

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF GEORGE CLOS,

COMPLAINANT,

v.

CASE NO. 21-869-EL-CSS

**THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC
ILLUMINATING COMPANY,**

RESPONDENT.

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on February 23, 2022

I. SUMMARY

{¶ 1} The Commission dismisses this complaint, without prejudice, at the request of the complainant.

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 Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (CEI) 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 18, 2021, George Clos (Mr. Clos or Complainant) filed a complaint against CEI, alleging that CEI's billing is not transparent to customers. Complainant asserts that the Distribution Related Component (DRC) and the Cost Recovery Charges (CRC) on the bill provide no detail concerning how the respective charges are calculated. Complainant contends that he contacted CEI requesting an explanation of how these charges are determined, but no explanation was provided. Complainant observes that 97 per cent of his July bill is attributable to DRC and CRC. Mr.

Clos contends that his bill for the June/July 2021 period is \$186.76 and that, in contrast to CEI's charges, there is transparency in how to determine the \$63.92 charge from his electric supplier.

{¶ 5} In an answer filed September 7, 2021, CEI asserts that its Commission-approved tariff and riders provide in detail how DRC and CRC are calculated. CEI also notes that the information provided on customer bills complies with electric utility customer billing requirements set forth in Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-10-22. In addition, CEI asserts, after Mr. Clos contacted CEI on July 14, 2021, he was given guidance concerning CRC and was provided with information for contacting the Commission. CEI admits that CRC and DRC comprise most of Mr. Clos's bill.

{¶ 6} By Entry issued September 13, 2021, the attorney examiner scheduled a September 27, 2021 settlement conference. Both parties participated in the conference.

{¶ 7} On January 27, 2022, Complainant filed a letter stating his interest in withdrawing the complaint.

{¶ 8} Given Complainant's January 27, 2022 request, the complaint shall be dismissed without prejudice and this case closed of record.

III. ORDER

{¶ 9} It is, therefore,

{¶ 10} ORDERED, That this complaint be dismissed without prejudice and this case closed of record. It is, further,

{¶ 11} 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 Deters

JML/hac

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

2/23/2022 2:46:52 PM

in

Case No(s). 21-0869-EL-CSS

Summary: Entry dismissing this complaint, without prejudice, at the request of the complainant electronically filed by Heather A. Chilcote on behalf of Public Utilities Commission of Ohio