

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF GEORGE DREILING,

COMPLAINANT,

v.

CASE NO. 21-483-EL-CSS

DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.,

RESPONDENT.

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on September 23, 2021

I. SUMMARY

{¶ 1} The Commission grants the joint motion to dismiss with prejudice filed by Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

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} Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke) is a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02 and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 4} On April 21, 2021, George Dreiling (Mr. Dreiling or Complainant) filed a complaint against Duke, disputing charges on his bill and objecting to receiving a disconnect notice. Mr. Dreiling explains that his rental property in Cincinnati was upgraded with new wiring in summer 2020; Duke was to install two new meters after completion of the upgrade. Before the new meters were installed, Complainant contends, tenants that had been evicted contacted Duke and alleged that Mr. Dreiling “was stealing electricity,” after which the electricity was shut off. Complainant asserts that neither he

nor the tenants were notified of the disconnection before it occurred. According to Mr. Dreiling, he then contacted an electrician to “jump” the existing meter and restore power; Duke subsequently installed two new meters and the property passed a final inspection by the city of Cincinnati. Complainant adds that, later, tenants informed him that Duke had sent a letter to the rental address indicating that Mr. Dreiling owed \$2,436.52. Mr. Dreiling emphasizes that any bills sent to him should have been mailed to his home address, not the rental address, and that he always pays his bills on time. Complainant also contends that Duke eventually disconnected the “jumped” meter. Mr. Dreiling asserts that he could not have been “stealing electricity” while he was receiving electrical inspections regarding the upgrade for electric service.

{¶ 5} Duke filed its answer on May 11, 2021. Duke states that Complainant was sent a disconnect notice of \$183.75 and that there was no disconnection of electricity. Duke denies all remaining allegations made by Mr. Dreiling.

{¶ 6} By Entry issued May 25, 2021, a settlement conference was scheduled for June 3, 2021. The parties participated as scheduled and agreed to continue the discussions.

{¶ 7} On September 2, 2021, the parties filed a joint motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice, stating that all issues raised in the complaint have been resolved and the matter settled.

{¶ 8} The Commission finds the joint motion to be reasonable. Accordingly, the joint motion to dismiss with prejudice shall be granted.

III. ORDER

{¶ 9} It is, therefore,

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

{¶ 11} ORDERED, That this case be closed of record. It is, further,

{¶ 12} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

COMMISSIONERS:

Approving:

Jenifer French, Chair
M. Beth Trombold
Lawrence K. Friedeman
Daniel R. Conway
Dennis P. Deters

JML/hac

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

9/23/2021 3:17:51 PM

in

Case No(s). 21-0483-EL-CSS

Summary: Entry granting the joint motion to dismiss with prejudice filed by Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. electronically filed by Ms. Mary E. Fischer on behalf of Public Utilities Commission of Ohio