

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

<b>Emmanuel J. Black</b>	)	
9411 Stonecrest Court	)	
Cincinnati, Ohio 45249	)	
	)	
Complainant	)	Case No. 17-2322-EL-CSS
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
	)	
<b>Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.</b>	)	
	)	
Respondent	)	
	)	

---

**ANSWER OF DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.**

---

For its Answer to the Complaint of Emmanuel J. Black (Complainant), Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (Duke Energy Ohio or Respondent) states as follows:

1. The Complaint does not contain any allegations or requests for relief, nor is it in a form allowing for specific admission or denial as to individual allegations. Accordingly, Duke Energy Ohio generally denies that Complainant is entitled to any relief in connection with their Complaint.
2. With regard to the documents attached to the Complaint, Duke Energy Ohio states the easement provided by Complainant is not relevant to his property or the lawful actions Duke Energy Ohio intends to undertake on Complainant's property so as to enable the continued safe and reliable operation of its high-voltage transmission system. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that the easement provides it with the unambiguous right to remove trees and other obstructions in the easement and right-of-way. However,

with regard to certain statements therein, Duke Energy Ohio states that the terms of its lawfully obtained easements speak for themselves and further denies that its request, as docketed under Case No. 16-915-EL-ESS, has not been approved. Said request was approved pursuant to O.A.C. 4901:1-10-27(F)(2). Duke Energy Ohio further states that it has engaged in extensive community outreach, interacting with individual property owners on whose property the Company possesses easement rights and will be working. All remaining allegations, as inferred or implied by the documents attached to the Complaint, are denied.

3. Duke Energy Ohio denies each and every allegation of fact and conclusion of law not expressly admitted herein. Duke Energy Ohio further states that its actions are consistent with its express grants of easement and with its Programs for Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Distribution and Transmission Lines, Section (f), as approved on June 13, 2016. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

1. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense the easement attached to the Complaint does not concern the property owned by Complainant. Such easement, therefore, cannot support the Complaint. Answering further, such easement expressly confirms the rights of Duke Energy Ohio to engage in vegetation management activities with regard to the property on which such easement exists.
2. The Complainant does not assert any allegations of fact that would give rise to a cognizable claim against Duke Energy Ohio.

3. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that pursuant to R.C. 4905.26 and O.A.C. 4901-9-01-(B)(3), Complainant has failed to set forth reasonable grounds for complaint.
4. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that Complainant has not stated any request for relief that can be granted by this Commission.
5. Duke Energy Ohio states as an affirmative defense that Complainant lacks standing to assert any claims against the Company in respect of property for which he is not the lawful property owner of record.
6. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that to the extent Complainant is seeking monetary damages, such relief is beyond the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.
7. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that, to the extent the Complainant is seeking equitable relief, such relief is beyond the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.
8. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that it has superior property rights, as confirmed by lawful grants of easement.
9. Duke Energy Ohio reserves the right to raise additional affirmative defenses or to withdraw any of the foregoing affirmative defenses as may become necessary during the investigation and discovery of this matter.

### **CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, Duke Energy Ohio respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss the Complaint of Emmanuel J. Black for failure to set forth reasonable grounds for the Complaint and to deny Complainant's request for relief, if any.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts

Amy B. Spiller (0047277) (Counsel of Record)  
Deputy General Counsel  
Elizabeth H. Watts (0031092)  
Associate General Counsel  
Duke Energy Business Services LLC  
139 East Fourth Street, 1303-Main  
P.O. Box 960  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960  
(513) 419-1810 (telephone)  
(513) 419-1846 (fax)  
[amy.spiller@duke-energy.com](mailto:amy.spiller@duke-energy.com)  
[elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com](mailto:elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com)

/s/ Robert A. McMahon

Robert A. McMahon (0064319)  
Eberly McMahon Copetas LLC  
2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206  
(513) 533-3441 (telephone)  
(513) 533-3554 (fax)  
[bcmahon@emclawyers.com](mailto:bcmahon@emclawyers.com)

Attorneys for Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Answer of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., was served via regular US Mail postage prepaid, or by electronic mail service, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of November 2017, upon the following:

Emmanuel J. Black  
9411 Stonecrest Court  
Cincinnati, OH 45249

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts  
Elizabeth H. Watts

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**11/22/2017 11:29:16 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 17-2322-EL-CSS**

Summary: Answer of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. electronically filed by Carys Cochern on behalf of Watts, Elizabeth H. Ms.