

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Complaint of Arthur and)	
Vicki Maser,)	
)	
Complainants,)	
)	CASE NO. 22-0701-EL-CSS
vs.)	
)	
Ohio Edison Company,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ANSWER OF RESPONDENT OHIO EDISON COMPANY

Ohio Edison Company (“Ohio Edison” or the “Company”) is a public utility company, as defined by R.C. §4905.03(C) and is duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Ohio. In accordance with Rule 4901-9-01(D), Ohio Administrative Code, the Respondent, Ohio Edison, for its answer to the Complaint of Arthur and Vicki Maser (the “Complainants”) states:

Complainants’ Complaint consists of one typed page without numbered paragraphs. Ohio Edison will attempt to specifically answer each allegation in the Complaint, however, to the extent Ohio Edison does not respond to a specific allegation, Ohio Edison denies any such allegation.

1. The first typed paragraph of the Complaint does not contain any allegations, and thus no response is required. To the extent a response may be deemed necessary, Ohio Edison is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation(s) and therefore denies them.

2. In response to the allegations contained in the second typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison states that records indicate a vehicle occupied by Central Transport struck communication facilities in the vicinity of Complainants’ property. Responding further, Ohio Edison denies any negligence or equipment failure resulting from Ohio Edison’s conduct. As to

the remaining allegations contained in the second typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation(s) and therefore denies them.

3. In response to the allegations contained in the third typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison states that records indicate a vehicle occupied by Central Transport struck communication facilities in the vicinity of Complainants' property and caused subsequent damage to Ohio Edison's equipment. Responding further, Ohio Edison denies any negligence or equipment failure resulting from Ohio Edison's conduct. As to the remaining allegations contained in the third typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation(s) and therefore denies them.

4. In response to the allegation contained in the fourth typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison states that the allegation is not directed to Ohio Edison, but to the extent a response may be deemed necessary, Ohio Edison states that records indicate a vehicle occupied by Central Transport struck communication facilities in the vicinity of Complainants' property.

5. In response to the allegation contained in the fifth typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison states that the allegation is not directed to Ohio Edison, but to the extent a response may be deemed necessary, Ohio Edison is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation and therefore denies them.

6. In response to the allegation contained in the sixth typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison states its equipment was damaged after a vehicle occupied by Central Transport struck communication facilities in the vicinity of Complainants' property. As to the remaining allegations contained in the sixth typed paragraph of the Complaint, Ohio Edison is

without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation(s) and therefore denies them.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. The Complaint fails to set forth reasonable grounds for complaint, as required by R.C. §4905.26.

2. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

3. The Commission may lack subject matter jurisdiction to award some or all of the relief Complainant seeks.

4. At all times, Ohio Edison complied with the Ohio Revised Code Title 49; the applicable rules, regulations, and orders of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio; and its Tariff, PUCO No. 11, on file with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. These statutes, rules, regulations, orders and tariff provisions bar Complainant's claims.

5. Ohio Edison denies all allegations of the Complaint that are not otherwise admitted herein.

6. Ohio Edison reserves the right to supplement its answer with other defenses, including affirmative defenses, as discovery progresses in this matter.

WHEREFORE, Ohio Edison Company respectfully requests an Order dismissing the Complaint and granting Ohio Edison Company all other relief deemed necessary and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ John W. Breig, Jr.

John W. Breig, Jr. (0096767)
BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER, COPLAN &
ARONOFF LLP
200 Public Square, Suite 2300
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2378
Telephone: 216.363.4500
Facsimile: 216.363.4588
jbreig@beneschlaw.com

And

Kristen M. Fling (0099678)
(Counsel of Record)
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308
Telephone: 330.606.8087
Facsimile: 330.384.3875
kfling@firstenergycorp.com

Counsel for Ohio Edison Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Answer was filed electronically through the Docketing Information System of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on this 2nd day of August 2022. A courtesy copy of the foregoing Answer was sent by U.S. Mail to the following person on this 2nd day of August 2022:

Arthur and Vicki Maser
13440 Theeland Avenue NW
Uniontown, OH 44685
Complainant

/s/ John W. Breig, Jr.
John W. Breig, Jr. (0096767)
One of the Attorneys for Ohio Edison Company

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

8/2/2022 3:07:14 PM

in

Case No(s). 22-0701-EL-CSS

Summary: Answer Answer of Respondent Ohio Edison Company electronically
filed by Mr. John W. Breig on behalf of Ohio Edison Company