

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF
PETER ROHLOFF,**

COMPLAINANT,

CASE NO. 17-1721-EL-CSS

V.

THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY,

RESPONDENT

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on September 26, 2018

I. SUMMARY

{¶ 1} The Commission dismisses the complaint upon the joint motion of the parties.

II. DISCUSSION

{¶ 2} Pursuant to R.C. 4905.26, the Commission has authority to consider written complaints filed against a public utility by any person or corporation regarding any rate, service, regulation, or practice relating to any service furnished by the public utility that is in any respect unjust, unreasonable, insufficient, or unjustly discriminatory.

{¶ 3} The Toledo Edison Company (Toledo Edison) is a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02 and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 4} On August 2, 2017, Peter Rohloff (Complainant) filed a complaint against Toledo Edison. The Complainant alleged that Toledo Edison erred in the calculation of his electricity consumption and did not properly account for electricity produced by his solar panels.

{¶ 5} On August 22, 2017, Toledo Edison filed an answer to the complaint.

{¶ 6} By Entry issued September 13, 2017, the attorney examiner scheduled a settlement conference for October 4, 2017.

{¶ 7} On November 17, 2017, the parties filed a joint motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice. The joint motion states that the parties have resolved all issues and claims arising from the complaint.

{¶ 8} On February 8, 2018, the Complainant filed a letter in which he acknowledged that he signed the motion to dismiss, at the request of Toledo Edison's counsel. The Complainant expressed a concern about not having an interconnection agreement. The record does not disclose whether the parties drafted and executed an interconnection agreement.

{¶ 9} On March 9, 2018, the Complainant filed a letter ostensibly showing the absence of power from his electrical inverter.

{¶ 10} In neither letter filed after the motion to dismiss did the Complainant express any intent to withdraw from the motion to dismiss. To the contrary, the Complainant acknowledged his signature. Therefore, we conclude from the record that the parties have resolved all issues and claims arising from the complaint. Consequently, the Commission shall grant the joint motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice.

III. ORDER

{¶ 11} It is, therefore,


{¶ 12} ORDERED, That the joint motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice be granted. It is, further,

{¶ 13} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon the parties and all interested persons of record.


THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO




Asim Z. Haque, Chairman




M. Beth Trombold



Thomas W. Johnson



Lawrence K. Friedeman



Daniel R. Conway

LDJ/sc

Entered in the Journal

SEP 26 2018



Barcy F. McNeal
Secretary