

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF
RONALD KALINOSKI,

COMPLAINANT,

CASE NO. 22-229-GA-CSS

v.

THE EAST GAS COMPANY D/B/A/
DOMINION ENERGY OHIO,

RESPONDENT.

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on January 31, 2024

{¶ 1} 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.

{¶ 2} The East Gas Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Energy Ohio (Dominion) is a natural gas company as defined in R.C. 4905.03 and a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02. Accordingly, Dominion is subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

{¶ 3} On March 18, 2022, Ronald Kalinoski (Complainant) filed a complaint against Dominion alleging that Dominion's monthly charges for natural gas transportation service are excessive, particularly when compared to historic changes to inflation and interest rates.

{¶ 4} On April 7, 2022, Dominion filed its answer, in which it acknowledges that Complainant is its natural gas service customer, denies all the other allegations set forth in the complaint, and sets forth several affirmative defenses. Specifically, Dominion denies that monthly charges to Complainant's account for gas transportation or delivery charges

have been excessive, stating instead they have been charged to Complainant's account in a manner consistent with all applicable statutes, rules, tariff provisions, and orders of the Commission.

{¶ 5} By Entry dated April 18, 2022, the attorney examiner scheduled a settlement teleconference for May 11, 2022. However, the parties did not reach a settlement of the case at that time.

{¶ 6} Complainant filed additional information in the docket, including responses to Dominion's answer and questions directed to the mediator on April 15, 2022; April 19, 2022; and June 21, 2022.

{¶ 7} By Entry dated September 14, 2023, the attorney examiner ordered the parties to file a report outlining the status of settlement discussions. The Entry also ordered the parties to confirm whether they could attend an evidentiary hearing, if necessary, on October 24, 2023.

{¶ 8} On September 28, 2023, Complainant filed a report stating he was prepared to proceed with an October 24, 2023 evidentiary hearing.

{¶ 9} On October 4, 2023, Respondent filed correspondence indicating that, while Respondent believes this case presents no underlying factual dispute, the company is nonetheless available for an October 24, 2023 evidentiary hearing.

{¶ 10} By Entry dated October 6, 2023, the attorney examiner scheduled this matter for an evidentiary hearing on October 24, 2023.

{¶ 11} On October 20, 2023, Complainant sent a request via email to continue the October 24, 2023 hearing because of a family health emergency. Counsel for Respondent agreed to continue the date, and on November 14, 2023, the attorney examiner issued an Entry rescheduling the hearing for January 30, 2024. In that Entry, the attorney examiner also scheduled a status conference for January 23, 2024.

{¶ 12} The parties discussed the case at the status conference on January 23, 2024. However, the following day, the Complainant sent a request via email to the attorney examiner and Respondent seeking a continuance based upon unforeseen circumstances preventing him from preparing for and traveling to the January 30, 2024 hearing.

{¶ 13} By Entry dated January 26, 2024, the attorney examiner canceled the hearing. Subsequently, the parties discussed potential available dates for a rescheduled hearing.

{¶ 14} Therefore, the attorney examiner schedules this matter for an evidentiary hearing on February 13, 2024, at 10:00 a.m., Eastern Standard Time. The hearing will take place at the Commission offices, Hearing Room 11-D, 11th Floor, 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215. The parties should register at the lobby desk and then proceed to the 11th Floor to participate in the hearing.

{¶ 15} In order to facilitate a timely resolution of this matter, the attorney examiner does not intend to grant any additional continuances of the hearing date, absent serious extenuating circumstances.

{¶ 16} As is the case in all Commission complaint proceedings, the complainant has the burden of proving the allegations of the complaint. *Grossman v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 5 Ohio St.2d 189, 214 N. E. 2d 666 (1966).

{¶ 17} It is, therefore,

{¶ 18} ORDERED, That the evidentiary hearing be scheduled for February 13, 2024, at 10:00 a.m., as indicated in Paragraph 14. It is, further,

{¶ 19} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon each party of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/ Clint R. White

By: Clint R. White
Attorney Examiner

NJW/mef

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

1/31/2024 9:58:35 AM

in

Case No(s). 22-0229-GA-CSS

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry scheduling an evidentiary hearing for February 13, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. at the offices of the Commission, Hearing Room 11-D electronically filed by Ms. Mary E. Fischer on behalf of David M. Hicks, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.