer everything.

MR. McMAHON: Objection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, we'll just focus on questions, Mr. Anderson.

- A. I can't speculate to that amount. I would have to go back --
 - Q. It would be late charges.
- A. Again, there would be late charges on an account if the payment was not received in full for the balance that is owed.
- Q. And that -- would those late charges grow on a monthly basis for that thousand dollars? It would be additional late charges if it wasn't paid every month for those -- for the period of time it was owed.
- A. A late charge can increase, yes, because it is a percentage of the balance that is owed.

EXAMINER LYNN: Ms. --

- Q. You didn't ask -- answer the question that was asked.
- EXAMINER LYNN: Maybe I can step in here and try to clarify.
- DR. ANDERSON: You can. I appreciate it because I'm not very good at this.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, you know, as I said, you're representing yourself, so I've made that clear all along.

2.1

DR. ANDERSON: I appreciate it.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Ms. --

Ms. Coffman, let me see if I can understand your answers correctly, okay? Are you saying that when there was the actual read done at Corbly and an adjustment to that bill and there was a credit that was applied to I think you said it was like Sir Douglas? I believe the credit was applied to Sir Douglas or credit for Corbly was applied to --

THE WITNESS: The credit from Corbly was transferred to Kemper Road.

EXAMINER LYNN: Kemper Road, okay. Are you saying that when -- even when that credit was transferred, that it's Duke's position that there were still other accounts that were open for which there were bills not paid? In other words, the credit from Corbly would have helped -- you are saying the credit from Corbly would have helped on the amount owed on, say, you know, the address of -- the bill at one address, but it wasn't enough to cover what Duke felt was owed for other addresses; am I on the right track there?

THE WITNESS: Well, our -- are you asking if we would have spread out the credit over other accounts?

2.1

2.2

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, Mr. McMahon, I think you are on the right track. What I was trying to clarify, and if I am understanding Mr. Anderson correctly, is there was a credit generated from Corbly. Okay. That was applied to another account. And I think what he is asking is, well, then if I'm correct on this, you know, what would have been -- what late charges might have been reduced on other accounts as well once we had this credit?

MR. McMAHON: Well, to be clear the credit was transferred from Corbly as has been entered into evidence to 8700 East Kemper Road which is the address and account at issue in the complaint. That's the account denominated on the face of the complaint. If I may finish?

DR. ANDERSON: That's incorrect.

MR. McMAHON: The account at issue in the complaint along with 85 Redbud. So the account credit was transferred to the account in dispute in this complaint proceeding.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

MR. McMAHON: All -- any other active

accounts with balances are not germane to these proceedings.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

2.1

DR. ANDERSON: The other accounts are very germane to these proceedings because it was not transferred from Corbly to 8700 East Kemper. It was transferred from Corbly through a series of other properties and eventually ended up at Kemper. It was transferred -- it was transferred through Clovernoll. When we look back to what has happened, it was transferred through Redbud. In fact, it was -- it's all those -- all those properties that are in that pile it was transferred to before it went -- EXAMINER LYNN: You are referring to your

examiner Lynn: You are referring to your own exhibits.

DR. ANDERSON: Before it went to -- and so my position here is that they should have recalculated for the amount owed. They should have recalculated all the late charges, and I think that's what we're disputing is the late charges.

EXAMINER LYNN: Fine. Again --

DR. ANDERSON: And that the other -- the other issue on it is that I think the late charges on it because it was a fraud charge originally. All late charges should be removed because we would have

paid those charges for those other properties if they had been legitimate.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Mr. Anderson,
Ms. Coffman, I apologize for perhaps confusing the
issue. But there are numerous properties at issue
here and I was trying to clarify the matter of the
credit.

DR. ANDERSON: The credit was -- the other properties are important because it was bounced from one property to the other.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Well, then we'll -- that's in the report and that will be taken into account.

Mr. Anderson, did you have any other questions?

- Q. I don't know if we've clarified it. So there was no calculation -- no credit given for late charges because of the -- because of the erroneous charge for on Corbly -- erroneous overcharges of Corbly.
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- 22 Q. Okay.

2.1

- A. We have no recalculations on your accounts.
- Q. There are no recalculations from that.

86 1 Α. No, sir. EXAMINER LYNN: Well, thank you. 2 3 I think actually we have clarified that. Did you have any other questions at all? 4 DR. ANDERSON: I think that's the big 5 6 issue is the late charges. 7 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. 8 DR. ANDERSON: So I think -- I think 9 we've got that clarified now. 10 EXAMINER LYNN: Well --11 DR. ANDERSON: There's no credit been 12 issued for the late charges. 13 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. 14 DR. ANDERSON: That was the point. 15 EXAMINER LYNN: I understand there was no 16 credit issued despite the fact Corbly was 17 recalculated and so on. 18 DR. ANDERSON: So it should have been 19 calculated -- my position it should have been 20 calculated all the way from Corbly through each of 2.1 the properties and -- and through back there, and I 2.2 think that you would see that the rest of the money 23 would disappear. 24 EXAMINER LYNN: All right.

DR. ANDERSON: There might be 100, 200

25

87 dollars due is what I'm thinking. 1 2 EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you. And that 3 being said --DR. ANDERSON: That was what I was trying 4 5 to get in discovery. EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Was there -- is 6 7 there anything else you want to bring up, 8 Mr. Anderson? 9 DR. ANDERSON: No. Just a summary. 10 EXAMINER LYNN: Well, fine. Okay. Mr. McMahon? Do you need a minute to 11 12 think over whether you would have any additional 13 questions? 14 MR. McMAHON: No further questions, your 15 Honor. 16 EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. We have admitted 17 all the exhibits into evidence. And I often give 18 parties a chance to file briefs which isn't a 19 requirement. Mr. Anderson, briefs are basically just 20 a written summary of your arguments that could be 2.1 submitted after the hearing. 2.2 DR. ANDERSON: We can. 23 EXAMINER LYNN: It's not necessary by any

DR. ANDERSON: Mine is not going to be as

24

25

means.

formal as his.

2.1

2.2

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, again, it would -- we would take that into account certainly. Do you want the opportunity to do a brief?

DR. ANDERSON: I would be glad to summarize.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay.

DR. ANDERSON: I think that -- I think you were a little bit -- you are maybe straightened up, but you were a little confused on what I was trying to head for.

EXAMINER LYNN: Well, I think I better understand it now, but nonetheless you could put it into a brief. Mr. McMahon, do you want to file a brief? You don't have to.

MR. McMAHON: Yes, please.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. There's also an opportunity for reply briefs which, again, isn't essential or a requirement. Do the parties want reply briefs as well? That's where you would respond to what's said in the other party's brief.

DR. ANDERSON: Sure.

MR. McMAHON: I would ask that we file our post-hearing briefs at the same time and then any reply briefs at the same time --

89 1 EXAMINER LYNN: Right. 2 MR. McMAHON: -- rather than back and 3 forth. EXAMINER LYNN: No, I would agree with 4 5 that and that's usually the procedure. Just a minute, please. I am sure the transcript will take a 6 7 while to read through. Let's see, it's October 20 8 right now. 9 Let's go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) 10 EXAMINER LYNN: Back on the record. 11 12 Okay. So we'll say that the initial 13 briefs will be due November 17, and then Mr. Anderson 14 will be out of town, so the reply brief by December 20. So initial brief, whoever is doing a reply brief 15 16 December 20. 17 Okay. Thank you for reminding me to go 18 back on the record. And with that being said, I 19 believe then we will close the proceedings for today. 20 Thank you all for attending. 2.1 (Thereupon, at 11:36 a.m., the hearing 22 was adjourned.) 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 Friday, October 20, 2017, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter.

(KSG-6439)

OF OHIO

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/2/2017 10:26:29 AM

in

Case No(s). 16-0256-EL-CSS

Summary: Transcript Donald Anderson vs. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., hearing held on October 20, 2017. electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.